CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS

Introduction

As the epistemological underpinnings of this work are social constructionist and ecosystemic in nature, the general focus of this analysis is to reveal discursive themes from which the text of the interviews has been constructed. Specifically, the aim of this analysis is twofold. Firstly, it aims to reveal in the text an implicit discourse of training that is based on hierarchy and power relations between trainers and trainees. Secondly, it aims to expose an alternative discourse to that of training, a discourse which reveals a double bind experience and comments on the inconsistency between explicit and implicit contexts of learning. It is assumed that these discourses inform the construction of each trainee’s reality.

The primary focus of this analysis is on formulating an understanding of the implicit social construction of concepts of hierarchy and power within the Unisa training institution and of the implicit social construction of a double bind experience in training. In addition, there is a focus on understanding how these constructions influence the experience of trainees, and how they inform the text of transcribed interviews with these trainees.

It is assumed that there are many discourses (including an ecosystemic one) which can be shown to be operating in the text of these interviews. In addition to the two discourses explained above, this analysis could also have focused on revealing the
explicit ecosystemic discourse of training operating in the text of the interviews. The inclusion of this aspect in the analysis could have made the study more comprehensive. I have, however, chosen to focus exclusively on the two discourses mentioned above.

The following outline of the process of enquiry aims to show how my position shifted from the stance of a participant in the discursive interaction of the interviews, to that of an observer as I read the transcribed text with the purpose of analysing it according to the focus of the research. The position of interpreter was also adopted at times, as themes were extracted and meaning was reconstructed from the transcribed text. As interpreter, I reflected on how these meanings were informed by implicit discourses of training in clinical psychology, and by broader societal discourses that enable trainees to be “professionalised” into their profession and to think in certain ways that support the cohesion of that particular profession and society at large. The process of constructing meaning, therefore, involved a complex interaction of levels of analysis that occurred in a recursive manner. This process was not a linear progression, as the steps below imply (Oosthuizen, 2002).

In accordance with the macro-level of discourse analysis outlined in Chapter Four, the following steps were followed:

Step 1: Each audiotaped interview was transcribed.

Step 2: Each transcribed text was read a minimum of three times to ensure that I was familiar with the content of the text.
Step 3: Meanings that coincided with the research interest were identified and coded into themes. The content of the themes, and their identifiers (symbols), were sometimes changed on subsequent readings (Oosthuizen, 2002).

Step 4: The transcribed text for each interview was analysed, firstly for themes reflecting an implicit discourse of hierarchy and power relations in the training context, and secondly for themes reflecting a discourse which comments on a double bind experience in training.

Step 5: As there was a large amount of text from the three groups which reflected the above themes, an in-depth discourse analysis was conducted only with the Group Three (“the interns”) interviews. The Group One and Group Two interviews were used as collateral, to check the emergence of salient themes. The texts from Group Three were chosen for the in-depth analysis because this was the group that had been through the entire training process. An analysis of the text from these interviews revealed to me that these participants were better able to give a meta-perspective, when asked to comment on their training, as they had more distance from the training than the other two groups.

Step 6: As the themes and discourses were identified in the text, the following questions were asked of the text: “‘Why was this said, and not that?’; ‘What functions are being fulfilled by saying it that way?’; and ‘What effects are achieved?’” (Oosthuizen, 2002, p. 75).

Step 7: Parker’s criteria (cited in Oosthuizen, 2002) for discourse analysis were kept in mind in the process of this inquiry. The question, “what institutions are supported or subverted by what is said?” derives from these criteria. In the context of a particular
discourse, it was kept in mind what power relations were being reproduced, in terms of who gained and who lost by what was being said.

As we move to the analysis, it is important to note that it was through the questions that were asked in the interviews, and not others, and through my focus on particular discourses (which I chose in accordance with the focus of my study) in the text, and not others, that the results of this analysis were constructed. As this analysis aims to serve as feedback on what could be adjusted in the training system in order to add to its effectiveness, it is the so-called negative aspects of training that have been focused on in the text. It should be noted, however, that the interviewees also referred to so-called positive aspects of training, which were not recorded in the analysis.

Analysis

Phase One: Identifying Discourses in all Three Groups

An Implicit Discourse of Hierarchy and Power Relations

An implicit discourse of hierarchy and power relations in training was identified in all three groups. Themes were extracted which related to this discourse as set out in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1
Themes Extracted From the Discourse of Hierarchy and Power Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group one: “First years”</td>
<td>Trainers as powerful; trainees as powerless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trainees as having to fit in and conform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trainers as parents; trainees as children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trainers in control; trainees being controlled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group Two: “Second Years”

- Trainers as powerful; trainees as powerless
- Trainees as having to fit in and conform
- Trainees in control; trainees being controlled
- Trainees having to take responsibility; trainers not having to take responsibility

Group Three: “Interns”

- Trainers as powerful; trainees as powerless
- Trainees as having to fit in and conform
- Trainees as parents; trainees as children
- Men as powerful; women as powerless

An Alternative Discourse Which Comments on the Double Bind Experience

An alternative discourse to that of training, which comments on the double bind experience and includes an inconsistency between explicit and implicit contexts of learning, was extracted from the text of all three groups. This discourse was not divided into themes as it appeared in one form throughout the texts.

Phase Two: In-Depth Discourse Analysis of Group Three

An Implicit Discourse of Hierarchy and Power Relations

Themes relating to an implicit discourse of hierarchy and power relations in training were analysed in the texts of the transcribed interviews of Group Three.

Theme 1: trainers as powerful, trainees as powerless. The theme of trainers as powerful and trainees as powerless in training is situated in this discussion as a complementary construction informed by the implicit discourse of training that is based on hierarchy and power relations. The examples from the text cited below reveal this discourse as informing trainees’ experiences:

Where there’s an imbalance in power, you’ve got the trainer with a lot of power over the destiny of your life and you have to kind of fit into the
mould, or that was my initial perception. That was a disempowering perception …. So, if I had to go back now, within the structure of the course as it is structured now, I would still be able to, I would have a voice. But I did not have a voice until close to the end of the course. After I knew I was alright, very little that could go wrong now when the power differential became more equal.

In the above extract, there is a discourse of power relations between trainer and trainee operating in the text. The trainer is seen to be in a position of power and as having control over trainees and their lives. The use of the phrase “fit into the mould”, is a colloquialism, and reflects a societal discourse which positions trainees as having to conform to a predetermined idea of what a psychotherapist is. The text of the above extract also operates to subvert this discourse of power relations between trainer and trainee, and suggests that there could be a relationship between the two that is based on a more equal positioning.

The words in the text above create a meaning that implies that during training the trainee had a perception of how things “should” be. There was a protocol that was assumed to be in operation, namely that trainers were in charge. This perception reflects a larger societal discourse which operates to maintain trainers in a position of power and control in order that trainers can pass skills on to trainees.

This trainee’s perception shifted towards the end of training. She became aware that it was no longer necessary to take the “one-down” position with trainers. She reflects that if she had to do it over again, with the knowledge she now has of her training experience, she would do it differently. She would not accept her position of
powerlessness, and she would adopt a more equal position in relation to trainers. This reflects a discourse which subverts the traditional discourse of hierarchy between trainer and trainee, and reveals that this trainee has adopted a discourse that is an alternative discourse to that of training, one where she can experience her own power and sense of liberation.

The use of the word “voice” implies that this trainee initially felt that she could not express herself. She felt that she could not have an individual opinion during the training. The words: “After I knew I was alright, very little that could go wrong now”, imply that she had adopted a strategy of compliance during training. Once she knew that she had passed the course she felt that she could drop the façade, relax, and become more truly herself. The words, “when the power differential became more equal”, reflect the societal discourse that positions trainees as less powerful than trainers. According to this discourse, when trainees have completed their training they are considered to have moved up the hierarchy to the position of colleagues (which affords trainees greater status) in relation to their former trainers.

The following extract from another interview gives another example of an implicit discourse of power relations that were experienced as operating implicitly in training:

I think a lot of the training was more for the trainers and about satisfying their own needs as opposed to the needs of the students. Not once did they ever ask for feedback, but I think even if one did venture to give feedback it would have been taken up in a negative way or you would have been victimised and I personally saw that happen with one of the students and I
heard of previous experiences where students have tried to give feedback and it’s been, it’s impacted negatively on their training, so either their training was extended or life was made unbearably difficult now.

The words “I think a lot of the training was more for the trainers and about satisfying their own needs as opposed to the needs of the students”, reflect the societal discourse that students have needs that should be satisfied by the trainers, and that trainees depend on trainers for the satisfaction of their needs. This discourse operates to maintain trainees in a position of dependency, with trainers, by implication, as autonomous. In addition, it is a discourse that functions to create a perception that being dependent is weak and undesirable, and that being independent is strong and desirable. This discourse operates mainly in western, industrialised societies which encourage people to value independence, autonomy and individualism. It operates to support the capitalist ideal of acquiring personal and national wealth. People in western societies are influenced by a discourse which focuses on individual financial development. What this discourse does not acknowledge, however, is the destructive effects of individualist ideals on society, such as people’s isolation and estrangement from themselves and their communities. These people define their individuality. They live in houses with high walls to protect property and material goods that they have accumulated. This isolates and alienates them.

The words from the excerpt above, “Not once did they ever ask for feedback, but I think even if one did venture to give feedback it would have been taken up in a negative way or you would have been victimised”, reveal a discourse which operates to maintain trainers as active, and therefore, more powerful, in the training process, and trainees as
more passive recipients of the trainers’ skills. The interviewee reveals an alternative view to this discourse when she says, “but I think even if one did venture to give feedback”. These words reveal that she is defending herself in anticipation of the discursive argument that trainees are able to be more active in their interactions with trainers. She maintains that even if she had challenged the traditional discourse of power relations in training, the trainers would either have put her back in her place, namely, in a subjugated position, or they would have asked her to leave the training.

“It [the feedback] would have been taken up in a negative way”, suggests the perception that trainers defend their position and are not open to changing the way things are done in the training. The perception is that trainers will “victimise” trainees in order to maintain their position. The interviewee then attempts to establish legitimacy and substantiate her claim by calling on personal experience and other trainees’ reports: “and I personally saw that happen with one of the students and I heard of previous experiences where students have tried to give feedback and it’s been, it’s impacted negatively on their training, so either their training was extended or life was made unbearably difficult now”.

The implicit discourse of training that positions trainers in a position of power and trainees in a position of powerlessness can be further examined in the following example from one of the interviews:

but the way in which the trainers almost disrespected you as a person and only saw you as a student, who’s going to imagine that they are these psychological gods, you know.

This reveals the discourse that positions trainees as “less of” a person, not worthy of respect, because of their position in training. The word “only” implies that being a
student is “less than” being a trainer. The use of the phrase “psychological gods” reveals the perception that trainers see themselves as very high up on the hierarchy of human interaction, and that they think of themselves as worthy of some kind of worship. This trainee also subverts this discourse of hierarchy, by using the words “only” and “psychological gods” in an ironic manner.

The next extract also reveals this discourse of hierarchy in training, with trainers as powerful and trainees as powerless:

particularly our first year of practical placement was not about, how can we as trainers empower our students. It was more, “this is what, this is our mission in life. These are our needs. We have a need to fulfil.” And we were pawns in that.

The above example shows the perception that trainers have their own agendas and wish to serve their own purposes in training. This supports the societal discourse of trainers as in control and powerful. The use of the word “pawns” suggests that the training is seen as a kind of game, with strategies that are used by players to win. Trainees are seen as pawns. Pawns are the pieces which are controlled by the other pieces (in this case, the trainers) in the game. Pawns are used for the good of, say, the king and queen, who are the most important pieces in the game.

The following example reveals the feelings of powerlessness on the part of trainees, and shows that they have a part to play in their own powerlessness:
But it was part of my rebelling against the trainers at that stage and I realise quite strongly now how I let my life be dictated by the training, by the trainers and I mean, as a way of not trying to compromise myself.

The words “I let my life be dictated by the training” implies that the training process has control over the trainees, but that they also somehow allow this control. Trainees actively adopt their subjugated position, as well as being forced into it by others.

The following extract is another example of how trainees play a part in their own powerlessness:

The disempowerment I think is a combination of both the system there, as well as my personal issues with authority. And I think very often I lost my voice out of choice, not because I was forced to lose my voice, but I didn’t say what I wanted to say for a fear of persecution, like I will be thrown off the course …. And for me constantly the implication was, am I going to be thrown off this course if I speak out too much.

The above extract reveals how trainees may adopt a position of powerlessness in training, and how this maintains the status quo. This status quo is informed by a larger societal discourse which positions trainees in a less powerful position than trainers. Trainees are afraid to challenge this status quo because of the repercussions that may occur, namely, being “thrown off this course”.

An extract from another interview also continues to reveal the discourse that positions trainers as powerful and trainees as powerless:
I felt I was forced to speak about personal things and personal issues and it wasn’t treated sacredly. And that disempowered me …. I felt that if I focused more on certain aspects of myself, if you are more emotional and falling apart and out of control, that is qualities that is respected, but boy, if you show strongness and control and individuality and creativity in your own way, not in the way that they define it, it’s not good.

The extract above reflects the discourse that positions trainees as dependent and psychically fragmented: “if you are more emotional and falling apart and out of control, that is qualities that is respected”. Trainees are seen as not being treated with respect: “I felt I was forced to speak about personal things and personal issues and it wasn’t treated sacredly.” Trainers are regarded as in a position of power, where they are able to define the context of training. The word “forced” suggests that trainees are placed in a position where they give over control of their lives to trainers. Trainees must conform to what is expected of them in training.

This idea of trainees having to conform introduces the second theme, which supports the implicit discourse of hierarchy and power relations in training.

Theme 2: trainees as having to fit in and conform. A second theme, namely, “trainees having to fit in and conform”, can also be identified as reflecting an implicit discourse of hierarchy and power relations in training. This theme has already emerged in some forms in the analysis of the first theme.

The extract below is an example of this theme of trainees having to fit in and conform:
having to adjust to his way of thinking in that setting and then at [clinic] having to adjust to a different supervisor and his framework. And then of course we were at [clinic] …. Having to fit into that context…. Trying to fit in all of that. So it was a lot of diversity in terms of course content, in terms of what was expected of us, in terms of different settings and having to adjust to that …. So it was a constant case of trying to fit into the training, trying to adjust to what was required of me, in, with each supervisor, in relationship to them, in relationship to the course content.

The extract above reveals an implicit discourse which operates to position trainees as having to adjust, compromise and negotiate themselves around their supervisors and trainers. Trainers are seen to “expect” and “require” certain behaviours from trainees, and trainees must adhere to these expectations and requirements.

The next example continues this theme of trainees having to fit in and conform in the training context. Trainers are positioned as having a framework for training and therapy, and trainees are expected to adopt these frameworks. Trainees are seen, by this interviewee, as required to conform to a norm in training, whereby they become quite similar to each other. They adopt the same “language” and do not develop individual styles of therapy. This reflects the societal discourse which creates a context (namely, training institutions) where trainees are “professionalised” into their profession. They are taught to think and behave in certain ways. This operates to protect the cohesion and identity of the psychological fraternity in society.

Supervisors very often, especially the more experienced ones, came in with their very strong beliefs about what therapy meant and how it should be
done. I felt that it was almost imposed on us. Where there wasn’t enough room for us to explore, what it meant for us and feel confident enough to discuss it, and there was never space made to discuss that as well ….. There wasn’t enough room given to explore those areas. To grow in those areas and I think very often we all came up sounding of, especially my group, speaking the same language, not much individual differences. Because that was something that was constantly thwarted in the training. We were always, almost encouraged to conform to a certain way of speaking, a certain way of relating, a certain way of expressing ourselves.

The repetition of the phrase, “a certain way of”, emphasises the conformity and monotony of ways of thinking and behaving in training for trainees. In the above extract this discourse of trainees having to conform is subverted. It comments on the process of conforming, and suggests that it could be different, that trainees could be encouraged to develop their own style of therapy.

The following extract also reveals the theme of trainees being expected to fit in to the framework of training, as constructed by the trainers:

And I felt all the time that whenever I said what I felt and what really came from my heart and what I was really experiencing, I really got into trouble in the sense that it was devalued. It wasn’t, I felt that my experiences wasn’t good enough for what they wanted. They wanted sometimes a specific way of you going through the training and if you don’t follow those particular steps and that particular process then it’s not good enough. And the biggest
thing was when I tried to voice myself it was always criticised or silenced in some way.

This trainee felt she could not be real and spontaneous in her opinions and behaviours in training. She reports that her individual experience was “devalued”, put down by the trainers. She thought she was expected to be a certain way in training, and that the trainers imposed certain expectations on the trainees. This reflects a discourse of hierarchy, with trainers “coming down” on trainees, restricting and limiting them.

*Theme 3: trainers as parents, trainees as children.* Another theme that emerged was that of “trainers as parents and trainees as children”. This theme can be seen as comprising complementary constructions which show an implicit discourse of hierarchy and power relations operating in training. In society, parents are inherently more powerful than children as they have control over their children’s lives. The following extract illustrates this theme:

Then the other thing which the trainers gave the message to us, again it comes to the power and control thing, where they very often had this patriarchal approach to training, it was male dominated, we had just one female trainer throughout our training in the two years, and very often with the training the [trainer] took on a very paternal role. He took on the role of the father. That issue came on a very personal level in [the] group and it was explored and very often that was disempowering and abrasive because there was pressure to please “daddy”. And also “daddy” knows best, speaking metaphorically of course. Yes, very often I felt trainers did not consult with us …. The other trainers who are all males did not ever ask us, what is it
that you need out of this training. So there was never space to bring in your individual needs into the training. There was also never space to sort of do your own work first, like go and read up and then come and discuss what you’ve learned.

The use of the word “daddy” evokes an echo of a young child’s voice. This creates an impression of the trainee as small and dependent on her trainers. She is told that “daddy knows best”, which implies that she should ignore her own intuition as to what is best for her, and give this decision over to her trainer. This creates an impression of trainees as vulnerable and not in charge of their own lives, much the way that children are in our society. Children are less powerful than parents. Parents make decisions and children follow.

In addition, there is a theme of “men as powerful and women as powerless”. This theme is discussed in more detail in the next section. As all the trainers spoken about in the interviews were men, and all the trainees interviewed were women, trainers are positioned in this text as powerful and trainees are positioned as powerless.

Theme 4: Men as powerful, women as powerless. Another theme that emerged from an examination of implicit discourses of hierarchy and power relations in training was that of “men as powerful, women as powerless”. This theme has already emerged in some ways in the previous paragraphs, and is now explored in more detail:

It was almost as if strong women wasn’t allowed and was maybe a threat to the trainers. And that is when I started becoming, I felt like somebody that’s just complying and just trying to please and for me that wasn’t useful at all as a therapist, because I was starting to do things and the way I did things
wasn’t what I felt was in touch with who and what I was. I tried to be somebody else and I felt very uncomfortable in my therapies as well, around that, because I wasn’t allowed, or I experienced that I wasn’t allowed to develop my own style and my own way of thinking and it had to fit into this certain context.

The words: “It was almost as if strong women wasn’t allowed and was maybe a threat to the trainers”, reveal this theme of men as powerful and women as powerless. This theme is informed by a broad societal discourse which puts men and women in these positions. The participant in this interview comments on her perception that a “strong” woman would challenge the status quo in the training and in society. This is seen as a “threat” to the trainers, maybe a threat to their position of power in the training. If “strong” women are perceived as a threat, by implication “weak” women are less of a threat, and are more acceptable in training and in society.

A reading of the above section of the text also reveals the theme that trainees have to fit in with, and conform to, the training context. This theme has been discussed previously in this chapter, but is returned to at this point. The above text reveals the discourse that positions training systems as being structured by trainers, not by trainees. Trainers decide on what will be included in the training process, and what will be excluded.

The following extract reveals, again, the theme of men as powerful and women as powerless:

So, ja, maybe if there was a woman I would have felt, maybe there would have been equal, a more equal distribution, because then the issues become
huge in terms of society’s relation, society’s definition of relation between men and women and all those things had an impact.

This section of text reveals the broader societal discourse of men as powerful and women as powerless. This discourse functions to keep women in a subjugated position and men in a dominant position in society in general, and in training specifically. As all the trainees in this group were women and the trainers were men, the subjugated position of women extends to the position of trainees in this instance, and the dominant position of men extends to the position of trainers.

An Alternative Discourse Which Comments on a Double Bind Experience

It is the hypothesis of this dissertation that a double bind situation occurs for trainees when explicit and implicit contexts of learning in psychotherapy are contradictory. The general characteristics of a double bind situation were mentioned in Chapter Three, and are outlined here again, with specific reference to trainees in training:

1. The trainee is involved in an intense relationship with his or her trainer. The trainee feels that it is vitally important to discriminate accurately what sort of message is being communicated by the trainer, so that he or she may respond appropriately.

2. The trainee is caught in the training situation in which the trainer in the supervisory relationship is expressing two orders (explicit and implicit) of message which are inconsistent with each other.

3. The trainee is unable to comment on the inconsistency between the messages that are being expressed by the trainers and he or she cannot leave the field. The trainee therefore becomes symptomatic.
The interviews were conducted to facilitate a situation in which trainees could comment on their double bind experience. This comment would be a different response to that of being symptomatic, and would hopefully be more beneficial to trainees by helping them regain a sense of personal power and personal agency.

An alternative discourse which comments on a double bind experience and inconsistency between explicit and implicit contexts of learning in training was identified in the texts of the transcribed interviews, as well as the effects (or symptoms) of this double bind situation. In this analysis, the symptom mentioned by trainees is a feeling of powerlessness.

The following extract from a transcribed interview reveals a comment on an inconsistency between what is said and what is done by trainers, and how this contributes to a double bind experience. This trainee received mixed, or double, messages about how to behave in the training context. “It was messages like, ‘you are co-creating this course, you are co-creating your experiences, but boy, if you don’t create it in the way I want it, then you are in big trouble’. ” The trainee explains that she became symptomatic (powerless) as a response to her experience of this double bind:

Especially in the beginning I felt very powerless because I felt like I was in a double bind. It was double messages all the time. It was messages like, “you are co-creating this course, you are co-creating your experiences, but boy, if you don’t create it in the way I want it, then you are in big trouble”…. That you get all the time, that you say that ja, we are all together and we are all equal, but we are not all equal. And if that can only be voiced and say that, “you are the student, I am the lecturer”, then you know where
you stand, but it was very difficult to say, “we are all equal in all of this and we co-create this”, but if you try to give your input it’s devalued.

The use of “boy” in this above text emphasises the reported words of the trainers and the inconsistency between what is being presented theoretically and what the trainers actually practice with trainees (the mixed messages).

The next interviewee shares her experience of perceived inconsistency between what trainers profess (the systems theory idea of positive and negative feedback), and what they practice. She also mentions the effects of this inconsistency on her, namely a feeling of powerlessness:

I feel, the first part of your question, how was I disempowered? Gee whiz! That used to happen very regularly… at the end of our training we asked our trainers, wouldn’t you like some feedback from us? They didn’t want to hear any feedback. So I’m glad that there is some effort being made by people like you to force-feed them with feedback, you know. I mean, it’s so hypocritical to have a systems theory perspective where you have negative feedback and positive feedback but the trainers don’t actually practise it.

The above also supports the societal discourse that operates to maintain the position of trainers as in control, powerful and not needing feedback from trainees on how to adjust their training programme.

The following extract again reveals a discourse that comments on a dissonance between what is explicitly presented as a model of training, and what is implicitly experienced by the trainees:
My idea of ecosystemic training is a systemic approach which includes all other approaches. I didn’t experience that in my training. So it was more kind of, that’s the concept, the idea is that ecosystemic includes other systems. It is all encompassing, it’s the inter-relationship between systems. It’s the organicity of how systems fit together and grow together, yet there was only one system and in my, from my perspective, it was called social constructionism, and in therapy it often played out as either cognitive behavioural therapy or psychoanalysis. Not in that language, but in the process, but it was never called that and it seems like that the trainers, maybe, had a bit of a fear of calling things by their names so they would use approaches and processes from different schools of thought, but never call it that. They would call it that they are social constructionist or ecosystemic therapists.

This reveals that there was a discrepancy between the expectations of this trainee, “my idea of ecosystemic training” and the experience of training, “I didn’t experience that in my training”. There is also an inconsistency between the theory or “concept” of therapy, “social constructionism”, and what happens in the practice of therapy (“and in therapy it often played out as either cognitive behavioural therapy or psychoanalysis”). There is a comment on the inconsistency between the language, or theory, of training and the process of training: “not in that language, but in the process, but it was never called that.” This reveals an inconsistency between explicit and implicit contexts of training.
Conclusion

The analysis of extracts from the interviews, in terms of the underlying discourses which inform them, reveals an implicit discourse of training based on hierarchy and power relations in the text of many of the interviews. An alternative discourse to training also emerged from the analysis, which serves as a comment on the inconsistency between the explicit and implicit contexts of learning in the training system. According to Bateson’s criteria (cited in Becvar & Becvar, 2000) for a double bind experience, this inconsistency contributes to a double bind situation for trainees. An explicit social constructionist and ecosystemic discourse is assumed to also operate in the text, as this is the explicit model of training presented at Unisa. This discourse, however, is not dealt with in the analysis, as it is not part of the focus for this study.

The above extracts from the transcribed texts have been examined individually according to the steps of the analysis outlined at the beginning of this chapter. By way of a summary, Steps 6 and 7 are now followed in a general analysis of the texts.

According to Step 6, it could be said that there are functions that are being fulfilled by saying things in a particular way in the text. One function is to reveal an implicit discourse of hierarchy and power relations in the training. Another is to reveal an implicit discourse of inconsistency between explicit and implicit contexts of training, which contributes to a double bind experience. The way things are said in the interviews also functions as a comment on these two discourses. This comment functions to subvert these discourses, which allows the trainees who are commenting to have more power in the supervisory relationship.
According to the question, “What effects are achieved?” (Oosthuizen, 2002, p. 75), in Step 6, the discourses of hierarchy and double bind have the effect of maintaining trainers in a position of power and trainees in a position of powerlessness. These discourses also have the effect of maintaining the status quo in the training system, the university, the psychological fraternity and society at large. The trainees’ comments on these discourses perhaps have the effect of facilitating a more equal relationship, in terms of power, between trainer and trainees. They also perhaps have the effect of facilitating a sense of personal power and personal agency for trainees in their professional and personal lives.

According to Step 7 of the analysis, the institutions that are supported by implicit discourses of hierarchy and double bind are those of the training system, the university, the psychological fraternity and society in general. These institutions gain, in terms of power relations, when these hierarchical structures between trainers and trainees are kept in place. In some ways, trainees also gain from the maintenance of this hierarchy, as they are trained as psychotherapists and obtain the position of therapists in society. However, trainees often lose in terms of power relations when this hierarchical structure is in place, as they do not have a sense of personal power and agency during the training.

The institutions of the training system, the university, the psychological fraternity and society in general, are subverted when a comment is made by trainees on the discourses of hierarchy and double bind. The training system loses power, because these discourses are being made explicit, and something can then be done to adjust the positions of trainers and trainees in terms of power relations. When an alternative
discourse which comments on these two discourses emerges, the trainees gain power in
terms of relations with their trainers and in terms of their individual concept of self.

The next chapter explores whether the findings from the analysis in this chapter
are in any ways similar to the initial hypotheses of this dissertation, and whether the
findings from the analysis are similar to the findings in the literature review of Chapter
Three.