Contact email: [redacted]

Living with(out) maids:

A Foucauldian Discourse Analysis

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

at Massey University, Albany

New Zealand

Kayleigh Geyer

2019

Abstract

Domestic work in the South African context is a socially normalised employment option for predominantly women of colour, that when taken outside of 'common knowledge,' becomes questioned. The political transformations of South Africa from the Apartheid social order to the 'Rainbow Nation' of today, has seen a dramatic increase in immigration of South Africans since the late 1980's to countries such as New Zealand. This raises questions as to how South Africans construct and constitute their ideas and beliefs around domestic work, in a country where the slavery and servitude of the Indigenous population is not rooted in similar historical contexts.

Using Foucault's genealogical method of discourse analysis, the knowledge and truth claims of eight South Africans living in New Zealand are deconstructed and explored, to address the research question of; how do South Africans now living in New Zealand construct Domestic Work? The analysis of these eight interviews is centred around the integral issues of race, gender, social class and political structures, to direct attention to the social, moral, political and economic institutions that sustain or contradict assumptions and claims.

The dominant discourses of Race and Hierarchy, The Domestic Worker Employment Paradox, and Tension are identified from the analysis and explored, decentring South African race and gender relations in the New Zealand sphere. Power and knowledge as a circular concept promotes an "ethics" of the self for all who have immigrated, to engage in practical consciousness, critical self-awareness and reflexivity into the legitimacy of social knowledge.

Acknowledgements

I would like to begin by thanking the person who has always inspired me to question the world and social philosophies. My Grandpa Mike, with his quiet yet stable presence, planted the seeds of exploration and investigation into my young mind, allowing and understanding my interest in the why's and how's of life. I can still feel his influence in every book I pick up, in every venture I take, and every question I ask.

Thank you to Massey University for encouraging and supporting my academic journey, and for providing world-class library resources to better my own self-directed education. To my supervisor, Keith Tuffin, for patiently replying to my long emails, and for providing me with the direction and guidance I so desperately needed. Thank you for seeing potential in my ideas and for allowing me to push boundaries, yet always knowing when to reign in my tangents.

A special thank you to my parents Sandy and John-Paul Geyer, without you I would not have walked this incredible journey, and I am eternally grateful for every single sacrifice you have made. An equal thank you to my partner Kieran Griffiths and my sister Jeanne-Michelle Geyer, for understanding my need to hide away when I was in 'thesis mode' and for being there when I needed support. I would not have made it through many dark days without you two.

Thank you to all the people who have put up with me for the duration of this study- my family in South Africa and my friends both there and here in New Zealand. Your support has been invaluable to me. A special thanks to Matthew Kean for the many insightful and much needed coffee catch-ups.

Thank you to the Massey University Ethics Committee for their approval for this study, and my deepest thanks and acknowledgements to the participants who so willingly shared their stories with me. Without you this study would not have been possible.

Lastly, I would like to dedicate this thesis to Luna, my guardian angel.

Table of Contents

Introduction and Preface

I have grown up in a country where the colour of a person's skin represents more than anything else. A country where at the end of each day, the setting sun casts it's kaleidoscope of beauty across the sky. I am of the harshness of Africa, but am I African? I have lived in blissful ignorance of periods of political struggle, upheaval, activism, and social change. Acts of oppression and subjection occurring before my eyes as a child, coated beneath the sugar of normality. It is only through my New Zealand eyes that I begin to question everything I represent.

I am conflicted as to how I recall my childhood and adolescence in South Africa, accepting that this conflict may never be resolved. I was safe, happy and free, but how many others were too? The image that I carry with me always, is that of my families' domestic worker (or maid), whom is a part of my memories from as far back as I can remember. She feels as if she is part of our family, but she eats her meals in her quarters, and goes back to her home in the squatter camp at the end of each day. Her home is made of brick and corrugated iron and is the size of my childhood bedroom. We are white, and she is black. She means so much to me, but it is now that I've come to question, how much did she mean to my white-washed world?

This research grows from my interest and commitment to social justice, in whatever that may mean. Immigrating with my family at the age of fifteen to New Zealand, shifted the very foundations of everything I had come to believe about myself and the world. Visiting South Africa recently with my Maori partner, I began to see the things that I once considered so normal through his eyes. I have experienced instances in New Zealand with South Africans who openly express their political and racial opinions of South Africa in my company, a situation I have become so increasingly uncomfortable with that I often choose not to disclose my heritage. New Zealand leads me towards the open-minded South African New Zealander I aim to be. My struggle to negotiate the complexities of my positioning as both a New Zealand and South African citizen motivated my interest in this topic. I am aware that it is dangerous to position myself as willing to "right" anything of injustice, especially as I consider and

acknowledge the privileged position I accompany in relation to this research. I therefore do not aim to “give voice” to anyone, and I accompany the journey of this thesis with my own.

Chapter One

Epistemology

"In attempting to uncover the deepest strata of Western culture, I am restoring to our silent and apparently immobile soil its rifts, its instability, its flaws; and it is the same ground that is once more stirring under our feet" (Foucault, 1970 p.28).

Introduction

Before the very many complex issues surrounding "domestic work" can be contextualised, examined, and analysed, it is important to consider the epistemic context within which certain bodies of knowledge have become intelligible and accepted (Rousse, 1987, p. 96). This chapter will aim to shape the significance of the study not only for domestic work in South Africa, but also for the South Africans living in other countries they immigrate to. The implications of these issues provide a sound basis for the argument that they be deconstructed and conceived of through a Social Constructionist lens.

Social constructionism and Discourse

Social Constructionist inquiry is one that cannot be easily defined or categorised, because it is precisely these categories of Western conception that this view attempts to resist. The world through a constructionist lens is not what we have commonly come to know; in that our knowledge is a reflection of the world. Rather, this conception poses that the world is a reflection of our knowledge. Social constructionist epistemology is rooted within sets of assumptions that challenge the objective basis of knowledge. In these views, not only are broad areas of inquiry open for study, but the foundations of psychological knowledge are criticised (Gergen K. J., 1994). Shaking the foundations of mainstream thought, critical works' main agenda could be described as political, opposing the neutral stance accepted amongst researchers that have characterised the discipline until recent times. Social and behavioural sciences have traditionally aimed to render objective accounts of the human experience, with the aim of generalizing findings to people of all cultures and historical periods. This quest is

motivated by the generating of hypothesis and predictions for future behaviour. Language is therefore regarded as the bearer of objectivity, in that words can be utilised to reflect reality and thus, truth.

The "modern" era of the 1500's to late 1900's, provided by both scientists and empiricist scholars, sought to remove sciences from the question of morals (Gergen K. J., 1994). These assumptions rested on the bedrock of Positivism, where thinking could be defined to include beliefs of rationality and objectivity, in the quest to demarcate "good science" from superstition. This modern age, which is arguably still alive and strong, saw science dominate as the western conceptualisation and creation of knowledge, turning the inquiry of humans from the natural world to themselves. In this period, society saw huge historical changes such as the Industrial Revolution, which informed conceptualisation of knowledge and foundational ontologies. These ontologies began to split the subject and the object, in that humans. as individuals, began to view themselves through the eyes of science, and the eyes of a Psychology based on science. It is here that science attempted to demarcate itself from the Church, rationalising human behaviour as observable and amenable of scientific scrutiny (Lyon, 1994). Social understanding, or perhaps even, the creation of an innate "self", was born. This binary way of conceptualising "internal" states and "external" environments which has stemmed from the discourse of science, has transcended not only into the fields of academia, but is what constitutes the way many make sense of the world.

Within "postmodern" thought, the critical insight that Constructionism offers could be broadly understood in relation to two major historical traditions of intellect. The first being the empirical viewpoint, where the great thinkers of this "exogenic" perspective trace the source of knowledge to events representative of the real world. This carries the assumption that knowledge is a direct reflection of "reality." Behaviourism is one contribution of Psychology to this paradigm of thought, where the major determinant of human activity is placed in the environment. This insinuates a cause and effect relationship. Contrasting this view, other philosophers adopting the "endogenic" perspective, regard not the representation of reality, but the source of knowledge itself. In this view, knowledge is dependent on process, and it is these processes that build knowledge. This major reversal on the emphasis is seen in the recent cognitive "revolution" within Psychology, where the

emphasis on human action is dependent on internal cognitive functioning. This view emphasises that knowledge is built on the world as cognized rather than the world that is, but the question of one ultimate "reality" is not contested either. Thus, these two perspectives have formed the common conception that psychological science is concerned with these two philosophies, to render an account of objective knowledge of the world (Gergen K. J., 1985). Social constructionist theory however, proposes that it is not "truth-seeking" that is the aim, but rather, the "multiple truths" that are constructed within social interchange. It is social process and the construction of meaning that becomes vital for understanding the nature of knowledge itself (Gergen K. J., 1994).

The constructionist "turn to language" (Parker, 1990) highlights the focus of writers in the late 1960's and early 1970's that drew attention to the accounts people gave of their actions. This "new paradigm" focused on the crisis within social psychology, which gave rise to debates concerning structures of meaning outside the discipline; debates that were to form the beginnings of post-structuralism (Parker, 1990). "Post-structuralism" could be referred to as a set of writings on language and discourse produced by a number of historians and philosophers that would inform a general understanding by what is meant by "discourse." Discourse Analysis, or the analysis of "text," takes a critical view of language and highlights the constructive nature of language. In this view, discourses do not simply describe the world, they create it, they categorize it. They allow reference to "things" as if they truly existed, when the constructionist claim is that those "things" have been circumscribed by discourse, by providing a framework or coherent system of meaning that can be socially agreed on.

Social constructionism places importance on understanding the world in terms of social artefacts and historically situated interactions amoung people. This notion implies that there can be several variations of the way we understand phenomena based on our cultural and historical context, proposing multiple "truths" as opposed to one, singular "truth." People therefore construct meanings that are negotiated through language, which are ever-evolving and changing. These meanings are dynamic, and through social interaction become cultivated within that specific time, place, culture, and context.

Foucault: Power, Knowledge and the Subject

Within the broad area of critical work, Michel Foucault and the "toolbox of ideas" that he provides will be used in this thesis to analyse the general mechanisms in question (Hook, 2005). This "method" of analysis provides an important theoretical contribution to the application of power and the roles of many in the domestic and household sphere. Utilising Foucault's genealogical method of critique the approach will enable a political criticism of knowledge production, exploring historical realms of discourse. Importantly, the ideas presented do not aim to call themselves "Foucauldian" in nature, as even Foucault himself would defy a category or label (Fadyl, Nicholls, & McPherson, 2013) and will most likely draw from other areas of critical thought to enable knowledge and discourse deconstruction.

Foucault; is someone who by no means could be defined in terms of who he "was" or what he "did" in terms of his work, his ideas, or him as a person. The reason for this inability to be "defined" is because the breadth and complexity of his work exists and evolves beyond easy categorization, as he writes not in order to disclose the self but to escape it (McNay, 1994). As a great thinker Foucault has generated an enormous amount of literature, but the themes of "power/ knowledge" and the "subject," some of his most well-known ideas, are what grounds the perspectives and analysis of this thesis. In the eyes of Foucault, it is not the analysis of power itself, or the foundations of the phenomena that captured his intent, but how power relations create and maintain social practices, specifically those of inequality and oppression (McNay, 1994, p. 2). In this view, all knowledge is embedded in power relations, so much so that the terms "knowledge" and "power" could be used interchangeably (Hook, 2005). The connection of these two levels of analysis and political regulation is through the practice of "normalising judgement"' the construction of norms as a field of knowledge (Rousse, 1987). Furthermore, it is suggested that the exercise of power is not simply a relationship between partners, individuals or a collective of people, but the way in which actions modify others. In this way, power does not exist as an independent construct or force, but exists only when put into action. Power relations are rooted in the social nexus, not above society as a supplementary structure. Power is thus never present as an action on another, it is constituted as a power relation because of its reproduction over time as a sustained power relationship (Rousse, 1987).

The idea of the speaking human "subject" and the importance of the role that language and social action plays in this view enters with what Foucault terms "dividing practices." He deems the subject to be either divided within him/herself or divided from others; objectifying him/her (Foucault, 1982). Following this, he stresses the idea that humans are not innately born a subject, but they become a subject, through the societal discourses available to constitute this subjectivity. The "subject" is not a radical conceptualisation of the human being, but the ways in which the subject is conceptualised in mainstream psychology is critiqued through Foucault's ideas. He questions the notions of a rational subject, an idea that has governed westernised thought since the Enlightenment period. The breaking-down of this self-reflexive, unified "self" lies at the heart of the deconstructive nature of Foucauldian perspective, clearing space for other more radical ways of thinking and being (McNay, 1994). In his view, the idea of an inner "mind," "soul" or essential entity is in fact the effect of social process and subjection. This problematizes the taken-for-granted notion of "free-will" and "choice" and limits these ideas within the possibilities of discourse. Therefore, rationality is dependent on discursive regularities that determine what is socially possible to say, think, do, feel, or experience. These deep structures constituting all thought and knowledge are what Foucault terms "archaeology" (Foucault, 1972). Here the importance of history is stressed to conceive of how humans have constituted themselves, and importantly, constituted distinctions between themselves and the "other." This critique of Western culture is therefore crucially important to understanding the political agenda of Foucault's insights, as he attempts to dislodge the idea that the subject exists prior to language, deeming this idea of the subject as the origin of all meaning an illusion created by the structural rules that govern our discursive formations. Discursive formations do not refer to merely the structuring, ordering or representation of language, but it is the structuring principle through which beliefs and practices, words and "things" are governed, to produce what is termed "material" relations (McNay, 1994). He stresses the importance that within these discursive formations, objects under discussion come into question, but these "objects" within their domains were not already demarcated or existent independently of the discursive formations that made it possible to talk about them (Rousse, 1987). Here, it is possible to begin to see the carefully constructed walls within our societies; walls that have categorised our beliefs, ideas, and identities; crumble and fall down.

Reflexivity

Reflexivity on the part of the "researcher" in the case of discourse is extremely important and defies the mainstream conception of researcher neutrality and objectivity in relation to the topic of study. Most structuralists did not consider the concepts of truth and subjectivity, claiming a rational or objective basis for the knowledge. They therefore wished to make universal claims about these measurable, objective and defined structures, without perhaps reflecting on the self-reflexive realization that accounts of structure are themselves discursive (Gergen K. J., 1994). This poses an interesting yet complex obstacle for the discursive researcher, because if discourse is not driven by objects but by underlying structures, then to what extent can we conceive of discourse, independently of discourse? And furthermore, if we frame discursive accounts in language, then to what extent can these accounts map the reality of these structures? It is in this idea that "I" as the "author" is reminded that it is not the world as it stands that drives the research, but my own self-interest that drives my account of the world (Gergen K. J., 1994). In this view, I am therefore not separate from this research. The line between "author" and "thesis" as written is not distinct. In this view, I am not claiming objectivity, or rationality, or any possession of insights that are not saturated with my own ideology and discourse. To really claim criticality, would therefore be to acknowledge that in the process of research, thinking, writing, I am not able to "escape" discourse; I cannot stand reflectively on the outside of discourse and analyse "it" objectively, when I am also a part of it. I must endorse in some way, the very empiricist orientations that I attempt to subvert in this research. In the eyes of Foucault and his critique into the social and critical analysis, it is the various professions, such as psychology and sociology, that develop languages and therefore justify their existence in the social world. These languages are put into practice, within a thesis such as this for example. Discourse analysis and reflexivity are historically bound (Parker, 1990), suggesting that reflexivity does not absolve discourse, but may permit different spaces for manoeuvre and resistance.

Conclusion

To conclude, this chapter has oriented the reader to postmodern critique of knowledge, centred particularly around the work of Foucault, systems of knowledge and power. A genealogical method of critique is proposed, through which discourse analysis will be the primary method of deconstruction. These arguments position the social environments of South Africa and New Zealand within relations of power, bound by historical discourses through which human subjects come into being. This stance does therefore not take an individualistic approach, but rather directs focus to the relations between people and the social knowledge that accounts for their truths. Researcher reflexivity has also been explored, setting the tone for the reflexivity that will occur throughout this work. This again, considers a critical stance towards Psychology, alongside the acknowledgement that much of the knowledge and thus, discourse, is bound by and within the domains of academia and institutional philosophy. This political orientation and the historical knowledge of domestic work will be further explored in the following chapter; the Literature Review.

A reflexive account

This construction of discourse through my writing raises further reflexive questioning for me in terms of who "me" really is. I struggle with how I constitute myself within this space as a white South African born, New Zealand-living woman. I embody the coloniser, the Western thought. Although I am a woman I am not entirely the 'dominant,' but depending on the context, I could be interpreted as such because of my race, my education, my privilege. How I then "do" research in these "postmodern," "post-colonial," "critical" areas, without further reproducing the control and domination of colonisation, requires extensive self-talk in the process. Living in New Zealand, am I an "outsider?" Am I a coloniser here too? Am I an "other?" Do I still see myself as an "outsider" because I am not indigenous to a particular country and culture, as I am a mixture of various different periods of colonisation? At times I feel anger, and resentment for being a visual representation of the oppression of a culture, or many cultures. I can't take this back, I didn't "do" this, but through my institutionalised knowledge, my working life, my relationships, I still reinforce this don't I? Of all the questions I have, which possibly could never be "answered" by any final truth, is my important quest to

remain reflexive during this process. It is of utmost importance to me to not only remain critical of the discourses surrounding my topic, but to remain critical of myself and the many positionings I offer to this work. In this way, I become more comfortable with being consistently uncomfortable.

I could easily be one of the participants in my own study, analysing my own discourses. Do I continue to essentialise, by utilising discourses such as "woman," "race," "South African" etc? By attempting to deconstruct discourses, do we not further re-enforce them, by categorising them for the purpose of critique and analysis? I cannot be "perfectly" unbiased, nor can I claim complete ignorance to the part I play in this project entirely, but I can be open to the dialogue I have with myself, and of myself with others. No human being is able to step outside of themselves and view the world from no position at all, and the task of the researcher therefore becomes to acknowledge their involvement in the research process and to continually reflect on how this may play a part (Burr, 2015). *As I outlined in the introduction, the narrative of this work is a story, not separate from history, myself, the participants, their stories, their positions, my positions, and you, the reader. May the story be negotiated, contested, and compromised.*

Chapter Two

Literature Review

"the problem does not consist in drawing the line between that in a discourse which falls under the category of scientificity or truth, and that which comes under some other category, but in seeing historically how effects of truth are produced within discourses which in themselves are neither true or false" (Foucault, 1982, p. 118)

Introduction

It should be addressed in the beginning of this review that ambiguity exists surrounding the "title" of domesticity as a job in the South African context, with much of the literature using the terms "maid" and "domestic worker" interchangeably (Archer, 2011; Bradfield, 2012; Jansen, 2011; Nyamnjoh, 2005; Moboyana & Sekaja, 2015). Domestic service and thus, domestic servants as workers are also utilised (Cock 1981, 1987) though not as commonly. Bosch and McLeod (2015) shed light on these confusions in their study, where some domestic employees prefer the terms "nanny" or "housekeeper" if they are responsible for looking after children and cleaning, a few women finding the term "maid" offensive and others not. For this thesis, the term "domestic worker" will be utilised to refer to the position title, as this term can be understood between both New Zealand and South African contexts. Furthermore, this term refers to the employment of domesticity as work, specifically within the domestic space understood as the household.

This chapter is divided into four sections, following a genealogy of history similar to that of the study's' proposed methodology. This takes the view that the "body" of the domestic worker not be constituted as true or false, right or wrong, but be stripped of the historical imprints that constitute domestic normality and acceptance.

In Part One I review the wider social and historical contexts of South African colonialism, from which Imperialist and Nationalist knowledge emerges to constitute slavery, and servitude. Initially, I explore the notion of colonisation and the encoding of discourses

regarding race and social hierarchy (Said, 1994; Smith, 1999). This hierarchy is then positioned with the dependency created between coloniser and colonised, and thus the hierarchy between servant and master in the servitude relationship (Said, 1994). Afrikaner identity is then explored, specifically the role of the Afrikaans woman, the "Volksmoeder" in the construction and preservation of the Afrikaans household, as well as a white and pure nation. This preservation includes demarcation from the British, in the quest to establish cultural independence (Gilliomee, 2003). Narratives of religion and gender are then explored, as well as the construction of "whiteness" in relation to the black slave. Slave labour and its origins in the country are then addressed, to establish their contribution to the new colonial order (Viljoen, 2001). This moral "civilising" of the black majority through forced labour provides a set of discursive understandings, setting the backdrop for arguably one of the most important eras in South African history, Apartheid.

In Part Two I focus on the Apartheid era of South African history, to further explore understandings of slavery and how these notions have transformed into the socially acceptable employment of domestic labour. The legalisation of racial separation and the control of the white class during this era is further examined in terms of how the social understandings of the time inform the dominance of domestic servitude by black women (Cock, 1981, 1987; Jansen 2011). The normalisation of white household maintenance through the informal arrangement of domestic work is explored (King, 2007) to further address the divisions of race, enforced on whites and blacks through the Afrikaans government, and the established ideology of "common sense" in relation to white households and domestic work. Furthermore, the complex relationship between employer and employee within the domestic relationship is addressed, bringing attention to social power relations constituting those within the white household (Cock, 1981, 1987; Jansen 2011).

Part Three focuses on the post-apartheid era, addressing perspectives on the "rainbow nation" and the effects of democracy. Arguments surrounding the legal changes to domestic work as a legitimate form of employment, take a critical stance towards the political and social improvements and whom they serve to benefit (Cock, 1981; 1987; Mbeki 2009). Frameworks to support gender equality in the labour force are brought into question (Hassim, 2003), and how these frameworks position women in relation to domestic work are then

brought to light. Furthermore, “white” identity and comfort zones amidst social change are addressed, linking the “micro” relationship of paid domestic work to the “macro” political environment of race, social class and equality (Archer, 2011; Ballard, 2014; Bosch & McLeod, 2015; Bradfield, 2012; Steyn, 2009; Steyn & Foster, 2008). The power relations circulating to sustain and resist Apartheid constraints serve as a backdrop to these explorations, to question this still commonly accepted form of labour (Bradfield, 2012; King, 2007).

Finally, in Part Four I draw attention to the immigration of a high number of South Africans to New Zealand, to situate these relations of gender, race and domesticity into a different social sphere. A brief history of domestic servitude in New Zealand is explored (Macdonald , 2017) as well as the power relations regarding New Zealand colonialism, Maori and the household (Brookes, 2007). The small amount of literature available on South Africans, their identity and cultural knowledge following immigration is examined (Meares, 2007; Trlin, 2012) to provide coherency to the rationale of this thesis.

Part 1: English Imperialism, Afrikaner Nationalism and Servitude

Because of the complexity of the history of South Africa, “domestic work” remains deeply entrenched within the historical periods of colonisation, bound to the relations between ‘black slave’ and ‘white master.’ An ideology of what counted as human, in terms of intellect, invention, producing things of value, practicing arts of “civilization,” were all already encoded into imperial and colonial discourses prior to the actual periods of colonisation in South Africa (Smith, 1999). These discourses informed conceptions of classification, such as race and social hierarchies, and the ever-present creation of the “other” in relation to the White Man. In this view, it would be naïve to assume that colonisation is a phenomenon of the past, as colonialism maintains a legacy of connections that binds all countries to each other, who must today, deal with the dislocations brought about by an expanding European population (Said, 1994). British and European Imperialism is often considered to be a thing of the past; in that colonisation happened, ended, and societies such as South Africa rebuilt and moved on. Postcolonial critique however, would argue that this viewpoint negates the idea that imperialism created a complex capitalist system, and a structure of dependency between coloniser and colonised that does not merely come to an end (Said, 1994).

This dependency between coloniser and colonised, established along racial lines of division, derives from the institution of slavery instilled by the Dutch in 1652, and occurred in quick succession by British rule (Oliver & Oliver , 2017). These relations, from early colonial days, established a social and economic hierarchy within the country. Although slavery was officially abolished in the early 1800's, on modern-day South African farms, and within households, indications suggest that the majority of labour staff are either black or of colour, which includes the domestic roles as well as those of other manual labour (Oliver & Oliver , 2017). Colonial South Africa is seen therefore to have been structured along racial lines, where black people operated as subordinates to the dominant white people. These dichotomies of "self" and "other" began the building blocks for the construction of a "whiteness" within the country, one that would be contested and struggled between English and Afrikaans subjectivities.

Giliomee writes of Afrikaner identity as a form of opposition to the British; a cultural and racial identification and ultimately, in South Africa, as survival (2003). As descendants of the Dutch settlers in the Cape, the vitality of the Afrikaner history is drawn from an ultimate love of the harsh land, springing from liberation of dependency on Europe and the refusal to be considered "second-class Britons." Described as an extremely patriarchal and society, the Afrikaans society was based on Calvinism, with conservative values structuring the role that women played within society (Allen, 2014). As with traditionalist European narratives, women were designated to the household, but through the battles against the Imperialists, often took a front-seat. Boer (Afrikaans) women were seen to bring equal value to their culture as their men (Gilliomee, 2003, p. 231). Afrikaans women played a crucial and central role on the ideological formations of "Afrikanderdom," in particular, the construction of the figure of the mother in relation to all that she cares for, including her country (Vincent, 2000). The "Volksmoeder," translated from Afrikaans as "Mother of the People," highlights the importance of the Afrikaans household in the early days of Afrikaner Nationalism, where her "activism" was mobilised in the building of a "white" and "pure" nation. This nationalist narrative, which establishes Afrikaner women as the safe keepers of the Afrikaans bloodline during Apartheid, would not only encourage demarcation from the British, but separation from all others of colour, in the quest to maintain racial "purity." The role of the white

Afrikaner woman therefore became established securely as the gatekeeper of the house, and the nation.

The contest of land ownership and ultimate "whiteness" between the British and the Afrikaans during historical periods of war left the colonised black population consigned to the role of dutiful slave or servant. From 1652 till the abolishment of slavery in the Cape Colony in 1807, slaves were bought and traded from slave-traders in India and Indonesia, as well as other African countries by the Dutch, who would later become known as the Afrikaner "Boers" (farmers). They were primarily interested in supplying their ships as they rounded the Cape en-route to the spice producing islands of Indonesia. As these Afrikaans settlements in the farming lands expanded outside of the Cape, the indigenous KhoiKhoi communities within the areas were placed under enormous pressure and became incorporated into the colonial society. Viljoen ascribes the changing political landscape of the country as a force which allowed whites to "gain the upper hand over the KhoiKhoi on all levels" and had created a violent interior environment on the farms (2001). Their cultural independence was lost, and they were allowed only to contribute to the creation of a new colonial order. The belief ascribed to people of colour as befitting to manual labour is linked to the Dutch and the KhoiKhoi, serving as the benchmark for the unconquered African societies, who too would lose their independence in colonial expansion (Viljoen, 2001). Slaves and the production of wheat and wine in the 17th Century went hand-in-hand, and under British rule, it became acknowledged as necessary for the economy of the country to continue to flourish, as it was not at all certain that free or paid labour would be able to replace slaves without significant financial losses.

To summarise, the colonial history of South Africa provides a basis through which assumptions regarding slavery and black servitude can be addressed. These assumptions of giving "opportunity" to the uncivilised black population by the British and Afrikaans colonisers, encoded the idea that colonialism was not necessarily a racial enterprise but a mission (King, 2007). This gave the "savage" the opportunity to become like 'them.' Justifications of a deprived existence through slavery and the liberation that this ensues, provides a sound benchmark for the Apartheid social order and the domestic space. The idea that the European patterns of living are the "right" way to live, set the benchmark for others

to follow. This difference is one of implicit superiority, enacted explicitly and legally, through Apartheid.

Part 2: Apartheid and Domesticity: Race, Gender and Social Class

The Apartheid era (1948 to early 1990's) and the legalisation of racial separation is of interest to the maintenance and preservation of white cultural identity, and similarly, the identity of a previously established black servant; the domestic worker. It is argued that through the Afrikaans government of the time, Apartheid's justification was not necessarily white supremacy, but rather, the acceptance and normality of difference (King, 2007). In this period, the accepted notion of this difference is that if your difference is regarded to be to your detriment, in that you are not white, you are therefore not like me.

Apartheid reinforced many of the social and racial differences established through colonisation, one aspect of this inequality enacted in the South African household. Domestic service, that is the employment of a black woman by a white family, was ascribed as common practice during Apartheid; argued to have stood as a microcosm for the social inequality outside of that household (Cock, 1981). The informal arrangement of domestic work during Apartheid, dominated by black women, is argued by critical scholars through underpay and hidden abuse, to have been a highly unequal arrangement (Cock, 1981; Jansen, 2011; King, 2017).

King (2007) provides more insight into the feminisation of domestic work in South Africa following colonial periods. After 1911, black women were to perform domestic housework because of patterns of rural-urban migration, whereby men and women were allowed only to work on white farms, or travel into the cities to work for white households (Bujra , 2000, p. 77). Although not able to be verified, King proposes that the African way of life became more patriarchal in terms of labour and employment, through the influence of the British and later the Afrikaners, and this became further ingrained within the South African society through the 1900's (2007). This could account for the gender shift in work particularly located within the domestic realm.

Jansen (2011) provides insight into how the domestic worker contributes to the maintenance of the household, as well as the myth of civilization, while at the same time either has to neglect her own family for safety while residing in her "quarters" with no lights or hot water, or return to her own home in the townships, a spatial symptom of racial oppression. This "physical, ideological and emotional distance" as she terms it, is cultivated by the white family and the laws of the state during Apartheid, but is still evidently practiced to this day. In other words, the relationship was normalized, and therefore, what was wrong with it? In Jansen's discussion of white middle-class comfort, depicted in her analysis of family photos of her family and their domestic workers, she challenges the popular representation at the time of the domestic worker as a "maternal" figure, as well as the normalised attitude of white South Africans to believe they had a right to the service of black people. She critiques this common notion of a "loving" relation between the domestic worker and the madam, as well as between the domestic worker and the white children, on the basis that this relation does not necessarily produce a text that is progressive in nature, but rather, lends insight into the effect of entrenching social roles surrounding gender, and race, reinforced by Apartheid, and colonialist ideals. She also highlights the physical space between white children and their domestic worker in photos, where the black woman is generally off to the side, in the back of photos or not part of them at all. It is argued that the laws employed to govern racial partition during Apartheid have entrenched an ideology in South Africa that racial division is natural and necessary, and is therefore still justified as "common sense." This division is evident within the home, as well as the landscape of cities and space within the country (Dixon, Foster , Durrheim , & Wilbraham, 1994).

Cock provides extensive analysis into domestic servants during the Apartheid era (1981, 1987) as she questions not only the racial oppression these women suffer, but the patriarchal system further enforcing their oppression. Her critical insight supports the idea that the imperialist structures of the country control the power and resources to define and maintain the relationship between white and black as "master" and "servant" and that this transfers into all spheres of life. She equates domestic service as a microcosm of the inequality re-enacted within the social order of the country, and argues that the service reproduces these power relations (Cock, 1981). She points to the dependency of the relationship between patriarchy and capital, and argues that although domestic service represented a strategy for

women to gain employment, the capitalist structure of the nation was dependent on racial prejudice to sustain itself. She reasons this because the number of domestic servants in the country represent the double oppression of black women, but is also a reflection of the high standard of living enjoyed by most white people, where domestic service is deemed a requirement to maintain their lifestyle. This implication of domestic service therefore cheapens the cost of maintaining white labour power. Cock points out that during the Apartheid era white women gained more opportunities in the workforce, but the same is not the case for black women, arguing that the black servant was built into the cost and maintenance of the white lifestyle (Cock, 1981). This suggests a multi-layered dependence between domestic workers and the white household (Cock, 1987). The patriarchal institution of white middle class South Africa, and the subordination the black woman experiences in her own culture where she is also confined to domestic roles, positioned her in a loss of representation and autonomy. During this period of Apartheid she therefore bears many subordinations, extending from her household, her household of her employment, to South African society legalising her oppression (Cock, 1987).

In summary, the reviewed literature surrounding race, gender and domesticity within the Apartheid era, takes a critical stance towards the subordination of black people and the legalised privilege of white people within the South African household. The urban-rural migration of black people outside of established white cities provides a basis for black labour, and the patriarchal nature of both the white and black cultures for the establishment of domesticity as feminised. It is argued that the domestic worker, normalised through the periods of colonisation, became established as an occupation for black women, legalised and enforced through the racial laws and social understandings of Apartheid. These divisions of race, enforced on white and black through the Afrikaans government, is argued to have established an ideology of "common sense" in relation to white households and domestic work.

Part 3: Domesticity, Post-Apartheid and Social Change

The literature surrounding "post-Apartheid" bears many perspectives, as the domestic worker and the white household are situated within complex social and political

change. Macro political insights question whether the power relations in the country really have changed, and if so, how and to benefit whom.

The transition to democracy in the 1990's brought in a formal institutional framework that held up a serious commitment to racial equality, but to gender, by changing women's' engagement with the state from suspicious and oppositional during Apartheid to a permeable interest and focus on gender activism. Under the banner of the Women's' National Coalition during the transitional period (1990-1994), responsibilities were imposed on the government to address socio-economic inequalities and ways that erode inequalities of gender and race. A gender "pact" was then instituted as women were recognised and incorporated in the policymaking process. Despite women's' increased involvement in politics, it is argued that there has been little research into the extent to which increased representation has translated into really reducing gender inequalities (Hassim, 2003). Furthermore, Hassim argues that policy can only go so far as to re-create change, but it is the social practices and cultural norms that legitimize the inequality of women that is key (2003). This is highlighted in the issues raised by Cock (1981) where she argues that women, and black women in particular, are required to remain in lower positions of labour to sustain the capitalist structure of the economy. This points to a still existent dependency between patriarchy and capital, the luxury lifestyles still led by rich white people, and the emerging black elite classes. This racial prejudice is therefore argued as necessary for this structure to sustain itself, and servitude in lower socio-economic working positions are required for these social elites to maintain their lifestyle.

"Elitism" and capital gain was a concept reserved only for white people during Apartheid, but the question about how the distribution of wealth now functions in the post-apartheid sphere, and if this serves to benefit the previously disadvantaged, is of interest to many. Mbeki (2009) argues that by fighting for inclusion in the colonial system, perpetuated during Apartheid, has not brought about economic transformation for the under-privileged classes, but rather entrenched colonial inequalities. This is therefore the basis of the argument for the obvious inequalities still evident in the country, such as the availability of black labour, the normalisation of black female domestics and the desperation for work. In this emerging elite class, the link to patriarchy is therefore still evident, as within patriarchal

societies, it is the men in power who influence how the society survives and reproduces itself. These ideas begin to disrupt the dualism of race and privilege, and opens up the discussion of race and privilege amidst social reformation and the re-balancing of power.

Further insight into how these social reformations have perpetuated racial "comfort zones," where previously granted entitlement in the white classes is sought in the post-apartheid sphere (Ballard , 2004). Although the country has moved on positively in some aspects since the early 1990's, such as more black, coloured and Indian middle-class communities living in the previously white suburbs, the politics of space have become more complex, and remain segregated. White "comfort zones" can be seen in the gated communities and enclosed neighbourhoods of South Africa, potentially highlighting and reinforcing an idea of collective whiteness (Ballard , 2004). Although many white and middle class groups live within their gated communities and segregated suburbs, there is an acceptance of other races that is conditional upon conformity to white culture, norms and standard. This can be seen in particular through the black domestic worker, as she arrives from her residence, usually in the squatter camps, to her place of work, usually in a white neighbourhood.

This "white talk," laden with resistance to political change is deemed problematic in the post-apartheid space. Steyn (2009) in particular looks at the productive nature of "white talk" as resistant. She argues that the current political and social climate of South Africa brings crisis to Afrikaner identity, as traditionally their whiteness was resistant to the whiteness of the British. It is said that English speaking South Africans are more able to adopt a neutral position in relation to the new policies but Afrikaners can't escape that the Apartheid system was put in place in their name. These positions are relayed in the "white talk" operating within pockets of white South African citizens, perpetuating white comfort zones and resistances to changes in freedom and autonomy for the domestic worker.

Research into domestic employment relationships highlights another interesting complexity, in that employers expressed awareness and sensitivity to the concerns of South Africa's racialised past and these impacts on their relationships with their domestic workers but despite this, continue highly unequal and racially privileged relationships (Bosch &

McLeod, 2015). This is attributed to the complex nature of the employer-employee relationship that is more than just a working relationship, but is none-the-less one that continues to reinforce social constructions of the South African household as feminised and racialised space (Bosch & McLeod, 2015). Archer (2011) discusses the complexity of this relationship and illuminates the idea of employer "power" cultivated through habit. She suggests that although many relationships have changed positively since Apartheid, alongside the adoption of more legal and economic protections (Bradfield, 2012) many domestic employment relationships are still determined by habituated-norms established by the Apartheid moral order. She argues that the irony in this "improved" relationship is that by improving conditions and communication with domestic workers, employers are perpetuating and harvesting a dependent relationship, creating a myth of racial and class equality. This "myth" of a conventional working relationship is further deconstructed through the critique of South African sitcom "Madam and Eve," where the complexities of implementing multiculturalism are underwritten by the motivation of inclusivity, but rather are riddled with resistance to economic and political equality (Bradfield, 2012). This highlights an agentic nature of "white talk," as resistant to change, while at the same time not openly owning supremacist positions.

Insight into the power relations evident in the relationship between employer and domestic servitude suggests that because domestic workers are still such a marginalised group in South Africa, improvements in their working conditions and pay are assumed to be slower than many other sectors of employment (King, 2007). Through her analyses of nine domestic employment relationships in the post-apartheid environment, King suggests that this is due to the private nature of the employment, where relationships between the family and domestic worker are enacted behind closed doors. In alignment with Bradfield's ideas of habituated norms perpetuating an apartheid relationship in a post-apartheid sphere (Bradfield, 2012) a complete neglect of the past is shown in some cases, where employers distance themselves from Apartheid and deny any knowledge or involvement in its historical effects. Furthermore, a dichotomy is suggested between the words and actions of the employer, where in some cases domestic workers are regarded as maternal, "mother" figures, yet at the same time relegated to the status of a child. This is supported by the idea of a relationship reinforced through dependency (Bradfield, 2012; Cock 1987) as the use of

"kindness" was shown to enhance the power of the employer over their domestic workers. This notion of kindness is dismantled, as to support the notion of the "myth" of a better relationship as previously mentioned, actually used to ensure a compliance to the employers' demands, whereby the domestic workers genuinely believe and embody the beliefs that their employers treat them equally and fairly (King, 2007).

To summarise, the literature on domesticity within the changing social climate of post-apartheid South Africa reveals many complexities. Although progress and positive changes have been made since 1994, it is suggested that the redressing of previously sustained social inequality may not be benefitting the previously disadvantaged majority population, through corruption of elites that now span all racial classes. These power imbalances are shown in the relationship between domestic worker and employer, where improvements in working conditions are present, yet may serve to foster a dependent relationship which is difficult to manage through government policy. Furthermore, acknowledgement and denial of Apartheid inequalities by employers is contested, with social change and development proposed to be threatening the previously claimed entitlement of white identity, spatial, racial and cultural privilege.

Part 4: South Africans, New Zealand and norms of servitude

Alongside South Africa, New Zealand too has a history of colonisation by the British yet exhibits differences in regard to domestic servitude and the indigenous population. Domestic service in England and Europe is largely related to class and migration, while race and immigration dictate the narrative in United States (Macdonald , 2017). Domestic service and paid domestic labour is however, relatively non-existent in comparison, and certainly doesn't depict patterns similar to that of South Africa, or even close neighbours; Australia. Macdonald (2017), in attempting to account for this domestic "crisis" in New Zealand, raises questions around why New Zealand did not employ indigenous or non-white domestic labour within white households during colonial periods. Answers to questions around why Maori were not recruited into domestic service, as was the case in so many other colonised countries, are also sought. Historically, British colonisers are ascribed a pride of "whiteness," so strong that it prevailed over other considerations, even the burden of household chores.

This stands as potential reasoning for the lack of domestic service, as the household became a site of racial purity that was to be preserved. The woman was therefore responsible for this preservation, distancing masculinity from that space. This preservation to the commitment of a "white" society occupies an ambivalent position in relation to Maori, as on one hand they were marginalized and living in poverty, and on the other, included in the expansion of "Britishness" (Macdonald , 2017). Brookes (2007) provides further insight into the ambiguous historical relations between Pakeha and Maori in the construction of a 'white mans' New Zealand. Maori were included in white 'civilisation,' both racial groups uniting to exclude other migrants, particularly the Chinese. The association of Maori women working for Chinese men is positioned as a threat to Maori men and their status as leaders within the community, these ideals thus defended equally by Pakeha. With Maori not being relegated to the status of servants to Pakeha and other racial groups, but rather regarded as equal contributors to white civilisation, perhaps speaks to discourses embedded within New Zealand colonial history. Twentieth century discourses are argued by Macdonald (2017) to have inscribed the phenomenon of 'whiteness' in the land, a racial identification powerful both globally and personally. New Zealand defended this whiteness through the lack of non-white domestic employment; this defence representing Pakeha and Maori interests of labour, gender, and self-government. Dark servility would have challenged the identity and rights of the white working-class (Macdonald, 2012), and furthermore, the hybrid Maori-Pakeha 'race.'

Literature addressing South African immigrants in New Zealand is argued to be largely "invisible" (Trlin , 2012). Research exploring the social and employment experiences in New Zealand by South Africans posits that research focuses on 'visible' migrants, from places such as Asia and the South Pacific (Trlin , 2012) and potentially overlooks South Africans despite being the fourth largest immigrant population in New Zealand (Stats NZ, 2018). It is suggested that they are perhaps overlooked because they are not easily determined ethnically, yet still experience hardships and difficulties as a result of settlement. How South Africans therefore negotiate their identity in a new country, clearly situated within similar but also drastically different historical norms, is argued to be beneficial in its contribution to academic and social knowledge (Trlin , 2012). This is then further argued through the lack of research into the differences in paid domestic employment, where the availability of this servitude in South Africa contrasts with the lack in New Zealand. Although lacking in literature, research into the

personal experiences of South Africans in New Zealand proposes that migration disrupts the gendered balance of employment and household management, due to the constraints in the New Zealand economy.

To summarise, the brief body of literature reviewed on South Africans, New Zealand and domestic work is arguably in need of further exploration. Macdonald (2017) raises questions around why Maori didn't enact roles of domestic servitude and provides insights into the racial relations between Maori and British that speak of a hierarchy dependent of norms different to that of South Africa, yet still within the realms of race and social class. Furthermore, the argument that although a large proportion of the New Zealand immigrant population are South African, the hardships they face with social engagement and identity are overlooked. One study highlights the possibility that migration disrupts previously taken-for-granted notions of gender, the household and employment (Meares, 2007), constrained by the absence of full-time paid domestic work. One married couple however, displayed a continuity in their gender roles despite immigration and lack of paid domestic help, as the woman remained ultimately responsible for their domestic life and the upkeep of the household (Meares, 2007, p. 242). Although incoherency between the couple as to how these beliefs changed or remained fixed, the study suggests that migration bears a considerable impact on the balance between structural and agency on the experience of the South African migrant.

Conclusion

To conclude, the literature surrounding British Imperialism and Afrikaner Nationalism during the colonial periods of South Africa has been explored, to contextualise the role of the black African as "servant", and the white European as "master." A relationship established through hierarchy of race and social class, the Afrikaans and English "white" class fighting for its individual independence from each other, and the "other." This relationship, established along racial boundaries, is argued to be further reinforced during the Apartheid era, where racial division and the feminisation of the household becomes evident. During this period, domestic work as an occupation for black women becomes normalised, establishing an ideology of "common sense" in terms of what domestic work is, and for whom it is suitable.

The exploration of the post-apartheid sphere though the literature proposes a perpetuation of inequality through the domestic relationship despite social transformation, as employers are positioned as aware of a need for change, but are somewhat resistant to change, highlighting a marginalization of domestic workers as a disadvantaged population. Furthermore, it is argued that the structural economy of South Africa is sustained on lower-socio economic labour forces, dominated by a poor black class. The domestic worker is therefore argued to be a requirement to maintain the lifestyle of the expanding middle to upper-classes. Servitude in the New Zealand context amidst the popularity of immigration of South Africans to New Zealand after the 1990's, accounts for similarities in that both countries were colonised by Europeans, but differences lie in the relations between coloniser and colonised. The small visibility of domestic service in New Zealand is evident against the large majority of African women employed as domestic workers in South Africa, which raises questions as to how South Africans contest or transform these notions of difference following immigration. Furthermore, the relations between Pakeha and Maori in New Zealand, and the operation of these relations within discourse, conflict with that of South African domestic life. Those who have immigrated could therefore be a group with a large array of insights worth addressing and exploring.

As the review highlights an extremely complex relationship tied to domesticity and slavery, it is interesting that this is not an aspect more explored in the New Zealand context. Furthermore, the "invisibility" of research regarding South Africans as a population in New Zealand and the social order they constitute is important for the immigrant population in New Zealand, alongside their historical and cultural knowledge. The embeddedness of the Apartheid system, and the social normalisation of black, female domestic work, is non-existent in New Zealand. Although it would be unfair to compare two differing social contexts, both are or have been ruled by European colonisers, and both have Indigenous populations still constituting current societal knowledge. New Zealand remains an extremely popular destination for South African immigrants, with a seemingly similar lifestyle. This raises questions as to how South Africans in the New Zealand space, construct and constitute their ideas and beliefs around domestic work in a context historically rooted in relations different to their previously accepted norms. Furthermore, how might they explain the concept of domesticity as a profession, reserved predominantly for black women, to those within the

New Zealand context? This leads onto the rationale of the proposed study and how it aims to address the complexities raised in the literature, to add depth to the issues of race, gender and domesticity amidst historical relations of power.

Rationale

The issues outlined above provide the rationale for the main research question, how do South Africans living in New Zealand construct Domestic Work? Furthermore, this broad question is broken down into the smaller questions to guide the analysis, consisting of: how are power relations operating to sustain or resist constructions of gender, class and race ; how do South Africans position themselves in relation to the black woman through the domesticity relationship; how do South Africans talk of servitude in relation to race and gender, and how do South Africans construct, sustain or resist comfort zones through their talk?

The study will attempt to explore and deconstruct these accounts of New Zealand-living South Africans, to explore power relations through their talk. This exploration will invite discussion into the integral issues of race, gender, social class and political structures, to direct attention to historical discourses and political institutions that account for normalised assumptions and claims. Domestic work, although explored through historical literature, is lacking in the post-apartheid context and the power relations sustaining knowledge warrant further deconstruction. How South Africans locate domestic work within the "new", amidst the knowledge of the "old," requires further unpacking, to address questions of power, knowledge and systems of truth. This analysis of discourse is paramount to further understanding gender, class and race in the South African and New Zealand social spheres; to enable new modes of being to operate, as well as spaces of resistance. Furthermore, the study aims to open up discussion into the issues surrounding immigration from South Africa to New Zealand, more specifically the negotiation of domesticity and servitude in differing social contexts. Foucauldian Discourse Analysis was chosen as the analytic method and is discussed next.

Chapter Three

Methodology

"Genealogy is thus not directed primarily towards the cultivation of knowledge – and certainly not the 'discovery of truth'- but rather towards the generation of critique"

(Hook, 2005, p. 7)

Introduction

Foucauldian Discourse Analysis is chosen as the method of data analysis, allowing deconstruction of relations of power that produce and sustain systems of knowledge and realities that the participants account for. Following this, the process of ethics approval is detailed. The methodological issues such as objectivity, neutrality, researcher positioning, and political agenda are explored, with particular attention given to this thesis existing as a social construction and thus, a political artefact in itself. Participant recruitment, data collection and analysis then follow, detailing how the participants for the study were sought and contacted, the interview process and structuring, and finally, the data encoding and transcription.

Methodological Strategy

To critique or analyse from a Foucauldian perspective defies rules or procedure, providing confusion for the scholar, but similarly, a sense of artful creation, in that the engagement with text and discourse is not simple and straight-forward. Possibly much to the disdain of Foucault, the analysis for the purpose of the present thesis could be simplified for description, as seeking to expose, resist and understand social inequalities by taking a political stance to the truth claims made by discourse (Quayle & Sonn, 2009) which constitute the relations of power around race, gender, class and domestic work. Within this approach, there is a specific focus on the relationship between power, knowledge, and the subject. This goal has been described as "deconstruction," through the taking apart of texts, and in this case, talk as text, to examine how they are constructed in ways that present people and their actions (Parker, 1990).

This mode of critique therefore constitutes the kind of discourse analysis employed, termed loosely as "Foucauldian Discourse Analysis" but at the same time acknowledging that there is no specific way or set of rules through which this is conducted. The reason for this, as suggested, is that the methodological injunctions offered for the critical study of discourse is better accompanied by genealogical analysis than a set of analysis procedures (Hook, 2005). This genealogical analysis seeks to analyse the relations of power and knowledge involved in producing and maintaining discourses, that constitute and reinforce our realities.

Power is thus never present as an action on another, it is constituted as a power relation because of its reproduction over time as a sustained power relationship (Rousse, 1987). This bears insight into the importance of the sustained power relation between the domestic worker and not only her employers, but the wider societal discourses which sustain these relations. These relationships are not, in alignment with a Foucauldian viewpoint, enforced from the top down, but emerge from the support of a chain or system, which are the dynamic outcomes of the mechanisms of power that have been, and continue to be perpetuated by more general mechanisms and domination (Rousse, 1987, p. 110).

To analyse these general mechanisms, the work of Foucault and the "toolbox of ideas" that he provides therefore give important theoretical contribution to the application of power and the role of domestic work (Foucault, 1982). This analysis of power is vitally important in investigating how it supports and reproduces subjects and their positions, within and transcending the South African social nexus into New Zealand society. Utilising Foucault's genealogical method of critique the approach will enable a political criticism of knowledge production, analysing discourses that may appear unrelated to domesticity, but casting an outward eye into the wider social realms of discourse that constitute truth and knowledge claims constituting subjects.

Ethics

Before submission to the Ethics committee of Massey University, the Ethics Proposal was peer reviewed by the thesis supervisor and an independent colleague, Dr Veronica Hopner. The project was submitted as a low-risk notification, and was approved in June 2018.

Recruitment for the study began in late July 2018, and the data was collected in July and August 2018.

Methodological Issues

If the key ideas of social constructionism and critical thought are accepted, then it becomes clear that the approach to research within this framework becomes vastly different to traditional social inquiry. The ideas raised by Burr (2015) will be drawn on to assist in contextualising the issues that I and many other researchers within what could be termed "critical" research, may face.

Objectivity and Neutrality

Traditional psychological and social research aims to able to claim truthful, objective knowledge, removed from that of the researcher. The experimenter is therefore able to stand back from their own selves, in order to reveal aspects of human nature without personal bias, judgement or personal involvement (Burr, 2015). If it is accepted however, that it is not the accuracy or significance of the correlation that is under investigation, but rather the "inside" of the correlation (Tuffin, 2005), where does this leave the kind of knowledge critical researchers are interested in? This "objectivity" of results, and "neutrality" of the researcher, therefore becomes discourse itself, and is an impossibility. The questions that I ask, arise from the assumptions embedded in my own experiences. Burr (2015) argues that no human being is able to step outside of themselves, outside of discourse, to be able to approach anything with an objective stance. It is therefore impossible for me to view my work from no position at all, and because I am intrinsically involved in every process of this thesis, as well as before and after its completion, it stands as a collaboration between myself and the people involved. My questions and my interests therefore derive from assumptions I may hold, which I too contest and struggle with. I in no way aim to be, or claim to be, the white-coated scientist with all the answers. I do not have the authority, nor the will to validate or invalidate the experiences of others (Burr, 2015).

My Positioning and Political Agenda

Critical research highlights the power relations between the traditional relationship between researcher and researched, questioning the notion of giving voice to the "scientist" to demarcate truth from fiction. The context that therefore gives the subject's experiences meaning is stripped away, left to the interpretation of the scientist. This is not the aim in this research, as no "factual" accounts are searched for. Instead, I acknowledge that my interpretations are merely, my interpretations, and do not constitute a "truth" or claim on behalf of the participants. The subject of inquiry therefore becomes decontextualized, and so does the scientist (Burr, 2015, p. 174). Although it would be my aim to continuously engage in reflexive thought, and to acknowledge that although this research is situated within a critical paradigm, power relations may still exist between myself and the participants. It would also not be accurate to say that I do not have some degree of concern with issues of power and ideology, and therefore am not exempt from a "stance." I would argue that the discourses through which I constitute my own experiences, within the framework of a social constructionist perspective, is ironically, a social construction (Burr, 2015).

Recruitment

Eight participants were recruited easily and without difficulty. The intention was to recruit between five and fifteen South Africans living in New Zealand, over the age of eighteen, of any race, culture or gendered orientation. As the Apartheid, Post-Apartheid and New Zealand social environment was of interest to the study, participants were required to have immigrated to New Zealand after 1995, to ensure they lived within or were born after the "official" abolishment of Apartheid. They were also required to have employed a domestic worker in their home in South Africa or have grown up with domestic worker/s in their family home. For the practicality of face-to-face interviews, they were required to be living in New Zealand and able to travel to Massey Albany for the interview. A post was placed on the social media platform Facebook, on three "pages" consisting of South Africans who have immigrated to New Zealand. These posts invited interested persons to make contact with the researcher through private messenger for further details of the project. Once contacted, email addresses of those interested were obtained, and an Information Sheet was sent

(Appendix A). Taking part in the project would entail travelling to Massey University Albany campus for a one to two-hour interview with the researcher. Each person interested was assured that declining to take part once reading the Information Sheet would in no way impact them or the study.

Within all three Facebook recruitment posts, I positioned myself as South African born, living in New Zealand for the last ten years after immigrating with my family at the age of fifteen. No attempt was made to appear as an objective or uninvolved observer, and my intention regarding my interest in domestic work was to explore the surrounding ideas of race and gender within South Africa and New Zealand.

Once approval was obtained from those interested, time-slots were sent through email of suitable times and collaboratively agreed upon between researcher and participant. Participants were offered a petrol voucher of $20 which was approved prior to interviews by the Massey School of Psychology to thank participants for their time and travel. Originally twelve people had confirmed they would be interested in taking part, and after which four declined participation prior to their interviews.

Data collection

Data was collected using semi-structured interviews between one to two hours in length which were recorded using a voice recorder. After reading the Information Sheet again, participants were asked to sign and date the sheet if they were happy with all information. They were also asked to sign the Consent Form (Appendix B) as well as the Tape Release Form (Appendix C) that detailed their rights as participants. Before each interview commenced, I engaged in informal conversation with each participant about where they had come from, how long they'd been in New Zealand etc, reminding them that with each question there would be no right or wrong answer and that it was okay to deviate from the questions should they so wish.

The interviews were semi-structured in nature, and in the discussion prior to turning on the voice recorder participants were shown a schedule of questions (Appendix D) that the

interview would be loosely based on. Diversions were welcomed should the participant or interviewer have felt it would add to the discussion, and participants were not interrupted should they have diverged outside of what might have been considered the "topic." The tape was kept running and participants were made aware that they could ask at any time for it to be paused, switched off, or to decline to answer any question should they so wish. The interviews ranged in length, some up to two hours and others fourty minutes. The average interview time was one hour.

Analysis

The transcripts of the interviews, otherwise referred to as the "data" of discourse analysis, was transcribed by the researcher. Each interview transcription took thirty hours on average to transcribe, using a discourse analysis code adaptation (Fairclough, 1992, pp. 145-231) (Appendix E). Every word and sentence spoken by both the participant and myself was transcribed in full. During transcription, I kept notes of "truth" claims that appeared to be consistent across a number of interviews, and these later developed into full mind-maps of discourses and varying sub discourses. From these mind-maps, dominant discourses were identified and explored. The analysis of the data does not suggest a simple philosophy or a system of analysis but rather searches for discourses that appear to be regarded as truth or common knowledge by participants.

Conclusion

To conclude, this chapter has detailed the methodological process, beginning with the chosen methodological strategy. As explored in Chapter One, Foucauldian Discourse Analysis was chosen as the method of data analysis, allowing deconstruction of relations of power that produce and sustain systems of knowledge and reality that the participants account for. Following this, the process of ethics approval and how this approval was obtained was detailed. Methodological issues were considered and explored, where traditional scientific study is contrasted with the subjectivity and researcher involvement of this study. Participant recruitment, data collection and analysis then followed, detailing how the participants for the study were sought and contacted, the interview process and structuring, and finally, the data

encoding and transcription. This methodological journey thus paves the way for the findings to follow.

'Searching for certainty amidst assumptions'

A reflexive account

A "critical Analysis" carries with it the assumption that I am able to undergo any sort of analysis of anything. The assumption that I am able to delve into someone, their thoughts, their life, the "meanings" behind what they say, and to make some sort of observation "on" that. This, I have realised throughout the process of this thesis, should not be my aim, nor should it be a task I should ever believe I could accomplish. Simply because, it is not achievable.

Before I underwent the interview, transcription and analysis process, I conceptualised these sections as different "stages;" almost as a method, or linear progression. As I came to realise, this was not the case, and the movements I experienced shone through in my transcription, which was reflected in my analysis, shifting the approaches I brought to my interviews. The process was mixed, muddled and not as straight-forward as I had previously thought. The process was therefore not "linear" at all, and the less I attempted to control and structure it, the more it flowed and moved in a rather beautiful way.

Chapter Four

Findings

"It is only through the contexts of exclusion and disqualification- contexts marked with struggle, conflict and the violence of marginalization- that we can properly grasp the political force of knowledge" (Hook, 2005, p. 5)

Introduction

The first dominant discourse is **Race and Hierarchy**, where participants establish a coherency around conceptions of social hierarchy dependent on racial categorisation. This socially constructed understanding is informed by and conversely, informs, sub discourses that are explored further in the analysis. These sub discourses are *Racial Categorisation, Afrikaner and White Superiority*, and *Race and Ability,* providing coherency to the knowledge sustaining "your place" according to your race in South Africa.

Another dominant discourse is the **Domestic Employment Relationship Paradox**, where participants negotiate accounts of their relationship with their domestic workers. The construction of this relationship as a paradox rests on the contradiction of positionings that participants accounted for, weaving in and out of Apartheid established power relations, and the subject positionings the domestic relationship produces, sustains and contradicts. The sub discourses of *Servitude and Ownership, Part of the Family, Discipline* and *Obligation* that comprise this relationship, rest on the assumption of the *White Working Class*, providing coherency to the paradoxical relationship between employer and employee in the household.

The final dominant discourse is identified as **Tension**, constructed by participants as the space in the middle of the two countries. This discursive "space" accounts for the difficulties experienced in confronting a racial past within an accepting present. Participants justify and paradoxically, contest the placement of the indoctrinated and institutionalised racism of Apartheid, unsure of how to negotiate that in the New Zealand nexus. This tension informs gendered constructions, fairness around treatment of labourers and domestic employees, and white entitlement and privilege. The sub discourses of *the Bubble, Gender*

Roles, Self-Sufficient New Zealand, Equal Opportunity, and *Displaced Race* provide further discursive deconstruction into how they experience this tension, as they look to their past to confront their ingrained ideals and beliefs.

Part 1: Race and Hierarchy

The Dominant Discourse of Race and Hierarchy defines ways of knowledge that constitute the constructions of race that are embedded within the political history of South Africa. These discursive understandings warrant and account for positionings sustained through race, and the power relations that function to do so. This discourse is loaded with assumptions about South African historical conceptions of race, that it not only constitutes knowledge, but produces meaning and action through subject positionings (Foucault, 1982). These constructions establish dominant assumptions and social belief systems that govern social positionings; the allowance of the dominant race and silence of the "other." This dominant discourse comprises the sub discourses of *Racial Categorisation*, *Afrikaner and Racial Superiority*, and *Race and Ability* that through justification, negotiation, and transformation, construct such knowledges of race and hierarchy.

Racial Categorisation

This sub discourse is one of loaded assumptions, so deeply constituted in the conception of normality that many participants expressed difficulty with being able to view things differently. This is established from childhood and is ingrained into everyday life. This sub discourse justifies the normalisation of racism in the Apartheid era, and the creation of racial categories such as "white" and "black" and the demarcation of one racial category from another. The discourse of racial categorisation therefore provides a basis of exclusion through race, predominantly, the exclusion of "black" from the dominant, the accepted, the acknowledged; the "white." These accounts of "normality" are given authority, and therefore allowance, because their existence is perpetuated through traditional power relations. Stuart highlights how race informs hierarchy, and how the "embeddedness" of this hierarchy positions people.

Stuart *it's so difficult to say to a white South African um <u>were</u> you a racist you know the obvious answer is always going to be no I wasn't a racist but that's bullshit ((laughs)) you were so embedded in that hierarchy of race that it's become part of your psyche*

Stuart constructs race and the hierarchy it sustains as systemic, in that one could be "embedded" within relations justifying and warranting racism. He also then positions those embedded within these relations as racist. White South Africans are therefore positioned as embodying through their "psyche" the societal hierarchies of race. "Psyche" implies a soulful embodiment, a psychological reference to a human's soul, mind and spirit. Three important constructions occur concurrently; one being the construction of "racism" as the responsibility of white South Africans, another the positioning of a "white" South African as a racial category, and the other the embodiment of racism from social to individual. He therefore highlights the agentic nature of the racial categorisation discourse by assigning the role of the "racist" to the white South African. Amidst these constructions, is the difficulty of being constructed a "racist," with the obvious answer by many being that they may have lived within a racist society, but they themselves weren't racist. Stuart interrupts this notion by highlighting the idea that white South Africans may still enact racism because the embodiment of racism in the "psyche" suggests that this racial knowledge was so "normal" people became blind to it. The embodiment of a racial "psyche" suggests a personal nature to racism, where racism is not only an enactment of prejudice but becomes a part of *you*. In the extract below, Katherine constructs racial categories, that provide coherence to racial segregation and hierarchy.

Katherine *I think I grew up very much in the Apartheid years and so:: there was a lot of segregation and <u>black</u> people couldn't go into the same places you could*

Katherine outlines the physical segregation of "black" and "white areas" within South Africa, present in almost every aspect of life. Apartheid is inextricably linked to growing up at that time and as Foucault's perspective on discourse would highlight, knowledge is embedded within social practice and power (Foucault, 1982). Katherine's knowledge of her upbringing is therefore linked to the political and social power that Apartheid offered to white South

Africans, excluding anyone else not deemed to be in that category. She refers specifically to black people, again reinforcing the racial categories of black and white, and importantly, does not refer to "white" people but rather speaks of "you." This generalises who her statement is directed towards; is it me the researcher? Is it other white South Africans? The assumptions loaded within the "same places *you* could" offers subject positionings of privilege, an entitlement to go wherever one wishes to, and importantly, to highlight that if *you* are black, you are not allowed to. She therefore adopts this position of whiteness and offers a construction of racial category that sustains the white race as one of dominance and normalisation, positioning the black race as one of subordination. In Joanne's account below, she constructs racial hierarchy as an institutionalised set of beliefs that is enacted through individuals.

Joanne *South Africa had a major issue because they legalised and legislated Apartheid so it was formalised…it's not mind its <u>heart</u> it's what you really believe in your heart cause mind you can change your <u>mind</u> you can't change what's deep-seated in your <u>heart</u>*

As Joanne mentions, it's going to take years to fix a mindset of many generations. The historical, social and political happenings cannot be separated from the social discourses it creates and sustains through individual action. This discourse therefore bears what Foucault terms an action orientation (Foucault, 1980) in that it controls, constrains or allows action. She therefore constructs racial hierarchy as a set of beliefs and actions that were allowed, because they were sustained legally through the government. This regulation of power therefore provides a justification for the stubborn resistance to change she is outlining; where one may want to change in their "mind" but they cannot change what they feel in their "heart." This construction of the "heart" is not dissimilar to Stuarts account of the "psyche;" where they both construct human process that cannot be located and are therefore not easy to change or adapt. This reasoning provides further justification for the embodiment of the racial categorisation discourse, where it is difficult to shift what racial categories *mean*. This embodiment therefore also justifies the sheltered lives many South Africans lived during the Apartheid era, so sheltered that as Joanne highlights below, they were unaware of many of

the issues happening within the country, enabling a non-questioning and a blind acceptance of institutionalised racism.

Joanne *I never questioned the black and white thing it was just part of (.) the lifestyle that we led? um (2) and y-you know it it astounds me now how there was no questioning no anything it was just part of life*

The lack of questioning sustains the normalisation of the racial categorisation she Attributes to the Apartheid era where critical questions were not encouraged. Why would you question why black people don't have the same opportunities as you if you never have to come into contact with them? Here it is evident the hierarchy the racial categorisation established, with the white race being at the top of that hierarchy. White life is therefore "normal" to Joanne, she is astounded now that she never questioned her privilege, and that she was enabled not to.

The sub discourse of Racial Categorisation is just one of several that sustain the discourse of Race and Hierarchy; constituting knowledge surrounding white and black race, and the constraints and allowances that these categories sustain.

Afrikaner and Racial Superiority

This sub discourse is referred to as Afrikaner *and* Racial Superiority because as will be explored in the analysis, the superiority associated with the "white" race is contested amongst other discourses transcending the racial category of "white." It supports the dominant discourse of Race and Hierarchy because it seeks to account for racial hierarchy within the South African society and how this is negotiated and contested against the New Zealand social constructions of race and superiority. The Afrikaner and/or perceived racial superiority discourse sustains white entitlement and privilege, one entrenched within historical periods of colonisation and migration, positioning the Afrikaans bloodline at the top of the hierarchical ladder. This notion is contested and the category of "white" as explored in the racial categorisation sub discourse, is further dismantled.

Constructions of superiority between the English and the Afrikaans, with each side at times demarcating themselves from the other, are both referred to as the "whites." In the extract below, Brenda draws on the discursive thread of racial categorisation to distance herself from Afrikaans culture, as an English person. Although also "white," she positions herself as a victim of Afrikaner political power.

Brenda *they started to say you white people have ostracised and you white and I turned around and said excuse me you not the only one whose been culturally um been raced against the Afrikaans as well because they culturally want to have everything their way and they tried to impose it on everybody else and I said if you say you have your schooling the same way as everybody else we were too we were forced also to do Afrikaans wasn't just you just because our colours white doesn't mean that we also accepted it*

By positioning herself as a victim to the Afrikaner Superiority sub discourse, Brenda constructs herself as an "other" white, one that alongside other races, was also undermined and oppressed during the Apartheid era. Brenda's account therefore enacts a double positioning; one of inferiority to Afrikaans political power, and one of superiority to the black or "non-white" races. She may have not been Afrikaans, but as an English person she was still included as "white." She can live as a white person within the Apartheid period and the benefits that came with her skin colour, but at the same time her language positions her as an inferior to the Afrikaans language, forcing her through its political power to see the world through an Afrikaans discursive lens. This lens is not only defined by the utilisation of the Afrikaans language, but through everything involved in what it means to be Afrikaans.

Brandon extends this construction of Afrikaans Superiority when he speaks as an Afrikaans male on what an Afrikaans heritage means to him.

Brandon *I would say we:: very fast to (.) I don't know if this is a word but superiorise ourselves make ourselves superior to everybody else because we are God's people*

In Brandon's account, he constructs Afrikaans as able to position themselves as superior. He also refers to Afrikaans and himself as "ourselves"; he includes himself as "them." Importantly, he attributes this superiority to God. Afrikaans culture has been and most often still is governed through religion, where fear *of* God positions Afrikaans people as the "people" who serve a religious purpose to uphold. Brandon extends this below where he speaks to why the superiority of the Afrikaans culture was often taken for granted or unquestioned by Afrikaans children.

Brandon *WHY? no you're not allowed to you're <u>not</u> allowed to ask <u>why</u> we were brought up in churches when the pastor says to you listen you're gonna burn in hell e::very day of the week and twice on Sunday you believed it you <u>didn't</u> ask questions because THAT was what was taught and we were never taught to ask questions because we were NEVER ALLOWED to ask questions if you ask a question <u>why</u> is it green cause I say it's green no it might be bl- NO I say it's green*

Here Brandon extends on his construction of the Afrikaans child as one that is "brought up" in churches, a strict, controlling environment where one is not encouraged to question anything. The Church is constructed as not only a site of power relations, but a social practice itself. Not only would questioning or alternative views have been discouraged, but they would suffer consequences, such as the threat of hellfire. This fear, and the power produced by the Pastor in the church, is what Foucault would refer to as "pastoral power" (Foucault, 1977b). He argues that pastoral power is a productive power, in that it produces subjects. What is particularly productive about pastoral power is the notion of caring invoked through the pastor, in that he "cares" for his "people" by directing them towards beliefs believed through the Church to be the "right" ones. Believing themselves to be "God's people" constructs a sense of duty that a pastor has towards such people, and the duty they have to uphold this. This pastoral power, sustained through the institution of the Afrikaans church and the fear of "hell", therefore produces subjects who do not question, are resistant to think for themselves, and who may not necessarily want to.

The superiority of the Afrikaans people extended to all "other" races within the

country, even within the racial category of "white." As Brenda positioned the English culture as victim to the Afrikaner cultural imposition, in the extract below Rebecca introduces a construction of the "white" race as victims themselves.

Rebecca *black people have lots of opportunities these days the whites who were kicked out have no opportunities the doors are closed so if I could help a white domestic worker I would do that I will not explain that to New Zealanders they will not understand the circumstances*

Rebecca draws on the racial categorisation sub discourse to distinguish two races from each other, "black" and "white." In her account, black people are constructed as having many opportunities available to them in South Africa in terms of work, with white people placed in contrast to this with no opportunity. She uses this positioning to justify why she would prefer to hire a white person as a domestic worker instead of a black person. Furthermore, she attributes this lack of white opportunity to "circumstances" that New Zealanders would not understand, situating this choice within a realm of discourse exclusive to South African society. She positions a "white" domestic worker as a victim to circumstance, importantly, neglecting the victimisation of black people to hundreds of years of oppression. She does not name this "circumstance," perhaps suggesting that a fellow South African may understand that the "doors closing" is not favourable to white people.

In the extract below, Brenda too constructs the white worker as entitled to help, entitled to a "decent" job because of the colour of her skin.

Researcher *so hypothetically if you were in South Africa now and you'd stayed and a white woman who:: wasn't able to get any other job came to your door and said can I please can you please employ me to clean how would you feel about that*

Brenda *(2) I wouldn't allow that to happen I'd rather give her stuff (.) because (.) that's that's the hardest for any white person to do that to go and beg cause you never saw a white person beg on the side of the road for them to do that is for like they've really hit rock bottom and I'd be more willing to get them a*

job in my mind a decent job to improve their situation and improve their home life and improve their children than actually get them to clean my as they would say my toilet

In Brenda's account, she constructs the white worker not only as entitled to a "better" quality of life, but also constructs domestic work as something other than a "decent" job. Does she, through the discourse of superiority, construct household cleaning as a job suited only to black people, therefore inferior? She associates "rock bottom" and "begging" as acts never undertaken by white people, assigning that role to black people. The "toilet" is symbolic of the worst chore one would have to clean, a punishment. Positioning the black domestic worker as expected to do so, again places the white person as superior. In the extract below, Rebecca accounts for the suitedness of menial work to black South Africans, in how she conversed with her black domestic worker.

Rebecca *I was very good and kind to my domestic worker and um we never had a fight because I went down to her level of understanding instead of being angry at her because they don't understand always what you're trying to say or explain to them so instead of being angry and yell at her and things like that which will anyway totally floor her I would come down to her level and show her things and tell her in plain simple language*

Rebecca's account is contradictory. On the one hand she constructs herself, the employer, as considerate, by not attempting to intimidate or "floor" her domestic worker through "high class" language. In doing so, she claims to avoid her domestic worker feeling inadequate. This is a contradiction however, as she, by doing so, carries forward assumptions she has about the intelligence of her domestic worker, constructing her as someone who is less intelligent than she. Her account is therefore embedded within assumptions of the ability of the black race, and conversely, the white race as superior.

These accounts begin to deconstruct the normality of racial claims, constituting their positioning and the positioning of the white and the black domestic worker. These positionings are not only constituted within the realm of discourses of superiority, but as

has been questioned, are contested and negotiated amoung discourses surrounding race and ability, situated within knowledges of what "work" is socially accepted for which category of race.

Race and Ability

This sub discourse constructs a social understanding that black people do menial work. The justifications for this stem from the dominant discourse of racial categorisation, because the category of "black" is contested, but constantly remains "not white." This discourse positions people through their race as worthy or not worthy of certain "types" of jobs. White people work higher class jobs, and black people work lower class jobs. Anything deviating from that normalisation is contested by the participants. Further, it places black and white people, deemed by other discourses such as racial categorisation, in their "places" in society. As will be explored, this discourse does not only construct mutual knowledge within the South African social context, but is situated through talk within the New Zealand nexus.

Below Rebecca positions people within their racial categories within the discursive realm of job title and status. She begins to situate this in past tense and then brings it into the present tense, suggesting social class and wealth is still of importance in South Africa, "totally different" to that of New Zealand.

Rebecca *it's totally different in New Zealand in South Africa I don't know if you know but way back then certain jobs is for certain people you have these snobs {I don't know what word to find for them} but they are SNOBS they think they are higher class if they do this job and they live in this area and they have this car and the wife has this diamond kind of thing the question is in South Africa where do you work that depends on who you are what class what category* you are in society and things like that ((hhh))

Rebecca's account constructs not only racial categorisation in terms of work, but also attributes importance to educational ability, economic class, and capital ownership.

Through this discourse she constructs a "status," an important concept in white South Africa, asking someone what they do or where they work, informs their "place" in society, their ability, and the worthiness they bring. Importantly, she does not refer to race in her account, suggesting that it is the white racial category who places importance on these educational, economic and class categorisations to define themselves and others.

Next, Harry assigns the importance of race and ability to white people and a "traditionalist" system of knowledge.

Harry *but I do think within the white community and particularly like your real traditionalist you know still have this mentality of like you know they don't wanna work they should like make them work teach them a lesson or something*

Here Harry constructs white "traditionalists," drawing on discursive understandings of that categorisation to position them. In relation to this, he positions "they" the black person, as in need of punishment. In a Foucauldian sense, this discourse is loaded with assumptions of power, and how this power is enacted to sustain racial and class positionings. Here, the black worker is being punished, the white employer enacting the position of punisher, encased in the belief systems of traditionalist thought. This construction relies on the discursive understanding of what "traditionalism" means, which Annie explains.

Annie *so he's like on the other side of conservative and against black people (.) and he would just write me off if I if I were to work for a <u>black</u> family in South Africa that would be the end my FAMILY the o::lder nephews (.) if they don't come and {kill me at night} then they would just cut me off*

Annie highlights the resentment her family may feel of her working as a domestic worker for a black family, as within their "conservative" community, there is animosity towards black people. Is this what it means to be a "conservative" in South Africa? How Harry and Annie construct this social category not only reflects belief systems against black

people, but also enables action as loyal followers for white people. This is shown through Annie's talk, not only would her conservative family not approve, they may go so far as to kill her, one of their own family members, over the betrayal of her family and their beliefs. The suggestion is that this shared knowledge of black people signifies worthiness of superiority, and if these beliefs are questioned or threatened, you can no longer be one of "us."

Brenda's account below situates the discourse of race and ability within that of gender constructions, to again position the black and white women in relation to each other.

Brenda *WELL in South Africa you wouldn't ever find a white woman as a domestic worker because it was beneath them as a job the lowest they'd do is filing paperwork in an office cause they're better than that*

The white woman "acts" in the world as a higher class employee, capable of "more" than cleaning. Racial categorisation and racial superiority are all encased in this construction of the racial hierarchy the white woman sustains, highlighting the relationship between the discourses to sustain assumptions of race and work. In the extract below, Joanne constructs white South Africans in contradictory ways, allocating the act of inequality to "people," thereby distancing herself from this narrative.

Joanne *SO to me the difficulty is in South Africa is because of the:: the inequality um unless you have white South Africans that are out of a job or are desperate for a job think AH I can clean cause I've done it in my own home I can become a domestic worker then ofcourse they're gonna do that but it's got to do with I suppose status and what do you what do you think of [..] in South Africa I think unfortunately like the class system in india you know those that are up there are not gonna put themselves down there unless they realise or their life is devastated by some tragedy*

Joanne equates white people choosing domestic work only when it comes to necessity, which brings forward questions about how South Africans constitute black

women and domestic work as a viable employment opportunity. Domestic work is therefore, through Joanne and Brenda's accounts, constructed as a job only existent for those in desperation, and those in desperation are usually only black people. The differing constructions of black and white women through the talk of Brenda and Joanne is that domestic work for a white woman is a choice, and domestic work for a black woman is an expectation. This choice is constrained in the white Afrikaans culture however, as altering the social order of race and work is positioned as a threat. Perhaps the self-entitled superiority that Afrikaans culture ascribes itself as constructed by Brandon, would take extreme circumstances to alter.

Below, Harry positions the normalisation of work and ability within the realm of gender, where domestic work for black people becomes reserved for black women in particular.

Harry	*if you had a black guy that turned up and was a domestic worker they would be more acceptable than a white guy you know? I would think? so yeah I think those initial things are still very much very much alive over there you know*
Researcher	*why do you think it would be more acceptable for a black*
H	*I think I think cause it's probably just more accepted for them to be in those kinda*
R	*[male]*
H	*roles you know just be in real menial labouring roles you know um (.) um I'm not saying it's right but I think that's just what the you know what the thought process would be over there*

Harry's construction of "menial work" equated to labouring roles, is consistent with the constructions of Joanne and Brenda. Menial work, NOT the work a white person would carry out in South Africa, is assigned to the black person. This is "normal." He does however, extend the role of domestic work usually assigned to women to black men too, by positioning domestic work exclusively for black people. The "thought process" he refers to, is therefore embedded within and informed by the race and ability sub discourse, so strong

that it is “still alive” and enacting constraints for black people and their work choices.

Overall, the Racial and Hierarchy discourse sustains the three sub discourses explored above. Through the sub discourse of racial categorisation, participants categorise their accounts according to race predominantly through the constructions of “black” and “white.” This categorisation, normalised by their talk, allows and constrains the actions of those within South African society. What is highlighted is the privilege that the white race still sustains and enacts by excluding through categorisation, the black narrative. Through this categorisation, other discourses justifying these constructions emerge, such as the Afrikaner and Racial Superiority sub discourse, that allows and enables “white” superiority over all that are deemed to be “not white.” This discourse is contested by the participants, where English whiteness is positioned as victim to Afrikaner power, as well as Afrikaner culture as victim to its own power. This highlights the Foucauldian view on power, and how entrenched systems of truth are (Foucault, 1982). Pastoral power encases the Afrikaner constructions of whiteness and superiority, enabling a territorial dependency on Afrikaner heritage to justify and sustain hierarchy. This hierarchical justification and preservation of the white and Afrikaner bloodline justifies the construction of the black worker, contested through gender constructions, but constituted through the ability of people according to their racial category. The black worker and the “discipline” that their work represents, again allocates hierarchical positionings according to race, where the white person sustains their entitlement to “decent” work, and the black person sustains “menial” work to earn their place in society. Ironically however, the very discourses that construct these positionings serve to sustain them, as they never transform the discourses that constrain them to their work, their social status, or their worth, if transformation of these discourses represent a threat to white superiority. These power relations define, and furthermore, account for a very deep and complex domestic relationship.

Part 2: The Domestic Employment Relationship Paradox

This discourse establishes the household as a site of politics; an institution, and produces subjects specific to that institutions’ understanding. The discourse involves sub-discourses, that enable the existence of the domestic employment relationship, the meaning

of that relationship within South Africa and the transformation of that understanding through the New Zealand context. The Domestic Employment Relationship rests on assumptions of the *White Working Class Lifestyle,* a sub discourse that sustains the justification for domestic employment in South Africa. The paradox enters with discursive contradictions surrounding the relationships the participants constructed with their domestic workers, positioned against the sub discourses of *Servitude and Ownership, Part of the Family, Discipline,* and *Obligation.*

White Working-Class Lifestyle

The White Working Class-Lifestyle emerges as a sub discourse that rests on assumptions of everyday life in white South Africa. This "lifestyle" is described by many as fast-paced, stressful and demanding. As Brenda outlines below, financial pressure established the needs of the "working-class", which during the Apartheid era, were white South Africans.

Brenda *in those days the white people were the ones who were paying all the taxes so they had to work HARD hard lives and they were paying all the fringe benefits for the rest of the country which was fourty eight million in those days and schooling and everything was payed by the taxes of the <u>white</u> people and they worked hard and payed for everybody basically NOW DAYS if you look back it's like how did we do it but while you were doing it it was normal it was a way of life*

Brenda's account begins by situating the white people she refers to as in "those days" placing the discourses she draws from as within the Apartheid era. As explored in the previous discourse of Race and Hierarchy, this normalises the assumption that it would only be white people working hard or paying taxes. It would be "normal" to assign the white person the top step on the hierarchical ladder, and the black person at the bottom. Brenda then positions the white person as the provider for the rest of the country, the "not-white" population benefitting from that structure. The positioning of the white working class person as a provider and the black or person of colour positioned

as a beneficiary is contested by other participants' accounts, such as Harry's below.

Harry *we were part of the Apartheid structure it's like you can't get away from it like it was just the ideology was ingrained in everything but even in that I would still sorta say my parents were ah::: I wouldn't say weren't racist but THEY they actually tried really tried to help the people who worked for us you know they were kind to them*

Harry provides a broad frame of positioning between the white working-class and the black worker. Here he ascribes the "ideology" as being ingrained into everything, every social nexus and fibre within the country. This "structure" suggests a set of rules and boundaries, conceptions of right and wrong. By ascribing the role of "helper" to his parents, he positions them (the white person) as providers, and the people in employment positions as beneficiaries. In the extract below, Katherine paints a slightly different picture with how she positions those in need versus those giving.

Katherine *there's just so little employment in South Africa so little opportunities for people to do something with their lives and if they can help another family to raise their children to put food on the table then I'm in favour of it I think if they did away with it there would be so many people that would be disadvantaged by that*

Katherine attributes little employment opportunities to all South Africans, suggesting a nationwide competition for financial security. Her construction of working-class life is however still resting on the assumptions of racial hierarchy whereby one family (the white) "helps" another family to survive (the black). Economic positionings therefore enter the discourse of the white working class lifestyle, the white sustaining it and the black living off it.

The white household is therefore constructed as a site of giving, of providing for its Own and "others" through employment opportunity. This knowledge could therefore be considered institutional, perpetuated through the white Afrikaans governance of Apartheid,

and enacted through the micro relations within the white household. These positionings are normal, they are accepted, they are truth. Black or coloured work is labour work, serving to sustain the white working class positioning and it's power. Domestic work, situated within the walls of the white household, is therefore where these ideologies begin to show complexity and depth. The normalisation of the white working class lifestyle, the knowledge it as an institution sustains and the power it enacts, positions the black domestic worker and the white domestic employer within the paradox that is the domestic relationship.

The Domestic Relationship Paradox

The Domestic Relationship Paradox is a dominant discourse constructed by and utilised in the talk of the participants of their domestic worker/s in South Africa. This paradox make up a set of sub discourses that formulate the social understanding that the participants have of the domestic relationship, which is "unique" to the South African context. The sub discourses of *Servitude and Ownership, Part of the Family, Discipline, and Obligation*, are structured separately through the analysis, but they are deeply imbedded within the talk, one discourse drawing on the other to sustain or contradict itself. These discourses rely on each other to create meaning, situated within social understanding to exist, and create consistencies and incongruencies to make up the accepted contradiction of the Domestic Relationship Paradox.

Servitude and Ownership

Domestic workers are constructed as a "normal" part of life for many white South African households. Her presence, constructed as female for every participant except one, is constituted in various ways through the differences in her living situation, wages, chores and expectations, but one thing that is made clear through their contradictions is that she is always black or of colour, and "they" are always white. Dependent on understanding of the race and hierarchy discourse, is the positioning of the domestic worker as a lower class member of society, a "fixed" asset to the white household, a piece of furniture, a possession.

Rebecca *coming from a culture where domestic workers is part of your life you grow up with them it's just there it's like having clothes or furniture in the house she's there all your life*

Rebecca constructs the cultural expectation of domestic help, drawing on the Afrikaner and White Superiority sub discourse to sustain this entitlement. She also constructs the embeddedness of the domestic workers' presence to her entire upbringing, normalising the domestic workers' presence as an essential part of her household. The use of "clothes" and "furniture" constructs the domestic worker as a common place object, distanced from that of a human being. This likening to an object also infers something akin to an ownership, a permanent presence that Stuart highlights below.

Stuart *he became almost like a <u>permanent</u> person on our property so he began to fit a number of roles so not only was he a gardener he was now able to work in the house so we didn't have to employ someone*

Stuart's account of the permanency of his domestic worker is consistent with Rebecca's. His domestic worker is however, a man, which contradicts gendered understandings of domestic work as a job for women. Stuarts account however, does not position his domestic worker as akin to an object, rather allocating agency for the domestic worker as a gardener and an indoor household worker. Whether this agency is given because of the domestic workers' gender, or other discourses enabling this agency is unclear, but agentic or not, the domestic worker is a permanent presence.

This permanency, as outlined by Brenda below is an ingrained historical expectation.

Brenda *and that's how we lived because you it was no- you didn't HAVE any other help and that was IT you lived like that and that was normal*

The expectation is one of domestic help. Brenda's construction of domestic help is one of entitlement, because help is needed and therefore if help is not coming from

somewhere else, the only person that could fulfil that need is a domestic worker. This necessity of domestic help is constructed as normal for the South African household, constraining the idea of choice behind domestic employment.

Harry *[okay::] YEAH um ((hhh)) I suppose its yeah when I think of a servant its like someone they don't have a choice where um that's a real hard one I suppose cause I think for a lot of the domestic workers in South Africa particularly in the area I grew up in in sense they didn't have a choice you know either they do it or they don't have work you know they don't have food so I suppose like it's pretty close*

Harry constructs a servant and a domestic worker as lacking choice and agency, merging these two discursive understandings. This choice is confined by the domestic worker's inability to refuse chores or work on the basis that their survival is dependent on their job. The domestic worker is therefore not positioned as a servant but is "pretty close."

Similarly, Joanne constructs the two concepts of a servant and domestic worker as not mutually exclusive.

Researcher *ya um you may HAVE but if you were to come across someone in New Zealand who didn't understand what a domestic worker was in South Africa and couldn't discern um:: a domestic worker:: or a nanny or a cleaner as opposed to:: a servant how would you:: explain that to them*

Joanne *well obviously a servant is the same cause you're serving you're doing I mean I dunno what the definition of a servant is but I would say that a servant because that would mean serving the home so doing whatever was necessary within the home um but a servant can be a servant in any type of situation you know what I mean*

Joanne contradicts the justification of the presence of the domestic worker within

the white household, presenting her job as a form of legalised servitude. She does this by extending the concept of servitude outwards into other "situations" whereby one person could be serving another, displacing any power relations from the exchange, and normalising it.

The sub discourse of Servitude and Ownership is one that many of the participants draw on to position domestic workers, as lacking choice and autonomy, bound to the white household. The next discourse dismantles the servitude construction, where participants begin to construct opposing dimensions to the "master and servant" relationship, by positioning this relationship within the realm of the family.

Part of the Family

Stuart *he actually started to fit a number of roles and the greatest thing was the fact that we really warmed to him and his family so he became like a member of family in many ways*

Stuart places his domestic worker within the realm of duty, so he had his "roles" to fit in terms of gardener and domestic worker, and he took on the role similar to that of a family member. This positioning instantly begins to contradict that of a formalised employment relationship, where the line between professional and personal becomes blurred. Importantly, the voice is given to Stuart and not the domestic worker, where "we" warmed to him dictates the nature of the relationship. The power relations embedded within the relationship insinuates perhaps that if "we" did not warm to him, he may not be considered to be part of the family, and may simply be that of an employee or ex-employee.

Katherine *a domestic worker almost becomes a part of your family and you have a relationship with you get to know them as a person you value them as person and um yeah they just become part of your family your extended family*

Katherines account supports Stuarts construction of the domestic worker as a

member of the family, and in doing so, the way she positions the domestic worker contradicts the domestic worker as a previously constructed object, placing her within the realm of "human being." Here she talks about getting to know her domestic worker as a person, valuing them as a person, enabling the allowance of her as a family member. She does however, create distance to this relationship by continuing within "extended" family, perhaps suggesting that because she is an employee, she may not be considered part of her immediate family. She then adds further complexity to the way she positions herself and the domestic worker in her account below.

Katherine *my relationship was more of friend and family than somebody working for me an employee but it's a fine line you've gotta be really careful cause that person's still:: you're still paying them money to do something for you so you still have to have rules so it's quite a:: quite a fine line to tread to not not be overly:: kind of so that they can sort of do what they want sort of thing but you've gotta have that fine line of employee and friend and yeah it's a difficult:: balancing balancing beam there*

Here the relationship comes back to the hierarchical power relationship. Although Katherine places the relationship within the context of "friend" or "family," initially placing the employer and employee within a personal space, it transforms discursively into an area defined by rules and regulations. Importantly, the domestic worker is the one that works according to rules, established by Katherine, her employer. These rules are put in place to ensure that the domestic worker cannot "do what they want," assigning her the role of employee again, a balancing act between her duties and her as a friend. This entire construction is placed within the control of the employee however, as through Katherines talk, it is the employee that is given voice to define the rules and the boundaries constituting the relationship.

The 'Part of the Family' sub discourse is constructed as a relationship existing within elastic social boundaries, positioning both employers and the domestic worker. This relationship blurs the lines between professional employment and personal friendship/ relative, embedded within historical servitude that established these boundaries, and transformed

by the close bonds that many participants claimed. The domestic relationship, although enacted through a genuine caring by the employer, continues to sustain its paradox through another sub discourse, Discipline.

Discipline

This sub discourse adds further contradiction to the paradox that is the Domestic Employment Relationship. As a friend or close relative, the domestic worker is positioned as a loyal worker, who enacts various positions, all within the control of the employer. The paradoxes' next element, that of Discipline, draws on Foucault's ideas around Disciplinary Power to account for the talk of the participants. In particular, these ideas refer to a regime of power that centres around "decile bodies," referred to by Foucault as the disciplining, subjection and organization of the body to provide a labour force that is submissive, productive and trained (Foucault. 1975). The body in question is that of the domestic worker.

Joanne highlights an element of abuse present in her construction of the domestic relationship.

Joanne *you getting paid cash so you think ah cool you know what I mean so ah of course I mean I guarantee in South Africa there was abuse you know what I mean cause as I acknowledged to you with [domestic worker name] I don't know (.) I don't know what money changed hands I know that she was fed and she could shower if she wanted to she could use our toilet or whatever but (.) you know? I knew that that wasn't the same in my friends' parents homes? Almost like the movie the help you know you're not allowed to use my toilet or whatever um I guarantee that that would've gone on you know*

Joanne refers to her childhood Domestic Worker, whose treatment she reasons as "better" than how her friends parents' treated their domestic workers. She distances herself from this treatment, yet in the beginning of the account discloses some uncertainty. She also highlights the inability of the domestic worker to use the toilet, a rule

made coherent by the understanding of the white household and its boundaries. She makes reference to the movie 'the Help' set in the South of the United States, where African Americans worked for white employers as domestic workers or "the help" as they are referred to in the film. Joanne positions her and other domestic workers within those relations of power, the domestic worker disciplined through rules to refrain from using the employers toilet or personal belongings. These relations contradict the notion of the domestic worker as a part of the family, applying socially understood rules of hierarchy within the household. This contradiction situates Annie's account below.

Annie *YES she stayed in her <u>own</u> room at the back we tried to make it as go::od and cozy and nice as possible (.) but still I think when I think back today (.) I don't think the wendy house was (2) up to standard (2) but <u>somehow</u> we believed I dunno why SOMEHOW we believed (2) many South Africans believed and I think still believe the old people (.) the-the blacks are (.) u::sed to or they can handle the elements of nature (.) better (.) it's (hhh) it's a terrible thought actually that we thought or some are still thinking OH it's okay you know just shove them in there give her a blanket or two THEY can they can take it you know they can take it that's:: one of the sayings you know they can take it*

Here, the justification for the living arrangement of the domestic worker is justified by a social belief that black people are more used to, or better equipped to deal with a harsh environment. Her use of "shove them in there" and "give her a blanket or two" does not sound dissimilar to the way a prison guard might throw a criminal into a prison cell, with authority and importantly, allowance to do so. This carries with it relations of power, embedded in the relations Foucault likens to prison regimes. Here order is ensured and enforced through the separation of individuals, in this case the employer and the domestic worker through separate living spaces. This separation and treatment is common knowledge, through the common "sayings," sustaining superiority and hierarchy through punishment. This punishment is normalised, as Annie looks back on this treatment now as "terrible," a construction not justified then. She is therefore *produced* as an obedient worker based on the knowledge that she should not stay in the white household. The embeddedness of this power relation and the subjects it produces are highlighted

through Brandon's account below.

Brandon *earlier this year my brother in law got a new domestic worker an old old lady she obviously had this old way of thinking still and as she came in the first morning she was apologetic we said to her listen and she said where's my cups and my plates that I can use and I thought we are in twenty eighteen we still sitting with exactly the same thing there's a generation of people that were so dehumanised that she as an old person who should actually earn respect just because of her age walks into a white families' house and she's actually apologetic*

Brandon, through his talk constructs a domestic worker that is so embedded within the historical discourses of racial hierarchy and the social views on black people and menial work, that she is not only produced as a subject to these discourses, but actually constitutes *herself* as such. She embodies the social views of her and her colour, and her work, by enacting apology and shame. These disciplinary relations produce disciplined subjects, that through years of being told they are inferior, believe it themselves. Furthermore, she enacts her position in the hierarchy, and is sustained there. This ensures the functioning of power in the domestic relationship, that despite being considered a valued member of the extended family, may still enact apology on behalf of her presence. This is where the discursive thread of Obligation is reliant on Discipline, as participants construct an awareness to the sensitive nature of the domestic relationship and their suggested lack of control to changing it.

Obligation

The obligation to domestic workers stems from an acknowledged awareness of Inequality through the domestic relationship, and the desire to help.

Brandon *my dad had this with my mother because they:: lost jobs and so they were a bit pingy on the money side so they had to look at it and my mother said listen I'm not letting go of [domestic worker] I'm not gonna do it because she*

helps me and I've got an obligation towards her and that's what I love about my mother she actually accepted that [domestic worker] is actually a friend of hers she could actually speak to [domestic worker] as a friend they would have tea together

This obligation is of course based on finances, yet is rooted in the paradox that makes up the domestic relationship. Not only does Brandon's mother feel obligated to continue paying her domestic worker because she is an employee and perhaps relies on the money, but is considered a friend. They share a close personal bond and therefore letting her domestic worker go would not merely be a professional decision, but a personal one. There is a friendship to be lost.

Rebecca *I can't remember how but if I can give [domestic worker] something to give her children I will do that I NEEDED to do that to three of them I would do that but I didn't have jobs for them in a small household I had only one child*

The obligation to the domestic worker that Rebecca constructs is a *need.* She feels She needs to help her domestic worker to enable her to provide for her children, with the knowledge that she, the white employer, is in the position to do so. Does Rebecca therefore *need* to give her what she can in terms of employment, kindness, and friendship because she feels guilty, or responsible for the domestic workers' livelihood? Is Rebecca just as confined by this need, this obligation to her domestic worker? Her construction not only places her domestic worker in a position of dependence, but positions herself as facilitating a dependency between her and the domestic worker. This obligation to help raises questions as to whether the dependency this facilitates does indeed "help" the domestic worker, or further sustains her to be in need.

To conclude, the dominant discourse of the Domestic Employment Relationship is constructed by the participants as a paradox. The institution of the South African household places restraints and allowances on the employer and the domestic worker, allowing and disallowing action according to the rules and expectations of the *White Working-Class Lifestyle*. The *Servitude and Ownership* sub discourse is constructed as sustaining not only

white entitlement *to* domestic work, but the ownership *of* a domestic worker. This discourse therefore produces an agentic employer, one who is entitled to help, as well as a powerless domestic worker, who is expected to provide help. This informal nature of this employment within South Africa, which limits the choices of the domestic worker, meant that participants found it difficult to separate employed domestic work from the work of a servant. The employment of a domestic worker by her employee sets in place rules and boundaries, that participants expressed were blurry at times. The control of these boundaries was however, in the hands of the employee. The *Part of the Family* sub discourse thread throws another complexity into the servant/ master relationship, that contradicts the rules governing the actions of both worker and employer. This discourse allows a closeness between the two, the formation of a bond likened to a friend or family member by most participants. This allowance shifts power balances from that of a hierarchy, to one of even kilter, both parties benefiting from the relationship in a personal way. The "close but not too close" nature of this relationship however, still exists within the boundaries of the servitude and ownership sub discourse, where the employer lives in fear that the domestic worker may take their kindness for granted, potentially threatening the rules and boundaries set in place and thus, the hierarchy. The domestic worker is therefore constrained, knowing never to cross the line, and the employer ensures it. The *Discipline* sub discourse allows the employer this assurance, as the positioning of both parties maintains the servitude nature of the domestic workers' role, and the employer as enforcer. Participants expressed common knowledge of abuse that occurs in domestic relationships, where domestic workers are treated as "less than," separated spatially into living quarters, and socially in the way they are spoken to. This again contradicts the "family" closeness participants construct, because one can be extremely fond of their domestic worker, but the institutional knowledge and boundaries of the household will constrain the extent of that bond. The justifications many participants made were on the basis of race and intellectual ability, all situated within the discourse of *Race and Hierarchy*. This assumed superiority is embedded within the domestic relationship, continuously encapsulating the personal nature of the bond between domestic worker and employer. This allows the discipline to occur, not expressed as physical punishment by the participants, but discursively, as ingrained into social practice. The accounts of the treatment of many domestic workers by the participants produces an obedient, hardworking domestic employee, who through years

of historical oppression, is able to self-regulate her own actions to stay in her place, never to overstep the boundary. The employer is then positioned as *obligated* to try to help this inequality through continued employment, facilitating a dependency between the white household and the domestic worker. The paradoxical nature of this relationship is not straight-forward, and is at times, confusing and contradictory upon reflection.

Part 3: Tension

The Bubble, Gender Roles, Self-Sufficient New Zealand, Equal Opportunity and *Displaced Race* are some of the main sub discourses that contribute to the discourse of *Tension* which locates participants between two worlds; that of their racial past, and their present in New Zealand. The space in the middle is where the tension lies, contesting, contradicting, justifying, questioning and making sense of themselves, amidst the political history of South Africa and New Zealand. The participants construct conflict in the way they come to account for their place in New Zealand amidst the discourses they carry from their past, conflicted at times by the two social, political, economic, and cultural spaces they occupy. The power relations they sustain or disrupt in this tension are analysed, in a quest to deconstruct the discourses that have particular meaning for those who have lived in South Africa.

The Bubble

The Bubble is a discursive metaphor for understanding the South African lifestyle, which represents a life within protection. Namely, the protection that comes from those in positions of privilege. Brenda constructs the "bubble," what it enacts and who it positions.

Brenda *it was an innocent kind of life in some ways it was safer but only for a certain group of people it wasn't for everyone because you lived in your bubble and as long as your bubble didn't pop you were fine*

Brenda reflects on her life in South Africa as "innocent," sheltered from the presumably "bad" happenings of the country. This innocent way of life is reserved only for a "certain

group of people," positioning an elite group within that safe space. The bubble is constructed as protection, a shield through which things, people or situations that are "not fine" are unable to pop that bubble. Next, Joanne talks about indoctrination, a way of life or belief system that she can only now see through.

Joanne *I was certainly indoctrinated it's terrible looking back thinking I would have been indoctrinated cause I had no thought? you know probably for myself and my little life you know*

Through the construction of her "little life" she is positioned as safe within the bubble. Her awareness of her life as small, positions her against the backdrop of everything else within the country, assuming perpetuation of power sustaining the indoctrinated view she had. Indoctrination assumes responsibility to social belief, circulating and perpetuating the allowance of certain kinds of knowledge. This takes responsibility out of the hands of herself as an individual, placing it into the realm of the society; others within the bubble and those allowing the bubble to exist. The existence of this bubble, and the social allowance through discourse, seems to position those living within the bubble, as enacting privilege and entitlement to a certain kind of life, separate from those outside. In his account below, Stuart constructs the agentic nature of this discourse, and how it positions privileged South Africans a blinkered view.

Stuart *we sometimes refer to them as the proudly South African gang um they um they live in bubbles they don't actually see the <u>real</u> South Africa*

a lot of that group um they as I said to you they shield themselves or they buffer themselves through the fact that they have the privilege of the <u>white</u> skin and they are earning good money so it's all shielded from them and their families ya they PRETEND um you know to go through the right actions or the right words or motives or motions but (2) it's all it's just <u>that</u> it's um its superficial I think

In the first extract of Stuart's account, he refers to those within the bubble not being able to see the "real" South Africa, constructing a façade, an illusion. They see what they want to see, or perhaps, what they have cultivated to be real. This accounts for truth, and a set of knowledges that constitute "normality" for everyday life. There is perhaps an awareness that this knowledge is an illusion however, as in his second account, he constructs South Africans as "shielding" and "buffering" themselves from the happenings of the country through money and their white privilege. The idea that this all exists within a bubble however, implies that this protective layer could be popped, or taken away at any point, positioning those outside of that bubble as a threat to that privilege. The pretence at correctness is also constructed as "superficial," dismissed as authentic attempts to adjust moral actions or motives. In Brandon's account below, domestic work and the servitude intersects with and exists within the bubble.

Brandon *well make the change if you want to make something better make the change BE willing to make the change but it was so <u>fine</u> and nice to have it people looking after you that if I make the change I might not <u>have</u> this anymore*

Here Brandon highlights a need to "make a change." Using words, actions or behaviours by the privileged is presumed to be the "right" thing for political transformation, but comes as a threat of loss of entitlement. The entitlement is constructed as a barrier to change, where privileged South Africans acknowledge inequality, but are resistant to relinquish their own privilege. This construction again, positions those in the bubble as in positions of power, able to buffer themselves, say the right things, do the right things, able to enact choice. His construction also enacts a distancing, where Brandon positions others as a "you" and then contradicts this distancing with an "I." This highlights a potential tension of identity, removing responsibility and then assuming it.

The *Bubble* and all that it as a discourse constrains and enables is contested by Participants against the social sphere of New Zealand, a space that through discursive constitution, provides reflection and insight into the Bubble that perhaps they perhaps were not able to see or confront before immigration.

Gender Roles

This discourse, although situated within and difficult to detach from the Bubble, accounts for the gendered constructions of the South African upbringing. Participants construct life within South African upbringing as patriarchal, sustaining traditional gender roles. These fixed notions of gender position women within the household, and men to the external environment. These constructions provide reasoning for the employment of predominantly female domestic workers, and the constraints on women of all races that the participants account for.

White women are positioned within constraints, confined to the household and the duties required to uphold and maintain it, perpetuating dependence on the black domestic worker.

Researcher *mhmm how would you:: explain that to them like what the role of a domestic worker sort of is*

Katherine *um:: well in our household the domestic worker was just there to help with the cleaning and that but priority was to look after my children um to see to their well-wellbeing to make sure they're fed clean happy not in any danger um so that was my domestic workers priority house cleaning was a sort of added bonus put it that way*

Katherine's "need" for childcare help extends on the fast-paced and pressured white lifestyle that was constructed in previous discourses. These economic pressures on white middle-class would constitute a need for help, positioning Katherine as a woman and mother, as the one in most need of that help.

Harry's account constructs patriarchal expectations in South Africa which he equates to traditionalist mentality.

Harry *I think South Africa is still more in general is a lot more traditional than New Zealand so I think those gender roles and stuff and even sexism is still a lot*

more alive over there you know? and I think um I think it would take a lot longer to shift you know

In this construction, South Africa is positioned as 'traditional' in its social expectations of men and women, positioning New Zealand as less so. Harry's construction of it taking a long time to shift potentially indicates a wanting for these relations to transform, disrupted by the differing relations sustaining gender in New Zealand. Katherine's and Rebecca's accounts below constitute the construction of a male discourse, positioning the "typical" South African male as devoid of household responsibility.

Rebecca attributes autonomy and choice to men, entitled to domestic help.

Rebecca *the typical South African guy doesn't help in the house at all they come home they sit on the couch watch TV expect their plate of food I think the culture made them who they are and I think it's because of many years before the black domestic workers doing everything giving them everything*

Rebecca's construction not only places the white male in a position of above that of the woman, but above that of the white and the black woman. The "acceptance" of gendered hierarchy situate this within a patriarchal normalisation, which is sustained through the distribution of domestic work. Brenda supports this construction below where she accounts for the normalisation of domestic work as women's' work.

These constructions are heavily contrasted against the New Zealand backdrop of self sufficiency, where gender is placed outside of the limitations of traditional South Africa. Here, the racial and gendered bubble is popped, exposing preconceived ideas and conceptions of normality. The domestic worker no longer exists, opening up new discursive possibilities through which participants make sense of themselves and their roles amidst the tension.

Self-Sufficient New Zealand

This discourse accounts for the deconstruction of traditionalist gender roles, where participants ascribe a self-sufficiency to members of New Zealand society, thereby dismantling power relations sustaining reliance on domestic work and so enabling fairness and equal opportunity to all.

Rebecca accounts for the discomfort of these positionings, where the gradual realisation that one is expected to manage domestic chores is positioned in New Zealand.

Rebecca *BECAUSE the domestic workers did the work our houses is clean so you come here and you are used to these very clean houses now she's not there and you don't know what to do because she did that and all of a sudden your house is dirty and it's a mess WHAT IS GOING ON? it takes time to get into a change of your mind YOU have to do it yourself*

Household positionings transcend gender, where "you" doing it all yourself positions presumably anyone in a house. Her construction also dismantles the hierarchy sustaining race and entitlement, where the lack of domestic help in New Zealand enables self-sufficiency. These new discursive possibilities have enabled her reflection on South Africa and those who currently employ domestic workers as "lazy."

Rebecca *my view of South Africans when I went back for the four years now I came back in twenty fourteen is that the ones that still have the domestic workers lots of them don't have them anymore as we discussed they are lazy I don't have another word for it and I think it's because I'm used to working and doing things this way in New Zealand I saw them as lazy*

This "laziness" could also be embedded again, within the entitlement of the white working class society, as well as the constructed autonomy of men to choose not to help with domestic chores. This entitlement is enacted by South African's specifically and not New Zealanders of any race or gender, because as Annie suggests they have grown up with

differing social norms.

Annie *the lack of domestic services? I wonder if the New Zealand people (.) if they feel that there's a lack of domestic services because they grew up with:: like this*

Annie therefore positions South Africans as perceiving a lack of domestic help Stemming from their previous entitlement and privilege, all encased within a social and political system that allowed and sustained this. New Zealanders, positioned within a different social nexus, do not have the same discourses to contest, and so life without domestic help is quite normal. These discourses enable action and gendered positionings, as Katherine extends on below.

Katherine *so the people we know here it seems that the men are a lot more willing to be involved with whatever chores need to get done um I find a very different dynamic here in New Zealand you know people have grown up doing a lot of things themselves rather than in South Africa you've got other people who can do a lot of things for them*

Katherine talks of broader gender boundaries in the New Zealand nexus with men positioned as self-sufficient, existing within different social "dynamics." This "willingness" although located to men intrinsically, is constructed as a motivation due to a lack of external help. This lack of external help as constructed by Annie in her account below, disrupts the entitlement participants constructed domestic help to be, breaking the dependency developed between employer and domestic worker in the New Zealand context. They are constructed as self-sufficient at household tasks, not regarding domestic help as necessary.

Annie *we thought and we grow up with the thought that it is necessary to have that domestic help but when I came to New Zealand I saw (2) they just- they (.) the people here are just carrying on with their life (.)*

Overall, the sub discourses of *gender roles* and *self-sufficient New Zealand* position

gender as intertwined with historical privilege and hierarchy, with the "do it yourself" attitude of New Zealanders contesting and displacing these discourses. What it disrupts, is the dependency developed between participants and their domestic workers in South Africa, a lack of mutual dependency between the household and domestic help. Participants construct this self-sufficiency as transcendent into the constitution of New Zealand society, and more specifically, the construction of work and employment as fair and equal.

Equal Opportunity

This sub discourse accounts for New Zealand societal views around jobs and work. In the previous sub discourses of *Gender Roles* and *Self-Sufficient New Zealand*, participants not only constructed household chores as a shared responsibility, but the arrangement of domestic help as a job as structured differently to that of South Africa. Many accounted for differences in how domestic help is perceived socially in New Zealand; a stark contrast to domestic help in South Africa. A "menial" role reserved predominantly for black women is contested in New Zealand as a legitimate job, suitable for anyone of any race, gender or ability.

Rebecca legitimises domestic work as a job anyone can work, equating domestic as comparable to that of an electrician or a mailman.

Rebecca *whereas in New Zealand everybody is doing everything and no one is looking down on someone no one is saying oh ah:: you're a domestic worker or you're an electrician? oh okay no:: don't mingle with him NO:: no no no they will say if I say I deliver the mail every day or I'm a domestic worker which in South Africa is below your standard HERE if you say that to someone they will say oh good on you mate?*

Rebecca positions jobs such as electrician or mail delivery as "lower class," yet still regarded by New Zealand society as worthy of recognition. This construction levels out the power relations constructed previously within South African norms, placing anyone of any

ability and social class on the same standard. Annie's highlights the enactment of this normalisation and how this transcends into the treatment of workers in the New Zealand context.

Annie *in New Zealand they treat domestic workers like <u>normal people doing</u> just a JOB*

Annie positions the domestic worker as a "normal person" implicitly drawing on the discursive view of domestic workers in South Africa against which to constitute this comparison. This suggests that domestic workers are treated differently to that of those in South Africa, regarded as "normal" and thereby perhaps not positioned within the same hierarchies of race, gender and class previously constructed.

In the extract below, Harry provides an alternative construction to domestic workers in New Zealand, suggesting an implicit or not overly obvious social hierarchy through which to place the job.

R *what do you think about that in terms of the New Zealand context how do you think people view:: um domestic workers or cleaners or anyone in the service here*

Harry *um ((hhh)) I would say like there's there's a little bit of still yeah::: looking down on them? like not quite but just classing them a bit lower? you know?*

Harry's account contradicts the notion of equal opportunity associated with jobs in New Zealand, coherent with the previous constructions of social class. He positions this "looking down" on domestic workers as hierarchical, yet "not quite" perhaps insinuates that the power relations are existent but not overtly obvious.

Overall, the sub discourse of equal opportunity constructs the ways in which domestic work is regarded in New Zealand society. Domestic workers are positioned outside of the hierarchies of race or gender, coherent with the construction of an Egalitarian society. However, inconsistencies in social class are presented through

nuanced constructions, positioning those in domestic work as qualified and legitimate "people," thus not constituted through prejudice or hierarchy, but still "lower" on the social or economic ladder of society. These subtle inconsistencies in positionings perhaps suggest that although domestic work is considered legitimate outside of racial and gendered constraints, they may be implicitly, and not obviously, placed within social hierarchy. The ways in which participants confront and contest *their* position between these differing sets of discourses is constructed in the discursive thread of *Displaced Race.*

Displaced Race

The previous sub discourses contribute to the construction of the social landscapes of South Africa and New Zealand, leading to the *Tension* many of the participants feel. This tension enables a conflict and displacement of racism, sexism, and other forms of oppression. The placement of these racial views are contested as to whether they exist at all, where they exist, and who they belong to. Many participants were concerned about not appearing to be viewed a "racist" while others construct their South African upbringings as racially embedded, and themselves as "non-racists" within an oppressive system. This is where many of the discourses analysed throughout intersect, as participants struggle to contest discourses that positioned them and their views as the dominant norm in one context, and not welcomed in another. Importantly, they are located within New Zealand context, where the society is constructed as more open to racial discussion. This discourse enables questioning around racism, the importance of history and the justification of treatment of domestic workers.

Harry constructs how his immigration to New Zealand allowed reflexive thought into his preconceived social ideals, challenging the institutionalisation of the racism he accounts for.

Harry *I suppose coming to New Zealand has really highlighted that for me? it's really challenged me and my:: ah I just suppose the institutionalism racism stuff that has been ingrained in every part of society you know that really challenged me*

Harry positions racism as institutional in his account, which is consistent with constructions of Apartheid based race and hierarchy. The notion of power is strong in Harry's account, where he comes to realise the extent of the indoctrination of the social beliefs he once considered normal (Foucault, 1982). He embodies this institutional racism by positioning New Zealand society as able to challenge those views. Next, Brandon positions himself as having undergone a transformation.

Brandon *yes I made the choice to move out and financially and emotionally it cost me a lot to do but my eyes also opened up in the sense of what we did to people*

Brandon contests the discourses that sustained him and his domestic worker in South Africa, New Zealand society as having opened his eyes to what was done to people in South Africa. This treatment is elaborated next.

Brandon *basically the way they were treated really irritated me <u>now</u> that I'm fourty four and being able to look back at how they were treated the ((hhh)) the way:: everybody that treated them a certain way was basically excusing themselves out of any problems we have currently in SA as in I didn't really do anything wrong it was just:: it wasn't <u>my</u> fault that they weren't allowed to use the same toilet that they just cleaned in my house cause they're a different colour? it's there so for me it's <u>really</u> irritating to have people still AND my parents are some of those people saying the same things but WE didn't do anything wrong*

Brandon's account potentially constructs a denial, or non-acknowledgement of the racial past of South Africa by white South Africans. Perhaps the social nexus of the New Zealand environment allows him to "look back," something he cannot do embedded within the discourses still operating and being sustained in the South African context? "Still saying the same things" suggests a continuous, never changing reasoning by his parents and others, that are constituted within the acceptance of these views in South Africa and are not accepted in New Zealand as a valid justification. Through his account, Brandon separates

himself from those views, acknowledging in his first account that he enacted oppressive ideals, which he can now see and believes is wrong. The disavowal of wrong-doing by his parents or others in South Africa is perhaps constituted by the normalisation of history, where morally "right" or "wrong" actions were constituted by Apartheid law and therefore still justified as legitimate.

Stuart contests his placement of race and racist ideals as he positions himself as struggling to face the "deep seated issues" sustained through the South African discourses.

Stuart *I think there are a lot of people of my age group who are sitting with this interesting paradox we like to look upon ourselves as having changed but I think there's a lot of deep seated issues of race you know*

He positions himself as within particular age group; drawing on the discursive understanding of the Apartheid era and the previously analysed hierarchical discourses. He places these discourses within a paradox, contradicted by the need or will to change his positioning within those discourses, while at the same time acknowledging that they still exist. Below, he characterises these.

Stuart *race is so embedded you're constantly within yourself faced with this paradox particularly if you're a liberal open minded person you try and see people for what they are and I do that all the time but then within you there's constantly let's call it a racist demon that appears at times and you've got to constantly adjust your um your vision of this*

The embeddedness of race is constructed in opposition to liberalism. The open-minded construction enables seeing people for "what they are," inferring a purity of humanism outside of the discursive boundaries of race. Stuart positions himself as able to do that yet the "demon" of his historical indoctrination still appears, creating the tension of how he can adjust his vision between these two conflicting ideas. This paradox is then extended outwards into the conflicts he carries not only about himself, but with black people as a racial category and of Africa.

Stuart *it's a paradox you know I was brought up <u>seeing</u> them as inferior to myself but at the same time I miss their energy and their drive I find myself listening more and more to black music I find myself enjoying a movie from Africa I find myself enjoying the fact that there's <u>success</u> in Africa so (.) ya I live with a very unusual paradox ((laughs))*

Here Stuart constructs the tension; between genuine appreciation and nostalgic constructions of Africa, and the way he was brought up to position black people and success. His appreciation opposes what he was raised to believe, an appreciation he is allowed to have in the New Zealand context. He locates this paradox within himself, something that he accepts and that he lives with.

Tension is constructed as a space of displacement of beliefs and ideas. This tension is not something that was considered to be evident in *the Bubble*, the shielded and protected life of white Apartheid South Africa. The bubble prevented confrontation with the reality of life for black South Africans, including domestic workers. The space within the Bubble positioned many participants to justify their privilege, something that some became aware of after immigration to New Zealand. This also drew on the sub discourse of *Gender Roles*, where the construction of "lazy" and "entitled" South African men provided not only the positioning of the woman as responsible for domestic work, but provided justification for domestic help, and the employment of a *female* domestic worker. These justifications are embedded within the previously constructed discourses of **Race and Hierarchy** and the **Domestic Employment Relationship Paradox**, as the male entitlement constructed in regards to the household was positioned by participants as sustained predominantly within the Afrikaans cultural background. The male employer's dependency was imbedded within the constructed entitlement to domestic help developed historically, the female entitlement embodied through the social pressures on her role as a woman. These conservative views were contrasted with the sub discourse of *Self-Sufficient New Zealand*, whereby participants positioned New Zealanders as enacting household chores and work life outside of the gendered and racial boundaries that they previously knew. New Zealand was positioned as promoting questioning into the institution of the household and the previously accepted

gendered positionings. This questioning challenged the associated of domestic work to women, and introduced household chores as a shared or individual responsibility, disrupting the justifications of domestic help as necessary. *Equal Opportunity* constructed the treatment of domestic work in New Zealand amidst racial, gendered and social positionings. Domestic work is considered a legitimate job in New Zealand, existing outside of the South African views of gender and race, yet still regarded as a "lower class" profession. This positioning was positioned as implicit, suggesting a subtle, not overly obvious social hierarchy. Through the *Displaced Race* sub discourse, the accountability and ownership of racist indoctrination and institutionalisation in South Africa is contested in New Zealand. Participants positioned themselves in the middle of two ideals, acknowledging a racist past in a more open-minded society. This raised inconsistencies as to how and where to place these previously normal racial positionings that are now unacceptable.

Summary

Firstly, the discourse of **Race and Hierarchy**, based on constructions of *Racial Categorisation*, *Afrikaner and White Superiority*, and *Racial Ability*, accounted for the institutional, systemic and social belief systems in South Africa. These systems established normality around conceptions of social hierarchy dependent on racial categorisation, which participants contested and contradicted through discourse. All participants however, constructed white at the top of that racial hierarchy, and black at the bottom, establishing the allowance of white justification and reasoning, and the silencing of the "non-white."

Secondly, the discourse of the **Domestic Employment Relationship Paradox**, based on constructions of the *White Working-Class Lifestyle* and the *Relationship Paradox*, constructed the discursive positionings of employer and employee in the South African nexus. The relationship paradox was further broken down into *Servitude and Ownership, Part of the Family, Discipline*, and *Obligation;* discourses used interchangeably to establish and negotiate accounts of that relationship. The construction of this relationship as a paradox rests on the contradiction of positionings, weaving in and out of Apartheid established power relations, and the subject positionings the domestic relationship produces and sustains. The power

relations suggest that the dominant voice in that relationship is that of the employer, enacting choice, control and dominance over the nature of the domestic relationship in South Africa.

Finally, the discourse of **Tension** was constructed through *the Bubble, Gender Roles, Self-Sufficient New Zealand, Equal Opportunity*, and *Displaced Race.* This discourse, constructed as the space between two countries, accounts for the difficulties in dealing with a racial past and a conflicting present. Participants contested the placement of the indoctrinated and institutionalised racism inflicted on them through the social acceptance of oppression during Apartheid, unsure of how to negotiate that in the New Zealand nexus. This tension informed gendered constructions, fairness around treatment of labourers and domestic employees, and white entitlement and privilege. Although differing accounts, justifications and contradictions in how they experience this tension, their talk strongly constructed New Zealand as a society enabling them to question the importance of history in their constructions of themselves and others in a new country.

CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion and Exploration

Introduction

The following section aims to broaden the "findings" of this thesis within the realm of the reviewed literature, into an open space of discussion and exploration of possibility. These possibilities include insight into the potential contribution of this work to critical thought and Psychology more broadly, as well as recommendations for future research. The structure of this discussion follows the order of the three dominant discourses of **Race and Hierarchy**, **The Domestic Employment Relationship Paradox**, and **Tension**.

"Knowledge is not for understanding, knowledge is for cutting" (Foucault, 1977a, p. 154)

Part 1: Race and Hierarchy

Race and Hierarchy addresses two sub research questions guiding the arguments of this section; *how power relations operate to sustain or resist constructions of class and race*, and *how South Africans construct, sustain or resist comfort zones through their talk*. This section of the discussion gives particular focus to situating the constructions of race, social class and hierarchy within relations of power, to address these sub research questions as well as those posed by the literature.

Racial Categorisation

The literature review introduced the wider social and historical contexts of South African colonialist and nationalist narratives, to provide a context for beliefs surrounding race and social class (Said, 1994; Smith, 1999). The Analysis reflects large the prevalence of these ideologies through the construction of the highly racialized and class-conscious society of South Africa. It is reasoned as "normal" to categorise oneself and others according to their race; so normal in fact that it is not questioned. The embeddedness of these tendencies is ascribed to upbringing, where it is taught, and then implicitly embodied, not to question authority or those in power. This extends from family to government, where the European, colonial way sets the benchmark for the way one should conceptualise the world. This

supports the notions raised in the literature regarding post-colonial critique (Said, 1994) and the idea that colonisation never came to an "end" but rather created a complex system that binds people and countries together through discursive dislocations. This idea is highly reflective in the talk of embodied racial categorisation, where the metaphor of a "racial demon" to construct one participant's tendency to racially categorise others. This, he says, is a part of his and other white South Africans' "psyche," a psychological inference to embodiment that cannot be physically located and potentially, not addressed because it is so ingrained. Another participant's construction of this tendency to racially categorise as existing within the "heart" and not the "mind" also draws on a physical embodiment, bound to a system of beliefs that cannot be easily transformed. It's just the "way it is" and has always been. The motivations of the Apartheid system speak to this, encouraging demarcations of racial difference, to establish that if you are black, you are not like me. This normalisation of difference (King, 2007) is so ingrained into the "heart" and the "psyche" that it becomes difficult to detach as an independent entity outside of the person, an attachment many of the participants expressed they could acknowledge and still experience. The question of how one can then come to conceptualise one's own identity independently of the tendency to racially categorise others in an arguably more liberal social world than that of Apartheid becomes complex, because these questions involve further dismantling of all conceptions of normality and therefore, "truth."

Afrikaner and White Superiority

The questioning of "truth" is a pivotal point at which Afrikaner and white superiority enters the discussion, as dismantling the tendency to racially categorise means that the self-imposed superiority of the white race lacks solid foundation. If it is supposed that the categories of "white" and "black" exist, then the superiority and inferiority of racial classes becomes coherent. If, however, the categories of race are questioned entirely, then the hierarchy that exists through superiority comes crashing down; those at the top no longer able to sustain their positioning without those at the bottom. During the Apartheid era, the legalisation of the white race to enforce hierarchy was socially upheld, the Afrikaans in particular assigned the pedestal at the top of that hierarchy (Gilliomee, 2003; Vincent, 2000). Furthermore, the construction of the Afrikaans opposition society to the other "whites" sustained a hierarchy within the white class (Allen, 2014) which participants raised in their

accounts of racial indoctrination and oppression. The idea of English oppression as a result of the Afrikaans system of government was argued, allowing privileges in terms of a collective "whiteness" but at the same time, a distancing in social standing. Brandon's construction of the Afrikaans as "God fearing" provides insight into not only the Apartheid social system, but the motivation of fear and how this upholds Afrikaans and other "white" cultural belief. White superiority involves all those deemed to fit within the white racial category, but the defiance to protect the Afrikaans bloodline is somewhat overlooked in literature following the 'official' end of Apartheid. The construction of a group that believed to be 'God's people' can be aligned very strongly to Foucault's ideas of Pastoral power, where loyal subjects are therefore produced (Foucault, 1975). The idea of a 'pastorship' proposes a form of regulation that is originally external to the state but is eventually adopted by the government. This type of power is thus both totalising and individualising, in that the total interests of the centralised Afrikaner state are considered, as well as the ruling of individuals. Through pastoral power, belief systems of right and wrong are created and thus sustained through the Afrikaans political actions and Apartheid government. If it is believed that it is "right" for white Afrikaners to embody a superior racial positioning because it is a cultural entitlement, then moral and ethical foundations come into question when that is threatened. As one participant noted, to question these conceptions of right and wrong was to defy God, one's own people, and the state of South Africa. This raises ideas around the resistances to change that are ascribed to Afrikaans in the literature as well as in the data of this study, and the difficulties of questioning superiority. If it is acknowledged that racial superiority and cultural pride may stem from a past of oppression, what implications might that have for the young Afrikaans person in South Africa or abroad, who now deals with the dislocations brought about by a drastic change in government, that clashes with the knowledge of their Afrikaans belonging? This sub discourse is therefore largely intertwined with ideas surrounding social and cultural identity, and the justifications of racial stereotypes in relation to work and the economy.

Race and Ability

Racial categorisation and the quest for racial and social hierarchy sustained stereotypes, normalising knowledge of racial ability. These justifications account for beliefs that white people are more suitable for "higher" ranking jobs that potentially require more intelligence, and that black people are more suitable to "menial" jobs such as outdoor and

domestic labour. These beliefs stem from the imperialist narratives of colonial South Africa, embedded within the social actions of "civilising" the African and other "non-white" cultures (Oliver & Oliver, 2017; King, 2017). Accounts of racial ability therefore provide further justification for these beliefs in the modern-day economy, where it is uncomfortable to reverse racial roles and presuppose a white person enacting a role of service for a black person. This becomes even more uncomfortable within the intimate space of the household, where social roles are enacted on a micro level. What happens "behind closed doors" therefore further ingrains beliefs and is reliant again upon the conceptions of right and wrong resting on the bedrock of racial superiority. This highlights Foucault's connection between knowledge and power (Foucault, 1982) where the knowledge that black people are befitting for manual and servitude roles, serves the superiority of the white class. This superiority sustains the racial hierarchy and the normality of racial categorisation, where one participant spoke of the "treason" that a reversal of racial roles would represent, highlighting the betrayal that comes of questioning knowledge that sustains positionings of power. Employment therefore signifies social status, and South Africa was constructed as a society very dependent on status, and the prevalence of material wealth. Mbeki (2009) questions the notion of this superiority still resting in the hands of the white population, and rather suggests that the need to belong to the wealthy, upper-class society by black people is rooted in the capitalist system established by European neo-liberalism. The importance of material wealth and social status is thus sustained, potentially introducing the idea that one may be able to transcend racial prejudice and the social belief of ability, if one has a lot of money to "earn" a place in that hierarchy.

Conclusion

I argue that through the dominant discourse of Race and Hierarchy, indoctrination of systems of beliefs could potentially transform, but also continue to endure in South Africa and New Zealand following immigration. Participants expressed that because conceptions of wealth, status and ability are not as highly regarded in New Zealand, and are viewed at more independently of racial category, that they could question their past beliefs. This opens up further possibility for research into race talk in the South African context, how New Zealanders or people in other countries perceive South African immigrants, or furthermore,

the psychology of how people experience immigration to other countries. These avenues could provide further insight into the post-colonial climate, as well as avenues for cultural, social and racial identity amidst an increasingly integrative world.

Part 2: The Domestic Employment Relationship Paradox

The Domestic Employment Relationship Paradox addresses the sub research questions of *how South Africans position themselves in relation to the black woman through the domestic relationship* and *how South Africans talk of servitude in relation to race and gender*. These questions guide the exploration of the accounts of this relationship and the positionings offered through discourse, within institutional and political relations of power.

White Working-Class Lifestyle

The existence of domestic help in the South African sphere depends on the constructions of the white working-class lifestyle that sustains its normality. I argue that the "typical" South African household, established as middle to upper class and white during Apartheid, could be conceptualised as an institution with its own sets of knowledge and ideologies. These ideologies are reflective of those in wider society, and also protective of positionings and entitlements exclusive of social transformation. The nationalist narratives employed during Apartheid (Gilliomee, 2003; Viljoen, 2001) established the household and domestic duty as a feminised space. Furthermore, the still commonplace presence of domestic workers as black within white households further sustains the ideologies of the white household and the entitlement to superiority that is perpetuated. The positionings of the white employer and the black employee sustains the institutional beliefs of colonial oppression and apartheid through the household (Cock 1981; Jansen, 2011). Furthermore, the embodiment of institutional belief systems produces subjects, and importantly, the subject of the white employer and the black domestic worker. The household therefore functions as somewhat of a "mini" governance, with its own set of rules and regulations, defined by the household and constituted by wider society. One participants' justification of continued domestic employment following Apartheid as "helping another family to put food on the table" positions the beliefs of the household as the helpers; the providers. The

domestic worker is therefore the one so in need of that help that she would accept low pay, informal employment contracts, and high workload expectations. She is therefore serving the needs of this "lifestyle", where importance is placed on wealth and status; the domestic worker serving to enable functioning of that status. This constant presence since the early days of Apartheid has ingrained domestic help as an entitlement; a normalisation; an expectation that there will always be someone "behind you" as one participant expressed, to help. This relationship functions differently however to that of the previously established servitude role through slavery, as the relationship has now become more complex amidst the political and social changes. These complexities are discussed in the Paradox below, where the domestic relationship resting on the assumptions of white working-class life becomes dismantled.

Servitude and ownership

The relationship between employer and employee in the domestic realm is constructed by the participants to be that of servitude by those outside of the South African context; where the domestic worker is unable to enact choice regarding the nature of her employment and thus, her racial and gendered positioning in society. Although participants contested this idea, the line between domestic worker and domestic servant soon blurred, as Apartheid justifications became apparent (Cock, 1981, 1987; Jansen, 2011; King, 2007). The normalisation of her presence in the South African household; the institution perpetuating beliefs on white social class and entitlement, represents a lack of choice or autonomy. Jansen's insights into the emotional distancing from white life that the domestic worker receives (Jansen, 2011) does not differ far from the constructions of those in this study about their relationships, which function on a multitude of levels, but are ultimately always bound to the knowledge that a domestic worker belongs to the household. One participants' description of her domestic worker as "part of the furniture", speaks to the permanency, normalisation and ownership of her presence. Attribution to a piece of furniture constructs her as an inanimate "other." Linking back to the white working-class lifestyle, her presence thus sustains it's functioning and her help is thus justified. Furthermore, the "myth" that an improvement in working conditions has bettered the lives of employer and employee following Apartheid (Archer , 2011) is contested in the acknowledgement of an unequal

relationship, yet the normality and justification through the sub discourse of servitude and ownership disables change. Furthermore, the justification of her presence embedded within these relations of servitude disables accountability for change, despite a constructed need for it. The white employer and the black domestic worker are both functioning within discourses that sustain them to their unequal, and hierarchical positionings. The subjectivities that the participants construct through the role of former employer is one that carries both awareness and equally, disassociation. This first link in the cog of this paradox of a relationship sustains both parties' hierarchies as much as it does to disempower their agency.

Part of the family

This sub discourse provides justifications for sustaining the domestic relationship despite unequal relations embedded in hierarchy and entitlement, further contributing to the paradox of the relationship. The domestic worker becomes a role, a figure, likened to that of a family member or a close friend. At times she is attributed a maternal, nurturing role, personalising the once traditional servitude relations of Apartheid. As one participant described, she is considered a friend or family member, but there are still "rules" and the closeness of this relationship balances on a beam. This beam is within the control of the employer however, as is the nature of the relationship, whether that be one of family, friend, or merely employee. As constructed by another participant, the relationship is "close but not too close," perfectly encapsulating the ideas that (Jansen, 2011) raises in the literature about the cultivation of social distancing in the household despite genuine care. The relationship has boundaries, a rubber band that can be stretched but will ultimately always spring back to its original shape. This metaphorically accounts for the relations of power between employer and employee that are historically rooted in racial hierarchy. Treatment of domestic workers may have improved in the post-apartheid sphere, but whether these improvements transcend gender, racial and social roles or whether they reinforce them, is contestable. I argue that the relationship between domestic worker and white employee is not one to be questioned on genuine care or respect, but rather, the social relations, rooted in the normalisations of "family" life. This "family" is not that of the domestic workers', it is of the employers. They are not part of her family, she is a part of theirs. To view family in such a way does not account for the subordination and expectations placed on her as a result of her own

duties, often as a dual mother and carer. She is expected to uphold her gendered expectations to her own family and the family of her employers, within the recognition that she is and always will be regarded as less because of her race. The power imbalances within the four walls sustain the household as an institution, while the construction of family sustains the illusion of inclusiveness.

Discipline

The continuation of employed domestic help in the post-apartheid landscape is argued to be rooted in habituated norms established by the Apartheid moral order and the discourses sustaining positionings (Bradfield, 2012). These norms, preventing transformation of discourses, and thus further sustaining the power relations between employer and domestic worker, are constructed by participants through the enforcement of discipline. Returning to the view of the household as an institution, the domestic worker embodies the previously legally enforced "othering", enacting her unequal positioning. Ensuring rules are adhered to does not necessarily require direct force in the ways accounted for during times of slavery, but rather, the power relations embedded in the rulings of the household so that she knows her place. As Foucault suggests, rather than analysing a deep structure of power, one should focus on points of application (Foucault, 1975). This sub discourse therefore suggests that within the deep structure of the complex domestic relationship, points of application which serve to maintain control and domination are thus able to be analysed. This ingrained means of control is constructed through one participants' account of "just shove her in there, give her a blanket or two, they can take it." This spatial and emotional distancing discussed previously (Jansen, 2011) is highlighted in the reasoning behind such statements. Despite caring for the domestic worker, it is difficult to ignore the parallel of this account in many ways to a prisoner being shoved into a cell by a guard, creating further paradox to the justifications of a close and respectful relationship. Foucault's ideas around discipline and punishment pose that disciplining may not necessarily involve forceful acts of domination but may produce oppressive effects through social practices that become indirectly normalised (Foucault, 1975). Shoving a prisoner into a cell or a domestic worker into a wendy house therefore symbolise similar social practices if we consider that there are sets of knowledges and institutional beliefs that govern what is and is not allowed. Society accepts that the

institutional practices of prisons treat prisoners as such because they are in need of discipline and conformity as a result of wrongdoing, and the subjection of domestic workers is accepted as such within the knowledge of Apartheid and the governing practices of the household. It is therefore not seen as wrong in that discursive context; reasoned by the sets of truth establishing right from wrong.

Obligation

This sub discourse situates the domestic realm again, within a complex space. Although a relationship embedded in servitude, spoken of fondly as close and connected through family, while at the same time constituted by rules, employers feel obligated to help. As one participant summarised, "I need to help her and her family." Literature exploring the dependency between employer and domestic worker in the household space highlights a willingness to "right" the wrongs of the past through kindness and improvements in communication (Bradfield, 2012). This is however argued to breed further dependency by both subjects to each other, where the domestic worker feels obliged to enact her services, restricted by the unequal social situations created by Apartheid, and the employer to "help" her in whatever way they can. This help is predominantly financial, which although helping her and her family to survive, further sustains her positioning, both within the household and economically. She will never be paid enough to advance beyond survival, and any advancement is seemingly based on the "goodwill" of employers, which as constructed by the participants in this study, is far and few between. Her presence therefore continues to sustain the white working-class lifestyle, as her service allows the family to advance economically, with more time to dedicate to their own careers. The employer's obligation to therefore help in whichever way they can, through continued employment, a close bond, or pay, only further sustains this dependency, as without the domestic worker, they may stand to lose the lifestyle that this relationship upholds.

Conclusion

It is here, in this complex web of positionings, that the domestic worker and employer are bound to each other, economically and personally. Accounts of their relationship are

conflicting. The white working-class lifestyle, still sustained in pockets of white comfort, breeds institutional knowledge that justifies the presence of domestic help. This paradox sustains hierarchical beliefs that are enacted through this relationship, further normalising inequality behind closed doors. The literature and the constructions by the participants in the study suggest that the relationship has evolved and improved from that of traditional servitude, but consideration is also given to the argument that these improvements facilitate dependency and reinforce hierarchy. For South Africa to continue evolving, both economically, and socially, most participants agree that the domestic situation is both sad and unequal but is still normal. I therefore argue that it is not necessarily her presence that should be questioned as "right" or "wrong" but rather the mechanisms of truth resting on the institutional knowledges of Apartheid, that *inform* right and wrong, be questioned. Insight into these constructions could promote further research into the personal experiences of domestic workers themselves in South Africa from an Indigenous perspective, to further diminish the "othering" in the domestic relationship. Attention should also be given to the presence of domestic employment in other countries, encouraging post-colonial critique into social knowledge constituting race, gender and social class.

Part 3: Tension

Tension: a space, a feeling, an experience of looking back. It is uncomfortable, to view oneself in South Africa while in New Zealand, and to question everything. This section of the discussion is guided by the sub research question of *how South Africans construct, sustain or resist comfort zones through their talk*, through the displacement South African discourses in New Zealand.

The Bubble

The bubble; a protective sphere, provides comfort and safety. As accounted for by one participant, "they live in bubbles, they don't actually see the real South Africa." The South Africans in New Zealand account for this bubble as a façade. The bubble does not actually exist, but is rather constructed within South African life, to buffer against acknowledgement of the "real" South Africa. The insights into racial "comfort zones" in the literature provide further insight into this bubble (Ballard , 2004) where the previously granted entitlement in

the white class is now sought in the post-apartheid sphere. Although space has become more integrated since the 1990's, with black, Indian and coloured communities moving into the previously white-only suburbs, literature and the participants construct an environment where race and space has prevailed, through gated communities and segregated suburbs. These gated communities, with their high walls and security barriers, provide a physical image of the metaphor of the bubble. The bubble encases the household, the institutional movements of daily life and domestic help. The domestic worker not only enables the white working class life, but this life within the bubble, to uphold its existence. The bubble is not constructed as evident in South Africa by those living within that protective space because it is normal, it is believed through knowledge perpetuation. It is rooted in the discourses of superiority and white-working class; if superiority can no longer be enacted on a macro level, it can be in the bubble. Not only does the bubble prevent movement or racial transformation, but it encases discourses of normality that attain to the roles of those within this sphere, producing and sustaining "traditional " subjects and positionings.

Gender roles

Terms such as "traditional" and "conservative" are used liberally by participants to construct the gendered landscape of South Africa, which present questions around patriarchal conceptions and how they constitute the household sphere. The literature on Afrikaner Nationalism details an extremely conservative culture, where gendered roles are fixed (Gilliomee, 2003; Vincent, 2000). As pastoral power was discussed above in relation to racial category and superiority, so too can it be considered in the context of gender positionings. Although the imperialist influence and other cultural beliefs are ingrained into these notions, it is the Afrikaans culture that is predominantly drawn on in the data to account for gendered justifications, especially within the household. This links back to the defiance of the Afrikaner woman during war, to protect the household in the quest to maintain nationwide purity. If the Afrikaner woman's position is rooted in these historical discourses, can she be considered the "pastor," protector and safe keeper of the household, or a subject? Furthermore, this idea could be taken into the construction of the bubble; enacted away from the social changes of the society that may be considered a threat to this protection.

Not only are women delegated to the household, but male positionings are accounted for as perpetuating a reliance on women and thus, domestic help. The entitlement of men to domestic help, either by their wives or domestic workers, is constructed by one participant as "lazy," placing pressure on women to carry out domestic chores. The pressure of the capitalist economy, where the high standard of working-class life requires long hours at work, places the "family" unit within a cycle of further dependency on domestic help to sustain this lifestyle. Black AND white women's positionings are thus, as suggested by Cock (1981) sustaining the dependency between patriarchy and capital. Black women in lower labour roles sustain the white woman's positioning of choice, autonomy and control, yet still reinforce the gendered norms of domestic responsibility. The white woman enacting the 'gatekeeper of the household' position sustains the power relations between her and her male counterpart, as well as between her and the domestic worker. These ideas are justified and normalised in the bubble, embedded in the imperialist and nationalist narratives that provide the comfort and safety net of "traditionalism." These notions are questioned in the New Zealand context, as racial and gendered positionings provide the catalyst for reflection.

Self-sufficient New Zealand

The discursive environment of New Zealand provides the space of questioning the "traditionalism" of South Africa, where roles and positionings function according to different conceptions of normality. In New Zealand domestic help does not exist in the way it does in South Africa, as domestic workers themselves constitute different racial, gender and social classes, and domestic work is considered a legitimate form of employment. Domestic service is thus organised through contractual obligation, considered a service only when "needed." This need of course functions according to the differing discourses sustaining the entitlement to domestic help in New Zealand, which is not embedded in a racial history similar to that of Apartheid. New Zealanders are ascribed a "self-sufficiency," accounted for by one participant as having "grown up doing a lot of things for themselves." Kiwi are thus positioned as domestically self-sufficient. Thus, the pressures of a high standard of living as constructed in the South African nexus are contrasted with the "easy-going" lifestyle in New Zealand, where the household is not deemed to depict wealth or status to the same extent as in the South African society. This self-sufficiency provides for the enactment of the individual through discourse, where gender, race and social class are no longer considered constraints to action.

These possibilities encompass the accounts in the data where domestic chores are now considered to be the responsibility of each individual in the household, a transformation of the "traditionalist" South African narrative into the New Zealand sphere.

Equal Opportunity

The enactment of self-sufficiency in New Zealand not only provides possibilities for racial and gendered roles within the confines of the household, but transcends to the constitution of employment and societal positioning more broadly. Domestic work as a viable employment opportunity for any gender, race or social class is considered legitimate, contrasting the previously "normal" constraints in South Africa. The egalitarian construction of work in New Zealand therefore places employment outside of the previously accepted notions of social regard and status in South Africa, normalising equality and fair opportunity. Perhaps the historical constitution of domesticity and servitude in New Zealand as not expectant of Maori has allowed for knowledge that "non-white" are not necessarily regarded as servants. One participants' account of New Zealand treating "domestic workers just like normal people doing a job" speaks to a humanitarianism in New Zealand, positioning "menial" jobs on the same level as others. Domestic work therefore is no longer an "other" occupation, as this participant herself is employed as a domestic worker in New Zealand, a position she expressed many times would not be an option for her in South Africa as a white person. Alongside racial allowance into domesticity, gender is also deconstructed in the New Zealand context as it is not considered abnormal for a man to work as a domestic worker, as the binaries constituting gender differ. The participants expressed that they may initially feel uncomfortable employing a man to clean their house, but that it is accepted in New Zealand and that this challenges their traditionalist views. This challenging of views brings us to the final segment of this discussion, where an oppressive South African past is confronted in the New Zealand present.

Displaced Race

Racial displacement accounts for the tension that many of the participants experience between a racial past and an accepting present. They are unsure of how to unpack those previously accepted beliefs, as personal autonomy and choice are questioned in relation to

the domestic worker and their positioning as white employer. The "placement" of an indoctrination that was once considered normal, and at times, valued and upheld as the protection of a nation, is dislodged. The discourses in New Zealand challenge these conceptions of normality, promoting internal conflict of belief and thus, action in society. Historical morals constituting right and wrong are challenged and embodied, the bubble is popped, and previously upheld justifications are questioned. As the participants explain to others in New Zealand the concept of a domestic worker, a black woman who lives in a separate quarters to the main house, or who travels in by taxi from a township every day to clean, begins to sound absurd. How do you then explain, reason, justify or account for this in a context that functions within historical norms that wouldn't allow this? "My eyes also opened up in the sense of what we did to people" highlights the tension one participant and many others expressed they feel, in how they could allow, and willingly participant in oppressive acts. Importantly, they are only viewed as such outside of the context of South Africa, as these context-bound discourses are not only challenged, but by some, transformed.

Conclusion

Tension is the space in which all of the discourses identified and explored in this study unite; where the racial history of South Africa that constitutes the positioning of domestic work and the constraints and allowances for subjects, is questioned in New Zealand. The discourses constituting "truth" claims on knowledge, embedded within the power relations of South Africa, are transformed and contested. For many, immigration to New Zealand changes the game. The rules have changed, and thus, so have the players. Some continue to play the old game, and therefore do not experience perhaps the same extent of inner turmoil, while others challenge the discomfort this promotes and aim to further dislodge previous norms. Furthermore, the context of New Zealand provides the safety in which to experience this, because it is less threatening to superiority or racial entitlement. This transformation in discursive possibility even causes some to look at their family or others in South Africa who DO still live within the bubble of certainty and safety, shifting their foundations and promoting questioning into not only their past or their cultural belongings, but the very basis of their identities. Reflection on the past, a past that involves what they now acknowledge to have existed within an oppressive system, is conflicting and uncomfortable. To acknowledge that

within this system, dehumanisation occurred through the employment and or treatment of domestic workers, and communicating that in the New Zealand sphere amidst a society that does not welcome such justifications, is tense. This tense space of transformation following immigration allows potential research into national belonging, the psychology of nationalisation and the promotion of difference. This has implications for concepts such as belonging, the "us" vs "them" mentality, and the acknowledgement that it is not enough to simply "move on" from periods such as Apartheid, but rather to trace historical systems of belief to promote change and acceptance.

Part 4: Contribution to research, limitations and conclusion

Contribution to Psychology and the field of research

This study extends psychological knowledge by exploring the space between the two contexts of New Zealand and South Africa and the reflection on domestic work that this promotes. New Zealand society disrupts the normality of South African domestic work, enabling reflection and questioning of racial and gendered norms situated in social discourse. Furthermore, this study suggests that discourse has the potential to be transformed, in order to challenge historical preconceptions and beliefs. Although power relations will always be in circulation, and we may never be able to escape discourse (Foucault, 1982) perhaps we are able to achieve an awareness of at least some of the discourses we are bound to, in the hopes of addressing them. The literature surrounding domestic work, amidst the large number of South African immigrants in New Zealand, is benefitted by the insights this study provides. Reflection, acknowledgement and awareness of power relations sustaining individual action is the first step to addressing action that is no longer desirable, because questioning the constitution of truth enables the possibility that we as a society have the power to choose what is "right" and "wrong." The insights that this study has therefore provided into domestic work and the circulatory nature of power and knowledge further encourages research to view all conceptions of normality as political constructions; to never merely accept, and to never stop questioning.

Limitations

A proposed limitation of this study is of course that it cannot nor does it aim to "answer" the research question of how South Africans account for domestic work in New Zealand, but more so to promote further questioning of the normative and accepted discourses of Race and Hierarchy, The Domestic Employment Relationship Paradox, and Tension. This limitation is overshadowed by the power of this work and of discourse, to examine assumptions, truth and morality. Rather than identifying "truth," this study has turned its attention to the notion of "truth" itself, exploring many truths. The non-answering of questions opens up further avenues for exploration, for deconstruction of knowledge that apply to New Zealand and in turn, global society itself.

Conclusion

"Maybe the target nowadays is not to discover who we are, but to refuse who we are"
(Foucault, 1982 p. 216)

The formulation of power as proposed by Foucault, does not discount a repressive nature of power, nor does it deny a primacy. The exercise of power is therefore enacted through the interplay of power relations ref (McNay, 1994, p. 91) thus; the interplay between Race and Hierarchy, the Domestic Employment Relationship Paradox, and Tension.

To attempt to answer the research question of how South Africans living in New Zealand construct domestic work, requires the acknowledgement that their constructions are embedded in discourse. Power relations operating are not put forth as intentional through these discourses, dislocating the mainstream psychological notions of a racist or sexist "mind," but rather the legitimacy of the institutionalised knowledge of South Africa and domestic work. This institutional knowledge, as has been analysed and explored, bears negotiation by the South Africans in this study as to how it serves to "fit" in New Zealand society. How they now come to construct domestic work, is sustained within power relations of South Africa, and questioned among those in New Zealand.

This circulatory notion of power therefore is never localised to a specific place or person, and rather than confirming any answers, raises more questions in terms of identity, and how one can identify as racist, sexist, non-racist, non-sexist, liberal, open-minded etc; all discourses constituted in some way by power. How participants position themselves in relation to the black woman through the domestic relationship may be accepted and justified within a South African context, situated in history. How they talk of race and gender in relation to servitude is again, traceable genealogically to the dominant discourses explored above.

Discourse and power, can therefore never be "escaped," because the body is a product of the discourse that sustains it. In a Foucauldian sense, no society can be void of power; power will always exist. Discourses may transform, in the ways that some have for participants, but power relations will always be circulating. This raises questions for the autonomous, "liberal" individual that many may hope to incite in the New Zealand environment, but as this thesis argues, these ideals can never be guaranteed or definitive. It could be pessimistic to consider that contemporary white South Africa is still in many ways stuck in a racial and gendered past, but, as this study shows, this knowledge can be addressed and thus, potentially transformed. Through exposure and deconstruction of knowledge, we come to question what we think we "know," therefore the ideas and beliefs that we take for granted.

We are after all, all players in the game. We may not have direct control over the game, but we do potentially have a say in how we play. Knowledge of the world may always be constituted by power of some relation, but we do have the power to address this knowledge, especially if we occupy a position of privilege in which to do so. I argue, that we must do so. It is not enough for me to reflect on life back in South Africa in New Zealand, but rather, to promote this same questioning more widely.

A final message

As much as this thesis has aimed to question the assumptions of domestic work by South Africans living in New Zealand, it has in turn questioned my own. I occupy no superior

positioning to this work, and would go so far as to deny autonomous authorship. Rather, this work stands as a collaboration. A collaborative "writing" of thinking, speaking and sharing with other people throughout my life, my history, their history, the participants, my supervisor, my family, the domestic workers whom we speak of, the authors and philosophers who wrote the material I have engaged with.

As I write out my final words, I realise that the institutionalised thinking of Academia, and my own interest in discourse, presents a crossroads for me. How can I wrap everything up into a conclusion or a one-liner that summarises all of the points made to either be taken seriously or not, as if presented from one singular "researcher?" I also realise that I do, sit with the very same paradox's as the participants in this study. I live in the tension, we all do, whether we have immigrated or not. It is uncomfortable to question ourselves, our knowledge and what we represent. As I borrow one participant's account; "*it's a paradox you know I was brought up <u>seeing</u> them as inferior to myself but at the same time I miss their energy and their drive I find myself listening more and more to black music I find myself enjoying a movie from Africa I find myself enjoying the fact that there's <u>success</u> in Africa so I live with a very unusual paradox"* I know that I too, look at my past with both fondness and nostalgia, at the same time wondering if I should. As a white South African born woman living in New Zealand, I too am constituted through these complexities of discourse. Bearing in mind the complexities I face, I would hope that this work has gone so far as to propose that each person should constantly be reflexive to always remain suspicious of their own knowledge and its production and strive to always dissolve boundaries in order to bring about social change. Foucault deems this "ethics of the self" vitally important to deconstructing ways of thinking, as it encompasses a level of practical consciousness, critical self-awareness and reflexivity (McNay, 1994, p. 155). Whether change enacted through this ethical moment be considered "positive" is again, contestable, but it would be irresponsible to simply succumb to the dominant discourses that constitute taken-for-granted norms without critical and reflective thought into the dynamics of truth, knowledge and power that we all constitute and exhibit.

I finish off with Foucault's "cutting of knowledge" inserted in the beginning of this discussion, to serve as a reminder that we should never strive to know or understand *more*

of the world, but to cut the ties that bind together everything we *think* we know. To question is to shift foundations, to create new spaces for discussion, and to encourage different modes of being.

References

Allen, D. (2014). 'Mother of the Nation:' Rugby, Nationalism and the role of women in South Africa's Afrikaner Society. *Sport in Society, 17*(4), 466-478.

Annual Net Migration Eases from Recent Peak . (2018, February 28). Retrieved from Stats NZ : https://www.stats.govt.nz/news/annual-net-migration-eases-from-recent-peak

Archer , S. (2011). 'Buying the Maid Ricoffy': Domestic Workers, Employers and Food . *South African Review of Sociology* , 66-82.

Ballard , R. (2004). Assimilation, Emigration, Semigration and Integration: White People's Strategies for finding a Comfort Zone in Post-Apartheid South Africa . In M. Steyn, & N. Distiller, *Under Construction: 'Race' and Identity in South Africa Today* (pp. 50-67). Sandton : Heinemann .

Bosch, T., & McLeod, C. (2015). The Relationships between Female Domestic Workers and their Employees in Cape Town, South Africa. *Global Media Journal African Edition* , 134-155.

Bradfield, S.-J. (2012). Madam and Eve: The Politics of Race and Postcolonial Television in South Africa . *Television and New Media* , 529-544.

Brookes, B. (2007). Gender, Work and Fears of a 'Hybrid Race' in 1920's New Zealand. *Gender & History*. Sussex : Blackwell Publishing , 501-518.

Bujra, J. (2000). *Serving Class: Masculinity and the Feminisation of Domestic Service in Tanzania .* London : Edinburgh University Press .

Burr, V. (2015). Social Constructionist Research. In *Social Constructionism* (pp. 170-203). East Sussex : Routledge.

Cock, J. (1897). Trapped Workers: Constraints and Contradictions Experienced by Black Women in Contemporary South Africa. *Women's Studies Int. Forum* , 133-140.

Cock, J. (1981). Disposable Nannies: Domestic Servants in the Political Economy of South Africa . *Review of African Political Economy* , 63-83.

Dixon, J., Foster , D., Durrheim , K., & Wilbraham, L. (1994). Discourse and the Politics of Space in South Africa: The 'Squatter Crisis'. *Discourse and Society* , 277-296.

Fadyl, J. K., Nicholls, D. A., & McPherson, K. M. (2013). Interrogating Discourse: The Application of Foucault's Methodological Discussion to Specific Inquiry . *Health: An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Social Study of Health, Illness and Medicine* , 491-507.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change* . Cornwall: Polity Press.

Foucault M. (1970) The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences, London: Tavistock.

Foucault M. (1972) The Archaeology of Knowledge, New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M., & Hurley, R. (1975) T*he History of Sexuality: An introduction*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1977a) Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In Bouchard, D.F., editor, *Language, countermemory, practice selected essays and interviews by Michael Foucault.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 139-64

Foucault M. (1977b) *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*, London: Penguin.

Foucault, M., & Gordon, C. (1980). Power/Knowledge . New York: Harvester Whatsheaf.

Foucault, M. (1982). *The Subject and Power*. Critical Inquiry *, 8*(4), 777-795.

Gergen, K. J. (1985, March). The Social Constructionist Movement in Modern Psychology. *American Psychologist, 40*(3), 266-275.

Gergen, K. J. (1994). Crisis in Representation and the Emergence in Social Constructionism. In *Realities and Relationships: Soundings in Social Construction* (p. 49). London: Harvard University Press .

Gilliomee, H. (2003). *The Afrikaners: Biography of a People.* London: Hurst & Company .

Hassim, S. (2003). The Gender Pact and Democratic Consolidation: Institutionalizing Gender Equality in the South African State . *Feminist Studies* , 505-528.

Hook, D. (2005). Genealogy, Discourse, 'Effective History': Foucault and the work of critique. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 2*, 3-31.

Jansen, E. (2011). From Thandi the Maid to Thandi the Madam: Domestic Workers in the Archives of Afrikaans Literature and a Family Photograph Album . *South African Review of Sociology* , 102-121.

King, A. J. (2007). *Domestic Service in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Deference and Disdain.* Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

Lyon, D. (1994). Chapter 2 Postmodernity: The History of an Idea . In *Postmodernity* (pp. 4-18). Bristol: Open University Press.

Maboyana, Y., & Sekaja, L. (2015). Exploring the Bullying Behaviours Experienced by South African Domestic Workers. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 25:2, 114-120.

Macdonald , C. (2017). Why Was There No Answer to the 'Servant Problem'? Paid Domestic Work in the Making of a White New Zealand, 1840's-1960's. *New Zealand Journal of History* , 7-35.

Mbeki, M. (2009). *Architects of Poverty: Why African Capitalism Needs Changing.* Picador Africa.

McNay, L. (1994). *Foucault: A Critical Introduction.* Cornwall : Polity Press.

Meares, C. (2007). *From the Rainbow Nation to the Land of the Long White Cloud: Migration, Gender and Biography, Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology .* Albany : Massey University .

Nyamnjoh, F.B. (2005). Madams and Maids in Southern Africa: Coping with Uncertainties, and the Art of Mutual Zombification. *Africa Spectrum*, 181-196

Oliver, E., & Oliver , W. H. (2017). The Colonisation of South Africa: A Unique Case . *HTS Teologiese Studies/ Theological Studies* .

Parker, I. (1990). Discourse: Definitions and Contradictions. *Philosophical Psychology* , 189-204.

Quayle , A., & Sonn, C. (2009). The Construction of Muslims as "Other" in Mainstream Australian Society: An Analysis of Discourse . *The Australian Community Psychologist* , 8-23.

Rousse, J. (1987). Power/ Knowledge. In *Knowledge and Power: Toward a Political Philosophy of Science* (pp. 95-121). London: Cornell University Press.

Said, E. (1994). Freedom from Domination in the Future . In *Culture and Imperialism* (pp. 341-408). New York: Vintage Books.

Smith, L. T. (1999). Imperialism, History, Writing and Theory. In *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples* (pp. 20-43). London: Zed Books .

Steyn , M. (2009). Rehabilitating a Whiteness Disgraced: Afrikaner White Talk in Post-Apartheid South Africa . *Communication Quarterly* , 143-169.

Steyn, M., & Foster , D. (2008). Repertoires for Talking White: Resistant Whiteness in Post-Apartheid South Africa . *Ethnic and Racial Studies* , 25-51.

Trlin , A. (2012). "It's All So Different Here..." Initial Employment and Social Engagement Experiences of South Africans in New Zealand . *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* , 57-81.

Tuffin, K. (2005). *Understanding Critical Social Psychology .* Wiltshire : Sage Publications.

Viljoen, R. (2001). Aboriginal KhoiKhoi Servants and their Masters in Colonial Swellendam, South Africa, 1745-1795. *Agricultural History*, 28-51.

Vincent , L. (2000). Bread and Honour: White Working Class Women and Afrikaner Nationalism in the 1930's. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 61-78.

Appendix A

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
TE KUNENGA KI PŪREHUROA
UNIVERSITY OF NEW ZEALAND

Living with(out) maids: A Foucauldian Discourse Analysis

Participant Information Sheet

Who is the researcher?

My name is Kayleigh Geyer and I am 25 years old, studying and working in Auckland. I grew up in Cape Town, South Africa till the age of 15 with my mother, father and younger sister, and I have gone back to South Africa every couple of years to visit my extended family and friends. I am currently completing my master's Thesis through the School of Psychology at Massey University, under the supervision of Professor Dr Keith Tuffin.

What is this study about?

The complex issues and debates within the country of South Africa, particularly regarding gender, race and political power, have motivated the interest in the Domestic Worker still common within South African households. The project uses Foucauldian Discourse Analysis to explore understandings around the role of the Domestic Worker, and the complex social landscape of Post-Apartheid South Africa.

Why have I been approached as a potential participant?

You have been approached because you are a South African citizen who has immigrated from South Africa after the year 1995, you live in Auckland, New Zealand, and you employed/ grew up with an employed Domestic Worker in your household.

What would my involvement entail?

You would be interviewed during August of 2018 at Massey University Library Albany. The interview process is estimated to take around an hour, but this may fluctuate, as you are

welcome to discuss any ideas/ issues raised for as long as you deem necessary. The interview would be recorded on audio tape.

Your confidentiality and rights as a participant

- You may decline to participate in this research
- You may withdraw from the research process at any time and you do not need to give a reason
- You may decline to answer any questions
- You may decline to share any information you feel uncomfortable sharing
- You will be given the opportunity to amend your transcripts
- A pseudonym will be used for transcription to protect your identity and confidentiality
- No records related to your identification will be kept
- Only the researcher and the research supervisor will have access to your data and your data will be securely stored by the researcher only
- You may choose whether your interview audiotapes are stored in a research archive for five years, returned to you, or destroyed. The researcher will not keep these following the conclusion of the research
- You will be offered a summary of the research before submission
- Your data may be used in the master's thesis outlined above, and may be offered for publication in academic journals

Who can I contact If I have any questions or concerns?

You can contact me at any time if you have any questions about the research, or you feel you would like to discuss anything that was raised during the interview process at:
Email: [redacted]

If you feel you would like to raise any issues or concern with Massey University regarding this research or your rights as a participant, please contact Associate Professor Tracy Riley, Acting Director (Research Ethics)

humanethics@massey.ac.nz

Appendix B

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
TE KUNENGA KI PŪREHUROA
UNIVERSITY OF NEW ZEALAND

Living with(out) maids: A Foucauldian Discourse Analysis

Participant Consent form

I have read the information sheet for this study

I have been given the opportunity to ask questions and they have been answered to my satisfaction

I understand my right to ask questions throughout the study

I agree to the interview being audio taped and transcribed

I understand my right to ask for the audio recorder to be turned off at any time during the interview

I understand my right to decline to answer any question

I understand my right to withdraw from the study at any time before October 2018

I understand that my interview is confidential, and a pseudonym will be used to protect my identity

I agree to parts of my interview being used in this thesis project or other articles based on this thesis

I agree to participate in the study based on the conditions stipulated in the information sheet

Name _____

Signature _____

Date _____

Appendix C

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
TE KUNENGA KI PŪREHUROA
UNIVERSITY OF NEW ZEALAND

Living with(out) maids: A Foucauldian Discourse Analysis

Consent for Release of Tape Transcripts

I confirm that I have been offered the opportunity to read, amend or withdraw my audio transcript from the interview before publication

I understand that to protect my identity I have the opportunity to change my pseudonym

I understand and agree to the use of my audio transcripts to be used by the Researcher, Kayleigh Geyer, in her thesis project and may be utilised in other published journal articles

At the conclusion of the research I would like my tape ***destroyed / returned to me / stored*** (please circle one)

Name _____

Signature _____

Date _____

Appendix D

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
TE KUNENGA KI PŪREHUROA
UNIVERSITY OF NEW ZEALAND

Living with(out) maids: A Foucauldian Discourse Analysis

Interview Schedule

1. **Could you tell me what it was like running a household in South Africa?**

Follow up questions:

Was it necessary to employ domestic help? Why?

How would you reason or justify the employment of your Domestic Worker to someone in New Zealand who didn't understand?

Can you tell me more about that? OR Can you explain a bit more about what you mean by that?

2. **How would you define "domestic work?"**

Follow up questions:

Could you tell me your thoughts around the potential similarities or differences between a Domestic Worker and a servant?

How do you feel about the lack of Domestic Services or workers in New Zealand compared to South Africa?

Can you tell me more about that? OR Can you explain a bit more about what you mean by that?

3. **Could you describe the nature of the relationship you had with your/ your families' domestic worker in South Africa?**

Follow up questions:

What was his/ her living arrangement?

What was the employment agreement?

What factors were their wages based upon?

Can you tell me more about that? OR Can you explain a bit more about what you mean by that?

4. **How do you feel about the fact that most domestic workers, 24 years after Apartheid, are mostly women of colour?**

Follow up questions:

Do you think it's right/ fair? Or wrong/ unjust?

How would you have felt about employing a white man for example, as a Domestic Worker in place of a black or coloured woman?

Can you tell me more about that? OR Can you explain a bit more about what you mean by that?

5. **How would you describe the current political, social and economic states of South Africa and New Zealand? How do you think they compare?**

Follow up questions:

How did these factors influence your decision/ your families' decision to immigrate to New Zealand?

Can you tell me more about that? OR Can you explain a bit more about what you mean by that?

6. **How do you think the New Zealand societal views on Domestic Work compare to that of South Africa's?**

Follow up questions:

Have you employed someone to carry out domestic work here/ would you employ a domestic worker here if you were able to?

Can you tell me more about that? OR Can you explain a bit more about what you mean by that?

7. **Do you have any questions regarding this research?**

8. **Is there anything you would like to add/ talk about that you feel you haven't had the opportunity to discuss?**

Appendix E

Transcription Notation

1. **Overlapping Speech**

A: Talking here about something
B: [This is the interruption]

2. **Pauses**

A: Talking and (.) then continues
(.) = 1 sec
(2) = 2 sec
(3) = 3 sec
Etc

3. **Extended words**

A: I don't thi::::::::nk so no

4. **Emphasis**

A: Yes I <u>do</u> think so

5. **Volume**

A: the word that is LOUDEST is in capitals

6. **Rising Annotation**

Raising in pitch? at the end of the word

7. **Laughing talk**

{I am laughing while I say this sentence}

8. **(Inaudible) or (indistinct) utterances**

9. **Paralinguistic features**
((groan)) ((cough)) etc

10. **Identifiers**

[person's name]

11. **Unfinished words**

Alway-

12- **Audible inhalation ((hh))**
Audible exhalation ((hhh))

Appendix F

Living with(out) maids: A Foucauldian Discourse Analysis

Researcher: Kayleigh Geyer

Summary of results for participants

This is a summary of the study in which you kindly participated in August 2018. I would like to extend my deepest thanks to you for sharing your insights and your stories. I appreciate that the nature of this study and the various issues it draws on can be sensitive and I have therefore not attempted to generalise statements, nor give voice to any particular individual.The analysis of the data does not suggest a full scope of all possible discourses, but rather searches for dominant discourses and various truth*s,* as opposed to one truth. The findings of the discourse analysis were as follows:

The first dominant discourse is **Race and Hierarchy**, where participants establish a coherency around conceptions of social hierarchy dependent on racial categorisation. This socially constructed understanding is informed by and conversely, informs the sub discourses of *Racial Categorisation, Afrikaner and White Superiority*, and *Race and Ability,* allowing and constraining the actions of those within South African society. These intrenched systems of truth brought the Foucauldian notion of pastoral power into question, and the circulation of knowledge. Pastoral power encases constructions of whiteness and superiority, providing justifications for the construction of the black worker. The black worker and the racial, social and gendered hierarchy that their work represents, again allocates hierarchical positionings in South African society, whereby the white person is constructed to sustain an entitlement to "decent" work, and the black person to "menial" work. These power relations define, and furthermore, account for a very deep and complex domestic relationship.

Another dominant discourse is the **Domestic Employment Relationship Paradox**, where participants negotiate accounts of their relationship with their domestic workers. The construction of this relationship as a paradox rests on the contradiction of positionings that participants accounted for, weaving in and out of Apartheid established power relations, and the subject positionings the domestic relationship produces, sustains and contradicts. The sub discourses of *servitude and ownership, part of the family, discipline* and *obligation* that comprise this relationship, rests on the assumption of the *White Working Class*. The institution of the South African household places restraints and allowances on the employer and the domestic worker according to the rules and expectations constituted through power relations. The paradoxical nature of this relationship is not straight-forward, and is at times, confusing and contradictory upon reflection.

The final dominant discourse is identified in the analysis as **Tension**, accounting for the difficulties experienced in confronting a racial past after immigration. Participants justify and paradoxically, contest the placement of the indoctrinated and institutionalised racism of Apartheid, unsure of how to negotiate that in the New Zealand space. This tension informs gendered constructions, fairness around treatment of labourers and domestic employees, and white entitlement and privilege. The sub discourses of *the Bubble, Gender Roles, Self-Sufficient New Zealand, Equal Opportunity,* and *Displaced Race* provide further discursive deconstruction into how they experience this tension, as they look to their past to confront their ingrained ideals and beliefs.. Participants positioned themselves in the middle of two ideals, acknowledging a racial past in a more open-minded society. This raised inconsistencies as to how and where to place these previously normal racial positionings that are now questionable.

Application to Psychology and implications for further research

The literature and the constructions by the participants in the study suggest that the domestic relationship has evolved and improved from that of traditional servitude, but consideration is also given to the argument that these improvements facilitate dependency and reinforce hierarchy. For South Africa to continue evolving, both economically, and socially, most participants agree that the domestic situation is both sad and unequal but is still normal. This thesis argues that it is not necessarily her presence that should be questioned as "right" or "wrong" but rather the institutional knowledges that *inform* right and wrong, be questioned.

The space between the two contexts of New Zealand and South Africa is what makes reflection on life with the domestic worker, an extension of current literature. The New Zealand society disrupts the normality of the South African domestic worker, enabling reflection and questioning of past norms situated in social discourse. Furthermore, this study suggests that discourse has the potential to be transformed, in order to challenge historical preconceptions and belief systems. The literature surrounding domestic work, amidst the large number of South African immigrants in New Zealand, is benefitted by the insights this study provides. Reflection, acknowledgement and awareness of power relations sustaining individual action is the first step to addressing beliefs that are no longer desirable, because questioning the constitution of truth enables the possibility that we as a society have the power to choose what is "right" and "wrong." The insights that this study has therefore provided into the nature of power and knowledge further encourages research to view all conceptions of normality as political constructions; to never merely accept, and to never stop questioning.

Should you require any further information, a copy of this thesis will be available through the Massey University Library website from January 2019.