

A close-up photograph of two hands touching. The hand on the left is dark-skinned, and the hand on the right is light-skinned. The hands are positioned as if they are about to shake or are in a firm grip. The background is dark and out of focus.

FAULT A PRIMER ON RACE, SCIENCE AND SOCIETY LINES

EDITORS

JONATHAN JANSEN

& CYRILL WALTERS

Problematifying Race and Gender in Everyday Research Processes

A model of feminist research praxis

Amanda Gouws

Introduction

When researchers do research with human subjects, there is the hope that their findings will be taken up by, for example, government, to formulate policies; the public, for a better understanding of social, political or economic processes; or pharmaceutical companies, for new treatments. The hope is that, in the long run, everyone would benefit from the findings. But seldom is there a reflection on exactly what it means to the individuals and communities that were used as research subject-participants. More often than not, the thinking is that as long as the subject-participants were treated in an ethical way, they had played their role. Rarely is there any report back of the findings to the subject-participants.

When our the subject-participants become aware of the findings of our research and what it means for them, we as the researchers become aware of the impact of our research. This is not the type of impact for the collective good, but the type of impact that positions the subject-participants in a certain way, especially when the findings are used to generalise about entire communities.

In a country that has only recently emerged from a deeply racialised past, in which racial categories were imposed on its citizens and where “scientific research” was used to justify the racial categorisation of apartheid and exclusions based on race, researchers need to exercise caution when drawing inferences based on racial

categories. In South Africa, race is often a useful explanatory variable to understand exclusions and marginalisation, but context is everything. When race as a variable is used in an essentialist way (i.e. one that assumes certain unchanging characteristics of groups and ignores how identities are socially constructed) to argue that it is the cause of perceptions and behaviour, the findings “freeze” people in their racial identities, and cause researchers to lose sight of how the treatment of racial groups through processes of colonialisation, oppression and marginalisation have positioned them to have certain attitudes or exhibit certain behaviours.

When the controversy around the Sport Science article started on social media, it was to have serious repercussion for the researchers, the research community at Stellenbosch University, the women and communities from which the subject-participants were drawn and South Africa as a whole. At the centre of the controversy sits race and gender. In a sense, social media is a great information equaliser that can expose those who use it to research that they would not otherwise know about. It was the wrath of women from communities like the one from which the subject-participants were selected that made many a complacent researcher sit up and take note.

A gender perspective

When I read the article as a feminist scholar, the problem became apparent very quickly – both from a gender and race perspective and from the intersectionalities¹ of race, gender and class. When science is done using a positivist approach (i.e. with the idea that there is a direct relationship between the empirical world and our understanding of it through scientific methods, usually producing quantifiable findings) research subject-participants are viewed as objects whose only purpose is to provide information. There is a distance between the researchers and the subject-participants in a hierarchical power relationship. In the case of the Sport Science article, the researchers’ lack of reflexivity² about this power relationship and the way the findings were directly linked to gender and race categories were two of the major causes that triggered the controversy. These problems, combined with an inappropriate sampling technique (one cannot generalise from a “snowball sample” that produces participants who are more alike than different); broad generalisations not embedded in the findings; and using a scale developed for the global North that may not necessarily be applicable to South Africa, deepened the palpable distress of “coloured”³ women colleagues at the University in the days following the publication of the article. They experienced a deep psychological injury.

The findings of “low cognitive functioning” amongst “coloured” women caused these colleagues to feel tainted by association. There was a need to reflect on the many

dimensions of this problematic research: unintended racism and sexism; research that once more connected Stellenbosch University with its apartheid past; bad science versus good science; and how to think about research when the intersectionality of identities (such as gender, race and class) forces us to understand the complexities of the lives of our subject-participants. However, the publication of the Sport Science article should be taken as a “teachable moment”, rather than as an opportunity to condemn the authors of the article.

Below I will elaborate on the usefulness of a feminist research praxis model that allows us to do research that is not distant and removed from subject-participants, but rather relies on engaging with their lived experience. I will start by discussing why the findings of the Sport Science article can be considered racist – something that was not apparent to the authors of the article or to the peer reviewers, editor and publisher of the journal. In other words, the controversy that followed the publication exposed the unintended racist and sexist consequences of bad epistemological and methodological choices. I will then discuss the lessons feminist research praxis holds for research projects.

In this chapter, key concepts will be highlighted to emphasise their importance and to clarify their meaning for prospective researchers

Issues of race hiding in plain sight

Already in 1984, Chandra Mohanty, in her seminal article “Under Western Eyes”,⁴ wrote about the way in which Western (read white) scholars treat women of the Third World⁵ (read women who are not white) as research subject-participants. She argues that there are assumptions of “privilege and ethnocentric universality on the one hand, and inadequate self-consciousness about the effects of Western scholarship” on the other.⁶ What this universality (i.e. applying to all people in the same way) refers to is a Western (white) understanding of reality through which difference with research subject-participants is conceived of as without history and as never changing. The complexities of the lives of women who are considered “Third World” are ignored and not reflected upon.

Mohanty calls this a blindness to history and reductionist – when women of colour are used as a category of analysis without an attempt to understand how context and history influence their attitudes and behaviour. Women are defined primarily in their object status – as objects of institutions and systems of oppression – such as victims of male violence or Islamic beliefs; or as universal dependents or members of tribal kinship groups; or as always in need of development interventions,⁷ etc.⁸ Through this discourse of women as victims lacking decision-making power (agency), the

complex relationships between their histories, specific oppressions and political choices, and how they are being represented in research narratives, are ignored.⁹

Feminist theorist Linda Alcoff writes about two approaches to race and racial thinking – what she calls an objectivist and subjectivist approach. The objectivist approach is a positivist way of doing research that incorporates facts, statistical categories about race and how social relations are organised around race. This approach ignores the “everydayness” of racial experiences that does not take into consideration the microinteractions in which racialisation occurs. A subjectivist approach, on the other hand, starts with the lived experience of racialisation and shows how race constitutes bodily experience, subjectivity and judgements. Race is the fundamental element of everyday embodied experience, psychic life and social interaction.¹⁰ This means the common-sense, everyday experiences and practices that do not rely on self-reflection. Common sense refers to that which is taken to be “obviously true” and about which consensus exists. As Alcoff argues, “Racial knowledge exists at the site of common sense.”¹¹ The sources of racialisation are embedded in the microprocesses of subjective existence.

This is what Philomena Essed calls “everyday racisms”.¹² According to Essed, many people have a common-sense understanding of what racism is. They associate racism with extreme types of behaviour, such as the behaviour of white supremacists, but they are far less able to identify the more complex, hidden forms of exclusion. As she puts it, “Common-sense notions reject racism explicitly, while implicitly they reproduce the notions that deny, and therefore help sustain, the inequalities of the racial-ethnic structure.”¹³ White researchers often have an uninterrogated common sense of black lives that they rarely reflect upon.

To understand exactly how invisible racism can be in the South African context, read Eusebius McKaiser’s *A Bantu in my Bathroom*¹⁴ and *Run Racist Run*.¹⁵

In their book *Race Trouble*,¹⁶ Durrheim, Mtose and Brown attempt to understand why race is present and absent at the same time in our interpretations of the world in South Africa. As they put it, “Because of the ambiguous presence and absence of race, it is difficult to separate fact from fiction in interpreting any situation.”¹⁷ This refers to how we are influenced by our subconscious understandings of race, which also inevitably enter research processes.

Very often, race is thought of in concrete and reductionist ways – as the actual reality of things – but racism also is the product of a way of life. People (including researchers) behave as racialised beings and treat others as racialised beings, with actions and discourses that are embodied and regulated through cultural norms and

social conventions.¹⁸ This recreates our understanding of race as a lived experience that is very often informed by stereotypes or prejudices.

From this discussion, it should be clear that we do not check our values, perspectives and common-sense understandings about “others” at the door before we start our research processes and fieldwork. On the contrary, our perspectives deeply influence our own understanding of the world, the type of hypotheses we formulate and our expectations about our research findings. Positivist research practices make us believe that objectivity is enhanced through distance from, and a lack of involvement with, our subject-participants. This is called “value-free” research. As a consequence, we are blinded to the influence of our views and values on the research process.

When we start our research from the position of feminist research epistemology, there will be an awareness of our values and the need to reflect on our own actions, as well as the need to involve ourselves with our subject-participants and to understand the research process as it unfolds.

The feminist research process

Power and research

Like any other human endeavour, doing research is embedded in power relations. Researchers most often have more power than the subject-participants, whether because of their knowledge of a topic or of the agendas determined by funders. There may also be race and class differences between researchers and subject-participants. And researchers have the power to interpret their data according to their ideological beliefs, which may not be the same as that of the subject-participants. Power relations are therefore multiple and can enter the research process at any given point.

In the case of the Sport Science article, the authors were more educated than their subject-participants, and had a different class position and racial identity. Their positionality (how they are positioned in relation to their subject-participants) put them in a relationship of power over their subject-participants. Reflexivity in this case would have entailed thinking about how to mediate these power differences. It would also have required an appreciation of the lived realities of these women, of, for example, how they have to use their cognitive abilities to come up with innovative ideas for feeding their families and keeping them safe.

The role of these power relations in establishing “truth” is what Michel Foucault referred to as “regimes of truth”; in other words, we establish what we consider to be true through scientific processes. According to Foucault, regimes of truth are the result of scientific discourses and institutions and are reinforced through the education system and the media. As he states in *Power/Knowledge*,¹⁹ truth is not

outside of power, and what we believe is true is generated through certain processes that we use to distinguish between true and false statements. There are techniques and procedures that are accorded value in generating truth.²⁰ Through the discourses we use when we do research, and the rules we use to test hypotheses and interpret data, we establish some type of truth; this we call our research findings. This “truth” then becomes the accepted knowledge about our research subject-participants.

The process of knowledge creation in which we engage through research is never value neutral and often highly politicised. Feminist research has at its core the desire to produce a more just world. So, it is not only doing research for the sake of research, but to utilise the outcomes of the research for some intervention, with a deep understanding that knowledge is constructed from where the researcher is situated. In this regard, we also have to think about issues of representation, in other words, of how we represent the voices of our subject-participants. It should never be through speaking about them, but rather speaking for them, in nuanced ways that capture their own voices. Feminist researchers usually give something back to the communities they work in – such as discussing the findings with subject-participants and indicating how the research will be used to the benefit of their communities.²¹ When we talk about the subjects of our research, we prefer to use the concept of subject-participant, in order not to objectify our respondents and to acknowledge that they help to co-construct knowledge.

Research subject-participant

Subject-participants of research can be individuals, groups, or organisations. They may be interviewed or observed in a participant observation. In sociopolitical research, it is problematic to call them “research subjects”, because that language treats them as immutable objects in a way that is logically inconsistent with the study of social and political phenomena. The phrase “research subject” disassociates people from the sociopolitics that are the dynamic context of their lives and were so before they became the subject of social and political science. We trouble that language by referring to those who provide and generate data in our research as “subject-participants”. By informing our work, they are participants in the research process, helping us to define the question, to create the data and to analyse that data.²²

Feminist ethics

Feminists are always deeply aware of power relations and how they influence the research process, and they are also cognisant of how politics play a role. Research that stems from feminist theories relies on self-reflexivity as a praxis (a way of doing things) that will commit researchers to think about absences, silences, differences and oppression,²³ as well as the power of epistemology (who is viewed as a knower, and whose knowledge is regarded as valid).²⁴

Feminist-informed research

Research that is feminist-informed takes as its point of departure feminist-normative concerns combined with knowledge of the diverse and complex theoretical interplays at work in any social science research project. Feminist-informed research, consequently, is self-reflexive, critical, political, and versed in multiple theoretical frameworks, in order to enable the researcher to “see” those people and processes lost in gaps silences, margins, and peripheries.²⁵

One of the most important aspects of feminist research is a praxis that means we should be self-reflexive about our research. In order to do that, we have to put ourselves, as Harding calls it, “on the same critical plane as the overt subject matter”,²⁶ in other words, put ourselves in their shoes, thereby reflecting on our own positionality as researchers. This means that our own class, race, culture and gender assumptions, biases and beliefs must be placed in the context of the research, so that we reflect on how we influence the research. When, for example, a white woman professor conducts research, she needs to reflect on the privileges that her position as a professor, as well as her race, class and education, bestow on her, and how these privileges forge relationships of power. This we call our understanding of subjectivity.

Feminist epistemology

Epistemology is a theory of knowledge that is concerned with who can be “knowers”, and what tests beliefs must pass in order to count as legitimate knowledge.

Epistemology

An epistemology refers to one’s theory of knowledge; it is the system of rules, conditions and beliefs that one uses to tell the difference between “knowledge” and “opinion,” between fact and belief. A feminist epistemology includes the belief that knowledge (truth) is produced, not simply found, and that the conditions of its production should be studied, critiqued if necessary, and certainly made explicit and exposed.²⁷ It also includes the notion that women are “knowers” (positivist science have systematically excluded women as knowers) – that women have and can produce knowledge and insight into what kinds of things can be known.²⁸

Harding²⁹ distinguishes a context of discovery and a context of justification. Both contexts inform the research process. From a feminist epistemological perspective, the context of discovery is very important because this is where relevant questions are formulated; the context of justification is where we use methodology to test our hypotheses. The context of discovery follows the “logic of discovery”. Androcentric (male-centred) science asks questions about the world in a gender-blind way that leaves women excluded. The context of discovery is therefore also about the questions that are not asked or that should be asked.³⁰ In androcentric science, interpretations about women are often added “after the fact”, after the research has been concluded

(the notion is to “add women and stir”), and very often findings have to be distorted to fit women in. For feminists, the questions that we ask therefore have to illuminate the lived experience of women and have to be included from the start.

Methodology is the theory and planning of how research should proceed. It is linked to the theory of knowledge (epistemology) used for the research project. It is a shorthand term for a theoretical or practical idea to be explored through a set of tools (the methods) that will specify what is to be investigated; what is appropriate and sufficient evidence, and how it should be produced; and what counts as good arguments about the evidence.³¹ A feminist methodology will commit us to reflect on the relationships involved in the research; on how to separate facts from beliefs; the purpose of the research; research design; and our ethical responsibilities to the subject-participants. Indeed, reflection occurs throughout the research process.³²

Method is a technique or a way of gathering evidence. The following techniques can be used: listening to informants (interviews), observing behaviour, and examining historical trends and records.³³ One can also use quantitative surveys or discourse analysis. Any method that has been used by androcentric science can be used by feminists. There is no method that is inherently feminist, but qualitative, open-ended, face-to-face interviews are preferable, because they open spaces to talk about respondents’ subjective understanding of their own lived experiences. Keeping journals is also a preferred method for feminist scholars.

Methodology

Generally, “methodology” is understood as a particular set of methods or way of doing research. However, a feminist methodology is not a series of particular methods or guidelines for research, like a protocol, but a commitment to using a whole constellation of methods reflexively and critically, with the goal being the production of data that serve feminist aims of social justice. Thus, a feminist methodology is a way of using and reflecting on methods, and not a particular set of methods or a particular research design. Rigorous feminist methodologies lead to decisions being made during the research process. This view of methodology helps us reexamine the basics of the research process in the social sciences.³⁴

Feminist praxis/standpoint

As Ackerly and True state, a feminist research ethic can improve scholarship regardless of whether it is feminist research or not.³⁵ One of the ways that a feminist epistemology enhances research is through a feminist standpoint. This entails that feminist research should start from the lives of women (or women’s experience). (It can also start from the lives of marginalised groups, for researchers not working on women’s lives.) Harding gives seven reasons why starting from the lives of

women is important for feminist research: (1) women's lives have been devalued and neglected as the starting point of scientific research; (2) women as valuable "strangers" to the social order – meaning that women's perspectives bring new insights that help with understanding; (3) women's oppression makes them less invested in ignorance; (4) knowledge emerges from struggles against the oppressors; (5) women's perspectives come from everyday activities – rather than the views of the dominant group (men); (6) women's closeness to care and caring objectives give a different perspective than that of men; and (7) women are the outsiders within that have perspectives on their own lives and the oppressive activities of the oppressors.³⁶

Feminist praxis

Feminists often use the language of "praxis" to refer to the practice of feminist scholarship that is informed by critical, feminist-normative and theoretical perspectives. Praxis is theory in action and action-oriented theory. Generally, we do not use the language of "praxis" to describe our methodology, because we don't think it is concrete enough in its prescriptions. Although critical self-reflection is not unique to critical feminism, the scope of these reflections sets most feminist contributions apart from the mainstream [malestream] social science disciplines of politics, international relations, sociology, and human geography, for example, and makes feminist inquiry an important partner in the more critical endeavours of those fields. A feminist research ethic (in the sense of a practice and a set of ethical commitments) guides the researcher through systematic reflection throughout the process, from research question to publication.³⁷

When researchers do research from a feminist standpoint perspective, it enhances what Harding calls "strong objectivity".³⁸ Harding calls "objectivism" (or positivist research) weak objectivity that gives only a partial and distorted explanation. By insisting on value-free, impartial and dispassionate research, it leads to the influence of values, perceptions and political interests being ignored, including racist and sexist assumptions. She argues that this type of blindness occurs because of the belief that only the context of justification matters, that is, the methods used for testing our hypotheses, rather than the context of discovery as well. This is the idea that "real science" is determined by methodological rules.³⁹ Objectivity is therefore defined in a very narrow way. As Harding points out about weak objectivity, "It produces claims that will be regarded as objectively valid without [the researchers] having to examine critically their own historical commitments, from which – intentionally or not – they actively construct their scientific research."⁴⁰

Strong objectivity, on the other hand, starts with women's lives and acknowledges values and interests that may influence the research. It also makes strange that which may be familiar – the views of dominant groups about women. It starts from the perspective of the lives of the "other" to show how gender (or class or race)

constructions distort the lives of women. When values are acknowledged (the values of the researcher, but also of the subject-participant) the outcome of the research is more objective (what we can call strong objectivity).⁴¹

Intersectionality

None of us only lives one identity at a time, such as race or gender; we live them all at the same time. This is what we call intersectionality of identities – for example, race, gender, sexuality and class. A person can be black, working class and lesbian – or white, middle class and heterosexual – all at the same time. But intersectionality also refers to interlocking relationships of dominance – between social, political, cultural and economic dynamics of power – that are multiple and occur simultaneously, as a consequence of how overlapping identities locate each individual in a matrix of domination.⁴²

It is therefore very difficult to make generalisations about women's experience. In South Africa, the racially defined categories, as well as class, sexuality and sexual orientation, locate women differently in different communities and very often determine their life chances and opportunities, depending on where they find themselves in the matrix of domination. Intersectionality determines women's lived experience.

Intersectionality

Intersectionality calls our attention to the fact that any situation, person, or research phenomenon can be understood only in terms of intersecting and overlapping contexts and social forces such as race, age, gender, sexuality, income, nationality, and historical moment, amongst many others. Consequently, attention to intersectionality provokes feminist inquiry to attend to the complexity of a problem that might serve to exclude or hide important dimensions that may be crucial to creating and/or sustaining a situation or problem.⁴³

Discussion

The retracted Sport Science article shows a lack of awareness by the authors of how they are positioned in relation to their subject-participants as well as a lack of reflexivity about the research process and findings. Rather than engaging with the lived experiences of their women subject-participants to see how conditions of poverty and social exclusion have shaped their lives, the authors used race as an explanatory variable to make broad generalisations (from a self-selected, snowball sample) to communities of coloured women.

The deep hurt about these generalisations was expressed by the Cape Flats Women's Movement in a response to the article: "We are the demographic of your study.

Life on the Cape Flats is brutal and the challenges we face are endless. We don't think you can even begin to imagine what kind of mental ability this takes. How do you think our children look at us now that a famous university has declared their mothers to be idiots."⁴⁴

As discussed above, the findings we generate to establish some type of truth become the accepted ideas about our subject-participants. The article created the understanding that coloured women, even when they are young, have low cognitive functioning and it reinforced the stereotypes of racist research that certain race groups have inferior abilities *because of* their race. In other words, the findings reproduce existing stereotypes and prejudices about coloured women. This is the damage done. Retracting the article cannot undo this damage.

Conclusion

In South Africa, research in the social sciences and humanities needs to contribute to the transformation of society, especially of the deeply felt legacies of a racial past. Universities will have to take the social sciences far more seriously. Neoliberal managements that focus on the marketability of skills ignore at their own peril the contribution of the social sciences to developing critical thinking and analytical skills in students. When articles like the one discussed here are published and then retracted, we need to ask how has the training of the authors failed them. And how has the neoliberal culture of "publish or perish" contributed to peer reviewers and editors not seeing the problems with the article?

For years, scholars in the social sciences and humanities have warned that they are being treated as less valuable because they are less marketable (this, of course, depends entirely on the definition of marketability – good social science surely has a different type of marketability). Good social science grapples with questions about what is good research, what the right research questions are, and how findings are used to transform our societies. The skills of critical thinking and analytical acuity that good social science teaching cultivates are invaluable in processes of social transformation, for which there is a deep need in South Africa.

In the twenty-first century, when politicians started talking about "fake news" and elevated lies to truth, there is no greater obligation on scholarly communities than to protect good social science research practices.

Endnotes

- 1 Intersectionality refers to the dynamic and shifting relationships between different identities, such as gender, race, class, sexuality, sexual orientation and disability. Black women in South Africa, for example, are differently positioned than white women because of relationships of power that may involve their class status or historical socioeconomic and political exclusions.
- 2 That is, reflecting on how our own positions in power relations and our values influence the research process.
- 3 The four categories used to divide South Africans under apartheid were white, black, coloured (mixed race) and Indian. The damage inflicted on people because of these imposed identity categories is part of the historical record of apartheid. Yet, the South African government continues to use these categories post-1994.
- 4 Chandra Talpade Mohanty, "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses", in *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, ed. Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo and Lourdes Torres (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991).
- 5 The term "Third World" is now viewed as derogatory; it has been replaced with 'developing countries'. At the time Mohanty wrote her article, the term "Third World" was still in use.
- 6 Mohanty, "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses", 53.
- 7 See, for example, Mary Daly, *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1979) on African female genital mutilation, Chinese foot binding and Indian suttee (i.e. burning wives alive on their husbands' funeral pyres), as some of the horrors that befall "Third World" women.
- 8 Mohanty, "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses", 57-66.
- 9 Ibid., 69.
- 10 Linda Alcoff, *Visible Identities: Race, Gender, and the Self* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 183, <https://doi.org/10.1093/0195137345.001.0001>
- 11 Ibid., 185.
- 12 Philomena Essed, *Diversity: Gender, Color, and Culture* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996).
- 13 Ibid., 12.
- 14 Eusebius McKaiser, *A Bantu in My Bathroom!: Debating Race, Sexuality and Other Uncomfortable South African Topics* (Johannesburg: Bookstorm, 2012).
- 15 Eusebius McKaiser, *Run Racist Run: Journeys into the Heart of Racism* (Johannesburg: Bookstorm, 2015).
- 16 Kevin Durrheim, Xoliswa Mtose and Lyndsay Brown, *Race Trouble: Race, Identity, and Inequality in Post-apartheid South Africa* (Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2011).
- 17 Ibid., 56.
- 18 Ibid., 82.
- 19 Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews And Other Writings, 1972-1977* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980).

- 20 Ibid., 131.
- 21 For a case study of feminist research that involved the communities of subject-participants in every stage of the research process, see Amanda Gouws and Mikki van Zyl, "Feminist Ethics of Care through a Southern Lens", in *Care in Context: Transnational Gender Perspectives*, ed. Vasu Reddy et al. (Cape Town: HSRC Press, 2014).
- 22 Brooke Ackerly and Jacqui True, *Doing Feminist Research in Political and Social Science* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 32, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-05442-5>
- 23 Ibid., 24.
- 24 Sandra Harding, *Feminism and Methodology: Social Science Issues* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), 3.
- 25 Ackerly and True, *Doing Feminist Research in Political and Social Science*, 22.
- 26 Harding, *Feminism and Methodology: Social Science Issues*, 9.
- 27 Ackerly and True, *Doing Feminist Research in Political and Social Science*, 27.
- 28 Harding, *Feminism and Methodology: Social Science Issues*, 3; See also Liz Stanley, *Feminist Praxis: Research, Theory and Epistemology in Feminist Sociology* (London: Routledge, 1990).
- 29 Harding, *Feminism and Methodology: Social Science Issues*.
- 30 Ibid., 7.
- 31 Ibid., 3.
- 32 Ackerly and True, *Doing Feminist Research in Political and Social Science*, 6.
- 33 Harding, *Feminism and Methodology: Social Science Issues*, 2.
- 34 Ackerly and True, *Doing Feminist Research in Political and Social Science*, 6.
- 35 Ibid., 21.
- 36 Sandra Harding, *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?: Thinking from Women's Lives* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), 121-33.
- 37 Ackerly and True, *Doing Feminist Research in Political and Social Science*, 7.
- 38 Harding, *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?: Thinking from Women's Lives*.
- 39 Ibid., 143-44.
- 40 Ibid., 147.
- 41 Ibid., 50.
- 42 Sirma Bilge, "Recent Feminist Outlooks on Intersectionality", *Diogenes* 57, no. 1 (2010): 58, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0392192110374245>
- 43 Ackerly and True, *Doing Feminist Research in Political and Social Science*, 30. See also Amanda Gouws, "Feminist Intersectionality and the Matrix of Domination in South Africa", *Agenda* 31, no. 1 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.2017.1338871>
- 44 Christa Kuljian, "Study Signals Enduring Racism in Science", *Mail & Guardian*, 10 May 2019, <https://bit.ly/37m1P0X>

Bibliography

- Ackerly, Brooke and Jacqui True. *Doing Feminist Research in Political and Social Science*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-05442-5>
- Alcoff, Linda. *Visible Identities: Race, Gender, and the Self*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. <https://doi.org/10.1093/0195137345.001.0001>
- Bilge, Sirma. "Recent Feminist Outlooks on Intersectionality". *Diogenes* 57, no. 1 (2010): 58-72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0392192110374245>
- Daly, Mary. *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1979.
- Durrheim, Kevin, Xoliswa Mtose and Lyndsay Brown. *Race Trouble: Race, Identity, and Inequality in Post-apartheid South Africa*. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2011.
- Essed, Philomena. *Diversity: Gender, Color, and Culture*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996.
- Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.
- Gouws, Amanda and Mikki van Zyl. "Feminist Ethics of Care through a Southern Lens". In *Care in Context: Transnational Gender Perspectives*, edited by Vasu Reddy, Stephan Meyer, Tamara Shefer and Thenjiwe Meyiwa, 99-124. Cape Town: HSRC Press, 2014.
- Gouws, Amanda. "Feminist Intersectionality and the Matrix of Domination in South Africa". *Agenda* 31, no. 1 (2017): 19-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.2017.1338871>
- Harding, Sandra. *Feminism and Methodology: Social Science Issues*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.
- Harding, Sandra. *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?: Thinking from Women's Lives*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Kuljian, Christa. "Study Signals Enduring Racism in Science". *Mail & Guardian*, 10 May 2019. <https://bit.ly/37m1POX>
- McKaiser, Eusebius. *A Bantu in My Bathroom!: Debating Race, Sexuality and Other Uncomfortable South African Topics*. Johannesburg: Bookstorm, 2012.
- McKaiser, Eusebius. *Run Racist Run: Journeys into the Heart of Racism*. Johannesburg: Bookstorm, 2015.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses". In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, edited by Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo and Lourdes Torres, 51-80. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.
- Stanley, Liz. *Feminist Praxis: Research, Theory and Epistemology in Feminist Sociology*. London: Routledge, 1990.