

https://dspace.org/

A qualitative investigation of South African male child sex abuse victims' trauma narratives

Heylen, Chloé

2019

https://hdl.handle.net/10539/29493

Heylen, Chloe (2019) A qualitative investigation of South African male child sex abuse victims' trauma narratives, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, <http://hdl.handle.net/10539/29493>

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

A Qualitative Investigation of South African Male Child Sex Abuse Victims' Trauma Narratives

By: Chloé Heylen

705553

Supervised by: Dr Sherianne Kramer

University of the Witwatersrand

This research report is submitted to the Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in partial fulfilment of the degree of Masters of Arts in Research Psychology.

For Bentley

Thank you for changing my life and the lives of our family. Thank you for saving my life.

This thesis would not have happened without you.

"You is kind. You is smart. You is important." – The Help

Declaration

I, Chloé Heylen, know and accept that plagiarism (i.e.: to use another's work and present it as one's own) is wrong. Consequently, I declare that this research report is my own, unaided work.

Signed:

Date: 10 June 2019

Abstract

Male Child Sex Abuse (MCSA) within South Africa is an underexplored area that warrants further investigation. Given the large amount of emphasis on female rather than male trauma narratives in sex abuse events, MCSA and its traumatic outcomes are often silenced in the public, psychological and academic domains. As a result of gendered constructions relating to sex abuse, the majority of MCSA victims fail to report their abuse and this results in low disclosure rates and consequently failure to seek treatment. This research analyses the discourse produced within trauma narratives of adult males who identify as Child Sex Abuse (CSA) victims. More particularly, this study aims to identify the influences of gender, trauma and sex abuse discourse on the construction of these narratives. This was achieved by drawing on semi-structured one-on-one interviews with seven participants, currently living in South Africa, who identified as adult male victims of CSA. Thereafter the transcripts were analysed using a Faircloughian (1989-1995) informed Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) which allowed for the rigorous examination of how participants drew on childhood, gender and trauma discourses in order to validate their belonging to the category of male victimhood. Key findings revealed that trauma narratives are largely influenced by societal expectations of how trauma *should* manifest within victims of abuse. Further to this, participants revealed their own disbeliefs concerning the reality of male victimhood which is indicative of the influence of gendered constructions of masculinity within South Africa. By exploring the constructions of gender, trauma and sex abuse that emerge in narratives of childhood sex abuse and the ways that masculinity in South Africa influences this emergence, this study contributes to the growing literature in the CSA discipline and, in turn, to intervention possibilities for male victims of CSA.

Keywords: Male child sex abuse; sex abuse; critical discourse analysis; gender; trauma; South Africa

Acknowledgments

A special thank you to Dr Sherianne Kramer for your continuous help and answering of my many questions. Thank you for taking the time out to teach me, I appreciate it so much.

Thank you to the University of the Witwatersrand for the Postgraduate Merit Scholarship which encouraged this research. Thank you to the National Research Foundation (NRF) and the Thuthuka Fund for the contribution to this research and for making this Master's degree possible. Thank you to every one of the participants who contributed to this study, you have made this possible and you have enabled this research to have the potential to help many children in the future.

This thesis and Masters degree would never have occurred without the support of my dearest Meema and Peepa. Thank-you for everything that you have done for me and for supporting me through this journey. Thank-you for all the food and love and support through such a difficult time especially for the encouragement. Thank you Meem for making sure I ate and for all the love, thank you Peep for the continuous F1 updates and for wanting me to be happy. Thank you for supporting my educational pursuits always and for never letting me go without anything when it came to wanting to further my academics. I love you both.

Thank-you to my special Nan for being incredible and for all of the phone calls of support. I love you for your prayers and faith in me and the Lord above. And, of course, where would I be without my brother and friend Ryan - thank you for going beyond the call of duty as a friend to be there when I needed you and for always being able to cheer me up – this would never have happened without your encouragement.

Thank you to Yvette and Clo ‘95 for being the most incredible friends. I appreciate you both so much. Thank you so much Dave for all your time and effort reading through all my work. It is so appreciated.

To Jason Nigel Brown. Thank you for being such an incredible person and for encouraging this thesis. You have inspired me with your kindness and care for all who come across your path. You may be a mathematician in thought and logic but at heart you are the true humanitarian. I love you.

To Hudson Heylen, you have filled a void in our lives and been such a joy. Thank you for showing us all what forgiveness and love are all about.

Lastly, to Bentley-Boo who sat and helped me through this time and was such an incredible comforter, may you rest in the house of the Lord forever knowing that you were a good and faithful servant.

Table of Contents

1.1 Introduction 1

1.2 Rationale 3

1.3 Research Aims 5

1.4 Structure and Outline of the Research Report 5

Chapter 2: Literature Review 8

2.1 Sex Abuse 8

2.2 Gender and Sex Abuse 10

2.2.1 Sex Abuse and Male Victims 12

2.3 Sex Abuse and Childhood 16

2.4 Sex Abuse and Psychological Discourse 18

Chapter 3: Methodology 24

3.1 Research Design 24

3.2 Participants and Sampling Strategy 25

3.3 Data Collection 26

3.4 Data Analysis 28

3.5 Self-Reflexivity 30

3.6 Ethical Considerations 32

Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion 35

4.1 Victim Profiles 36

4.2 Resisting Victimhood 39

4.2.1 Victim Discourse 40
4.2.2 Guilt, Blame and Shame 42
4.3 Incitement to Discourses of Damage 45
4.3.1 Access to Psychological Support 46
4.3.2 Psychological Language 47
4.3.3 Post-Hoc Constructions of Trauma 48
4.4 Reclaiming Masculinity 50
4.4.1 Survivor Discourse 50
4.4.2 Substance Abuse 54
4.4.3 Sexual Behaviours and Interests 56
4.5 Childhood Vulnerability 59
4.5.1 Childhood Naivete 59
4.5.2 Minimising Language 61
4.6 Critical Reflections of Key Findings 63
Chapter 5: Implications, Limitations, Recommendations and Conclusion 65
5.1 Theoretical and Practical Implications 65
5.2 Study Limitations 66
5.3 Future Recommendations 68
5.4 Conclusion 69
References 71
Appendices 91
Appendix A: Participant Information Sheet 91

Appendix B: Consent to be Interviewed 94

Appendix C: Consent to be Audiotaped 95

Appendix D: Interview Schedule 96

Appendix E: Ethical Clearance Certificate for Main Study 99

Chapter 1: Introduction, Rationale and Aims

1.1 Introduction

CSA is considered to be rampant worldwide (Alexander et al., 2005; Barth, Bermetz, Heim, Trelle, & Tonia, 2013; Domhardt, Münzer, Fegert, & Goldbeck, 2015; Tang, Qu, Li, & Tan, 2018). In South Africa it is estimated that one in every three children will have experienced CSA by the time they turn 18 (Ward, Artz, Leoschut, Kassanjee, & Burton, 2018). In the South African National Census of 2015 it was estimated that 18.6 million children lived within South Africa thus resulting in an estimated 6.2 million children being impacted upon by some form of CSA (Statistics South Africa, 2016). In terms of the prevalence of MCSA, of the male children within South Africa, it is estimated that one in five male children of the 6.2 million children will experience CSA (Statistics South Africa, 2016; Ward et al., 2018).

The statistics on CSA are indicatory of the extensive problem being faced by South Africa. However, the statistics of female CSA victims are emphasized within the media whilst the data relating to male CSA victims is not prioritized (Badoe, 2017; Richter, Mathews, Nonterah, & Masilela, 2018; Weatherred, 2015). This leads to an increase in the visibility of female CSA victims but results in a decreased focus on male CSA victims. This speaks to the invisibility of the male victim within South Africa and the lack of acknowledgement males receive as victims (Kramer, 2016; Kramer & Bowman, 2011; van Niekerk, Tonsing, Seedat, Jacobs, Ratele, & McClure, 2015). Over the course of history, there has been very little acknowledgment of the male sex abuse victim with sex abuse being closely associated with women and children (Back & Lips, 1998; Carpenter (2003; 2005); Davies, 2002). This means that male victims are an under-researched group globally. This research is, therefore, of importance because additional studies into MCSA victims are needed in order to further understand the discourses which

allow for the construction of the invisible male victim within South Africa (Mumby, 1998; Sunderland, 2004).

In broad terms, the inconceivable subject-position of the male victim is interesting considering the vast cultural atmosphere in South Africa and thus, the vast definitions of masculinity (Morrell, Jewkes, & Lindegger, 2012). South Africa is a largely patriarchal environment which enables the construction of the impossible male victim (Kandiyoti, 1988). Important to this research is the notion that the invisibility of the male victim of sex abuse is a subject-position created through gender, trauma and victim discourse (Parker, 2013).

Discourse is considered to be a way of constituting knowledge in social life (Foucault, 1982). Discourses vary across cultures due to the different perceptions of certain types of knowledge worldwide (Foucault, 1982). Discourse thus is constructed knowledge which influences the actions of people within the social life (Berns, 2001; Sunderland, 2004). Foucault (1982) determines that discourse constructs the way that a topic is spoken about which means that certain discourses dictate the way in which male victim's narratives are constructed. Exploration of the discourses which emerge in the narratives of MCSA victims allows for a greater understanding of the creation of meaning in the language used to discuss experiences (Litosseliti & Sunderland, 2002; Setati & Adler, 2000). This study will make use of Norman Fairclough's (1989-1995) critical discourse analysis in order to engage with the victims of MCSA in a critical manner. The use of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) will allow for examination of the discursive strategies used by victims of MCSA when constructing their experience of abuse.

1.2 Rationale

The social constructionist paradigm suggests that knowledge is shaped by cultural and historical contexts which influence the meaning attributed to certain topics (Gergen, 1985; Herek, 1986). The social constructionist paradigm allows for understanding of the narratives of MCSA victims based on the context these men live within and the societal influences they have been subjected to (Gergen, 1985; Unger, 1989). A central notion for social constructionist theory is that victimhood is constructed as a subject-position in which a person is weak and defenseless (Heber, 2012). Typically, victimhood is constructed as a position taken up by women and children in society and thus, women and children are constructed as vulnerable (Carpenter, 2005). The construction of victimhood is embedded in trauma and gender discourse. Gender and trauma are constructed such that females are able to speak about trauma without hinderance while men are unable to speak about their experiences with trauma freely (Fortier, DiLillo, Messman-Moore, Peugh, DeNardi, & Gaffey, 2009).This is because the characteristics associated with females, that of being weak, soft and defenseless, are aligned with the characteristics associated with victimhood (Brickell, 2005; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). However, men are characterized as stoic and strong and so male vulnerability is discursively unlikely (Berns, 2001; Henderson, 2007).

Social constructionism demonstrates that the constructions of human understanding and experience are influenced by cultural, historical and social contexts (Gergen, 1985; Herek, 1986; Lorber, 1990). This study uses social constructionist paradigm as it challenges constructs of knowledge that are considered to be 'truth' within human experience (Heber, 2012; Mumby, 1998). Social construction observes the meaning attributed to human's knowledge constructs regarding experiences (Gergen, 1985). It further observes the power that knowledge constructs have within a certain cultural, historical or social context (Allen, 2002; Connell, 2014;

Foucault, 1982). This aligns with Foucault's theory on power and knowledge which also occurs within a particular cultural and historical moment (Foucault, 1982). Foucault (1976) refers to discourse which is essentially an analysis of the way that experiences are constructed and the context they are constructed within. Discourse is closely linked to power as those who are in power in a particular context determine, and control, the discourse used within discussion and thus, maintain power (Foucault, 1976).

Social constructionist theory applies here because the construction of males and females has become normalized and this means that the invisibility of the male victim has continued to be entrenched (Davies & Harré, 1990; Fahlgren & Sawyer, 2011). As a result, it is important to explore the narratives of South African male victims of CSA as it is indicative of the way in which gender and trauma discourse have dictated who is a worthy victim of CSA and who is not (Kramer, 2016). Due to males being characterized as stoic and strong, the victim subject-position is difficult to procure as it is only deemed acceptable for those characterized by weakness (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). This study will draw on the CDA proposed by Fairclough (1989-1995) in order to understand how trauma, gender and victim discourse constrains the male victim subject-positioning (Davies & Harré, 1990).

South Africa is an interesting context for looking at the male victim as South Africa is largely patriarchal (Berns, 2001; Gray, 2006; Levett, 1990, 2016). Furthermore, South Africa is rampant with crime and the victims of crime are considered to be women more than men (van Niekerk et al., 2015). As a result, South Africa deems it acceptable to be a female victim of crime but does not seem to acknowledge males as worthy victims (Kramer, 2016).

1.3 Research Aims

Through engaging with male victims of CSA in South Africa, the aim of this research is to distinguish the discourse surrounding male victims of CSA and explore the way in which these discourses create invisibility for male victims of CSA within normative constructions of gender. These will be achieved by interviewing males who have been sexually abused as children and then reviewing the transcripts of the interviews using the critical discourse analysis proposed by Fairclough (1989-1995). This analysis will then be used in order to examine how discourses are used as a form of social control reflected in the way participants construct their experiences of CSA (Litosseliti & Sunderland, 2002). A sub-aim is to investigate how the described experiences are influenced by gender discourse and its focus on masculinity in South Africa. Through investigating the participants' experiences the study aims to observe the participants' self-identified victim subject-positions as indicative of the influence of normative discourses which reinforce the invisibility of the male victim in South Africa (Crossley, 1996; Kramer, 2016). The sub-aim will investigate the influences of gendered discourse, particularly the normative constructions of masculinity and how this impacts on the participants' retelling of their experiences of CSA.

Overall, this study asks the following questions: How do South African male victims of CSA construct their experiences of abuse? How are these constructions influenced by gendered discourse surrounding masculinity?

1.4 Structure and Outline of the Research Report

CHAPTER 2 examines the available literature surrounding the social construction of the 'worthy' victim. The literature review begins with the definition of sex abuse and an explanation of what sexual behavior is defined as within this study. Thereafter, the literature

review provides an understanding of gendered discourse and the way in which it frames males in a patriarchal society. Furthermore, the literature review provides a discussion on the intersectionality of sex abuse and male victimhood and the difficulty facing men when placed in a position of 'weakness' as a victim. This section observes the reclaiming of masculinity in order to resist victimhood. The review then examines constructions of childhood that allow for men to be worthy victims and occupy victim subject-positioning. The literature review then proceeds to discuss the invisibility of the MCSA victim and the conditions of possibility that allow for male victimhood. Finally, discourses that enable or constrict victim subject-positioning are examined in relation to the 'worthiness' of a male victim of CSA within South Africa.

CHAPTER 3 provides the research method and research design of the study. The participants and sample selection, data collection and explanation of data analysis are described. Furthermore, a self-reflexivity section is added as well as an ethical considerations section which accounts for the methods which the researcher used to ensure professional standards of conduct are followed throughout the research process.

CHAPTER 4 provides an in-depth discussion of the findings and results of the study. This section observes the resistance and occupation of victimhood within males who have been sexually abused as children. It further discusses discourses of damage and the necessity of trauma in narratives of sex abuse. The section then observes how participants reclaimed masculinity in order to be defined as both 'male' and a 'victim' in South Africa. Furthermore, a discussion of childhood vulnerability occurs in order to observe how childhood innocence gives rise to conditions of possibility for the occupation of victim subject-positioning.

CHAPTER 5 provides a summary of the study's key findings and observes the study's practical and theoretical implications and acknowledges its limitations. It further provides recommendations for future research studies.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Sex Abuse

Sex abuse is defined in a variety of ways (Holmes & Slap, 1998; Kramer, 2016). Sex abuse includes both contact and non-contact abuse of males or females in a non-consensual act (Barth et al., 2013; Kramer, 2016). However, there is no clear definition of sex abuse as it can range from sexual remarks to penetration, all equally abusive depending on the person's subjective experience of the abuse (Holmes & Slap, 1998). For the purpose of this research, the definition of sexual abuse will be dependent on the participants' self-identifications as victims of contact sexual abuse, which is sex abuse that occurs when there is unwanted physical contact between the victim and the perpetrator. (Chu, 2011).

Sex abuse is distinguished from other sexual offences when it involves a child in a sexual act (Kramer, 2016). CSA can also be defined in a variety of ways (Finkelhor, 1984). Criteria involved in defining CSA includes the age of the victim and perpetrator, the presence of coercion, the authority of the perpetrator and the type of abuse which occurred - either contact or non-contact (Holmes & Slap, 1998). According to Finkelhor (1984), CSA is sexual contact that occurs when there is a large age difference between the two participants: the 'abuser' may be in an authoritative position compared to the child and the acts may occur in a violent manner. In this study, research will be conducted exclusively on contact sexual abuse, based on the participant's self-identification as a victim of contact CSA whereby the definition of contact CSA will be based on the following explanation:

> Sexual behavior between a child and an adult or between two children when one of them is significantly older or uses coercion…The sexual behaviors include touching breasts, buttocks and genitals whether the victim is dressed or undressed; exhibitionism; fellatio; cunnilingus; and penetration of the vagina or anus with sexual organs or objects. (Sadock, Kaplan & Sadock, 2007, p.1315)

Legal discourse, which refers to the way that knowledge is constructed within the law (Aldridge & Luchjenbroers, 2007), has played a role in the public perception of victims of sex abuse and this in turn has impacted the number of victims disclosing their abuse (Martin & Powell, 1994). In South Africa, the sex abuse victim is constructed to be either female or a child (Carpenter, 2003; Gorris, 2015; Kramer, 2016; Levett, 2016). There are many laws in place regarding women's rights and the human rights of the child (O'Malley, 1996). However, despite many laws being in place for the protection of women and children, those who take their case to court are often faced with the victim-blaming mentality created through victim-discourse (Anderson, Beattie, & Spencer, 2001; Borgida & White, 1978; Briere & Rickards, 2007; Gotell, 2002). The linguistics used in a sex abuse case can often come across as manipulating and weakening a testimony of the sex abuse incident when presented to the court (Aldridge & Luchjenbroers, 2007). The questions asked of a victim may frame the sex abuse as something that was misunderstood by the victim, made up by the victim or place the victim in a position of blame (Aldridge & Luchjenbroers, 2007). Sexual violence is constructed to only affect females and the law focuses on the women and children regarding sex abuse and does not discuss the possibility of male sex abuse (O'Malley, 1996).

Perpetrators of crime in South Africa are associated with males (Kramer, 2016). The implications of this within legal discourse are that men are framed as the perpetrators and not as the victims (Aldridge & Luchjenbroers, 2007; George & Martínez, 2002; Kramer, 2016; Kramer & Bowman, 2011). Taking into account the difficulties women, who are already perceived as vulnerable, have when attempting to open a case of abuse - it is even more challenging for a male, framed to be a perpetrator only, to come forward in a court of law as a victim of sex abuse (Anderson et al., 2001; Gorris, 2015; Kramer, 2016). Legal discourse has framed sexual violence as a crime committed mostly by males and thus, often does not

acknowledge men as victims of crime . This results in the portrayal of men as unworthy victims in public outside the court (Goodrich, 1987; Kramer, 2016; Kramer & Bowman, 2011; Martin & Powell, 1994). Herein lies the power of legal discourse as it constructs victim subject-positioning for females and perpetrator subject-positioning for males which further constructs male victimhood as an 'impossibility' (Kramer, 2016).

In South Africa the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act of 2007 criminalizes any act of penetration, contact and non-contact sexual activity, sexual exploitations, grooming, child pornography, witnessing sexual acts and indecent exposure to children. For the purpose of this study the child is defined as a minor under the age of 18 who did not consent to the sexual activity and was abused by a significantly older perpetrator of any gender and thus this definition aligns to South African laws surrounding CSA. There is continued research attempting to create a more concrete definition that can be used globally regarding CSA (Finkelhor, 1984, 1994; Kramer, 2016).

2.2 Gender and Sex Abuse

There is an important distinction between sex and gender (May, 2017). An individual's sex refers to their biological anatomy which they are born with such as reproductive organs and sex hormones (May, 2017). In contrast, a person's gender alludes to the social roles society dictates should be embodied in people of a certain sex (Butler, 1986). Gender may also refer to the unique identification of characteristics a person may have concerning their own internal awareness regarding their social role within society (Annis & Merron, 2014; Kaiser, 2012; May, 2017). This means that biological sex is not related to the gender one identifies with (Goktan & Gupta, 2015; Helliwell, 2018). A person identifies their gender based on gendered constructions emerging within gender discourse (Gergen, 1985; Goktan & Gupta, 2015;

Helliwell, 2018; Kaiser, 2012). Discourse is defined by Foucault (1982) as a way of constituting knowledge and power. Discourse consists of guidelines and ideas which constitute what 'truth' is within a given context (Foucault, 1982; Parker, 2014). Entrenched gender constructions are created through discourses (Berns, 2001; Litosseliti & Sunderland, 2002). These discourses are disseminated and imply what can be considered to be 'truth' and what cannot (Litosseliti & Sunderland, 2002).

Gendered discourse is embedded in cultural constructions which dictate that males and females are different from one another (West & Fenstermaker, 1995) and that gender is binary. The implicit rules created through gendered discourse creates gendered subject-positioning for males and females that matches one's biological sex (Berns, 2001; Cowburn, 2005; Gergen, 1985; Sunderland, 2004). Connell (2014) speaks of hegemonic masculinity as a conceptual theory which recognizes that there are many masculinities which emerge across time, culture and context. It is system of knowledge which legitimizes men's dominant positions in society while subordinating other marginalized ways of embodying masculinity (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Dean, 2013; Demetriou, 2013). Hegemonic masculinity is not limited to males but legitimises powerful women too (Morrell et al., 2012). There are many females who are powerful and many men who are oppressed (Cowburn, 2005; Gavranidou & Rosner, 2003; Morrell et al., 2012). This depends on the person's specific embodiment of gender (Kaiser, 2012; May, 2017; Segalo, 2015). Discourses of sex abuse are associated closely with females which specifically excludes males from occupying the victim subject-position (Goktan & Gupta, 2015). In South Africa, discourses of violence and dominance are closely related hegemonic forms of masculinity (Morrell et al., 2012). The construction of the oppressed, and weaker, male often is not acknowledged (Kramer, 2016). Further to this, a male who has been sexually abused embodies the victim subject-position which challenges the normalized ideas

surrounding masculinity (Gergen, 1985; Phoenix & Frosh, 2001). Males are worthy perpetrators of crime, however, they are not considered worthy victims of sex abuse (Kramer, 2016). It appears that discourses of violence are closely associated with hegemonic forms of masculinity which specifically exclude females (Hatchell, 2006).

2.2.1 Sex Abuse and Male Victims

The 'unlikely' male victim is based on the construction of sex abuse and victimhood within South Africa (Kramer, 2016). As a result, men must draw on trauma discourse and sex abuse discourse in order to be considered victims of CSA (Gavranidou & Rosner, 2003; Matei, 2013) However, this is at odds with masculine norms (Cooper, 2002; Cowburn, 2005). Some males may not view their experience as abusive because it counteracts normalized masculinity (Morrell et al., 2012). It is only when the victim is subjected to incitement to sex abuse discourse that the male victim may choose to disclose (Epstein, 2003; Foucault, 1982, 1987). The incitement to discourse forces men to face their masculinity and negotiate what it means to be both masculine and a victim (Kramer, 2016).

Cultural constructions of gender are so entrenched that men regularly refrain from speaking about their emotions and continue to be pressured to exhibit strong and stoic traits (Butler, 1988; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Paine & Hansen, 2002). Men are framed as abusers rather than as victims which has implications for males who are victims of abuse in terms of their identities within cultural constructions of masculinity (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Demetriou, 2013; Phoenix & Frosh, 2001). Henderson (2007, p. 227) argues that men are, "…always positioned as violent subjects, unaware of their own vulnerability, while women are positioned as universally vulnerable and anchored in their own fear". This positioning emanates from a discourse which places men in a dominant, violent role and implies women

are the primary victims of violence (Henderson, 2007; Sorsoli, Kia-Keating, & Grossman, 2008). Weiss (2010) further discusses that men have sexual violence ascribed to their characters which maintains their dominant position within society and embeds fear into others, framing them as the powerful perpetrators of crime. Weiss (2010, p.276) explains that men have consistently been portrayed as perpetrators such that envisioning them as victims requires the, "bracketing of preconcieved notions about both sexual violence and gender."

Butler (1988) postulates that gender is in fact not a fixed identity but rather an identity which consistently changes over time through the repetition of acts. Gender is considered to be established through the performance of the body and is thus an act of 'doing' (Butler, 1988). In particular, gender stereotypes dictate the way a person performs their gender (Lovell, 2003; West & Fenstermaker, 1995). Butler (1990) believes that gender is not considered to be binary but rather gives rise to multiple masculinities which opens the discursive possibility of males being conceivable victims in South Africa. In South Africa, gender intersects with other identities meaning that the manifestation of gender can differ depending on context and cultural environments (Kramer, 2016). The discourse surrounding gender is largely influenced by the cultural creation of a gender binary and the stereotypes which come with each of the two binary genders (Gavranidou & Rosner, 2003; Litosseliti & Sunderland, 2002). Masculinity is considered to be the more powerful gender while feminine qualities are considered to be less desirable (Hobbs, 2013).

These stereotypes can be harmful to men who are victims of CSA as identifying as a victim is not considered to be masculine and is more closely associated with femininity (Kramer, 2016). However, Butler (1990) theorizes that one may resist the normative constructions of gender in order to give rise to conditions that create different subject-positions. South Africa has high

rates of crime in which males tend to be the victims and yet, due to the normative constructions of masculinity, male victims are made invisible and silenced (Kramer & Ratele, 2012; Pipe, Lamb, Orbach, & Cederborg, 2013; Sorsoli et al., 2008).

This places men, who are sexually abused, in a challenging position when faced with performing 'masculine' gender roles whilst experiencing sex abuse (Lemle & Mishkind, 1989). In order to become a victim within society men must occupy a victim subject-position made available through victim discourse (Anderson et al., 2001; Luchjenbroers & Aldridge, 2007). This means that MCSA victims express their experiences through speaking about their sex abuse and showing emotions relating to the event. This is described by Foucault (1987) as 'confession' (Kramer, 2015). In doing so, they perform the normalized construct of femininity in order to align themselves with 'weak' victim discourse which dictates that a person must show emotions and speak about their sex abuse experience in order to be a victim (Young & Skrla, 2012, p.250). However, in order to reclaim the masculinity lost in MCSA men often feel the need to compensate for their powerlessness in the victim subject-positioning (Young & Skrla, 2012, p.247). This includes the use of empowering discourse associated with being a survivor of an event (Maercker & Müller, 2004). Men are challenged to change their victim, and weaker, status to a stronger survivor status in order for a more 'masculine' discourse to be associated with their CSA experience. Figley (2013, p.399) states:

> But while the victim has been immobilized and discouraged by the event, the survivor has overcome the traumatic memories and become mobile. The survivor draws on the experiences of coping with the catastrophe as a source of strength, while the victim remains immobilized. What separates victims from survivors is a conception about life, an attitude about the safety, joy and mastery of being a human being.

In order for men to reclaim masculinity they need to shift their victim subject-positioning to survivor positioning in order to be seen in a position of strength and power rather than that of

weakness (Figley, 2013; Jordan, 2013; Maercker & Müller, 2004). This is because being male and a victim of sex abuse is so rarely associated together for men that the close association starts to make men feel they must counterbalance their victimhood through entrenching their masculinity through the use of discourses of power (Foucault, 1987).

As a result, men attempt to reclaim their masculinity while still allowing for subject-positioning as male victims of CSA (Miller, 2014). The abuse of drugs and alcohol appear to create the illusion of the 'tough' man (Clark, Lesnick, & Hegedus, 1997; Lemle & Mishkind, 1989). Alcohol abuse in particular is closely linked to males with 39% of males becoming dependent on alcohol at some point within their life (Lemle & Mishkind, 1989). Lemle and Mishkind (1989) postulate, "Heavy drinking symbolizes greater masculinity than lighter drinking, and the more a man tolerates his alcohol, the more manly he is deemed." It appears that the abuse of substances is closely linked to males attempting to embody their masculine subject-positions as dictated within a given context (Copenhaver, Lash, & Eisler, 2000; Gymnich, Ruhl, & Scheunemann, 2010, p. 46; Lemle & Mishkind, 1989). Further to this, men may show increased levels of aggression in their behavior (Copenhaver et al., 2000). These actions all create the illusion of the hegemonic male in order to make up for what masculinity was lost through victimhood (Copenhaver et al., 2000; Lemle & Mishkind, 1989; Mullen, Watson, Swift, & Black, 2007). However, these reckless behaviours are also closely associated with perpetrator subject-positioning which frames men as abusers (Henderson, 2007). This means that reckless behaviors are twofold in that they enable masculine subject-positioning and could enable perpetrator subject-positioning.

In order for men to disclose their abuse they need to frame themselves as 'worthy' victims of CSA (Kramer, 2016). This worthiness is constituted by discourse on damage and trauma –

discourse at odds with constructions of masculinity. Further techniques such as the use of childhood discourse allow for further conditions of possibility for victim subject-positioning (Kramer, 2017).

2.3 Sex Abuse and Childhood

Constructions surrounding children are understood as consistently changing and are malleable (Robinson, 2008). The normative construction of the child is described by Kehily, (2008, p.3) as, "Not just physiological immaturity but also connotes dependency, powerlessness and inferiority." Childhood in the modern world is thus that of being innocent, helpless, virtuous and requiring protection (Nybell, 2001; Robinson, 2008, 2013) . These constructions enable children to be portrayed as victims and is largely accepted as 'truth' (Robinson, 2008). Children are placed in opposition to adults with the child being seen as lacking in knowledge within the world thus being seen as naïve (Robinson, 2013, p.86). The construction of the child may differ depending on context and intersectionality within class, gender and race (Gergen, 1985; Robinson, 2008, 2013).

Foucault (1995) speaks about the concept of disciplinary power in comprehending the production of constructs through discourse. The ability to occupy subject-positioning is modulated through the constructed conditions of possibility (Nybell, 2001). Lupton (1999, p.86) describes the construction of childhood stating, "Childhood is increasingly being constructed as a precious realm under siege from those who would rob children of their childhoods…" Discourse surrounding childhood emphasises the need for children to be protected and is an example of the exercising of disciplinary power in regulating social bodies (Foucault, 1995).

The assumption of the child requiring protection is largely associated with the assumption that the child is asexual and does not have knowledge relating to sexual acts (Kramer, 2016). Sex abuse discourse dictates that children who have been sexually abused require intervention and protection (Cowburn, 2005; Fairclough, 1985; Finkelhor, 1987; Naples, 2003). In this manner, victim discourse places children in victim subject-positioning and allows children to easily take up victimhood (Finkelhor, 1994). It is considered acceptable for children to be victims and this means that children are considered to automatically be 'worthy' victims of sex abuse (Kramer, 2016; Kramer & Bowman, 2011). This creates a normative victim position which opens possibilities for MCSA victims, who are non-normative victims, to take up victim subject-positioning (Hansen, 2016; Shafer-Landau, 2017, p.206).

The possibility of MCSA victims subject-positioning is rare where gendered constructs dictate that men are prevented from being vulnerable or victims (Davies & Harré, 1990; Fahlgren & Sawyer, 2011; Kramer, 2016; Kramer & Bowman, 2011). MCSA is considered non-normative and is constructed as being an impossibility (Kramer, 2016). However, the child is considered to be a conceivable victim of sex abuse (Wilson & O'Brien, 2016). Through the use of childhood discourse, conditions of possibility are created which allow men to take up victim subject-positioning (Foucault, 1987, 2012). Childhood discourse creates the child as a conceivable victim of sex abuse and thus, when MCSA victims relay their experiences of abuse, they may take up victim subject-positioning based on childhood discourse which creates conditions of possibility for victimhood (Foucault, 1982, 1987, 1991; Hansen, 2016; Robinson, 2013).

Thus, the use of childhood constructions enables males to take up victim subject-positioning as a child who is vulnerable is a conceivable victim (Kramer, 2016). This is where disciplinary

power regulates the male social body, allowing for occupation of different subject-positioning based on using the appropriate social regulation in order to prove worthiness of victimhood (Foucault, 1995). Further to this, the victim subject-positioning is enabled through use of psychological discourse in order for the experience of the male victim to be conceivable. This intersection is one which is further regulated by the victim in order to prove worthiness of victimhood.

2.4 Sex Abuse and Psychological Discourse

Trauma discourse is engrained within social life and dictates that in order for one to be a victim of CSA one must experience trauma and be 'damaged' by the CSA experience (Levett, 1990; Matei, 2013). Levett (1990, p.43) states that:

> There is a sense in which the discourse (reports, talk conferences, interventions units, etc.) creates the phenomenon – the impulse as well as the reactions to it… Every aspect discussed serves to perpetuate and shape childhood sexual abuse and its repercussions.

Levett (1990) describes the manner in which discourse 'perpetuates and shapes' the way that CSA is discussed and revealed by victims. Discourse regarding sex abuse dictates that the MCSA victim is expected to identify as 'damaged' and 'traumatized' (Kramer, 2015). Trauma is defined by Barlow and Durand (2015) as, "…exposure to a traumatic event during which an individual experiences or witnesses death or threatened death, actual or threatened serious injury, or actual or threatened sexual violation." For the purpose of this study, this definition will be referred to when discussing trauma and its damaging effects.

Normative constructions of victimhood dictate that females tend to be the victims of sex abuse and males tend to be the perpetrators (Cooper, 2002). This results in male victims requiring certain conditions of possibility in order to take up victim subject-positioning (Berns, 2001;

Davies & Harré, 1990; Kramer, 2015, 2016). One of the conditions of possibility for occupying victim subject-positioning is the use of discourse on sexual trauma (Kramer, 2016; Litosseliti & Sunderland, 2002; Naples, 2003). For male victims, occupying the victim subject-position is challenging considering that men are not constructed to be vulnerable and victim positioning is constructed around weakness rather than strength (Breslau, 2002). In order to occupy such a position, men have to justify their victimhood through proof of being 'damaged' by their experiences of CSA (Levett, 1990). The use of sex abuse discourse requires the consistent regulation of the self in order to appear 'traumatized' and 'damaged' by the experience of CSA as dictated by normative constructs surrounding CSA (Fahlgren & Sawyer, 2011; Foucault, 1995; Levett, 1990; Phoenix & Frosh, 2001).

MCSA victims may express their 'traumatization' through disclosure to a professional in the psychological field (Alaggia, 2005; Kramer, 2015, 2016; Levett, 1990, 2016). This professional often suggests what symptoms a victim may feel after experiencing CSA and in doing so, incitement to sex abuse discourse occurs (Foucault, 1987, 2012; Foucault et al., 1988). Incitement to discourse refers to the introduction to certain ways of constituting knowledge surrounding sex, sex abuse and trauma and thus how one is expected to act and feel when one has experiences sex abuse (Epstein, 2003). Through this process one has incitement to discourse as one is exposed to the normative constructs surrounding victimhood (Epstein, 2003; Kramer, 2017; Mahalik, Burns, & Syzdek, 2007; Matebeni & Msibi, 2015). MCSA victims may unconsciously construct their trauma narratives of CSA in order to legitimize their claims to victimhood (Diamond & Quinby, 1988). Due to the depiction of females as victims rather than males, MCSA victims are unsure of how to occupy victim subject-positioning. It is only through an incitement to trauma discourse that descriptions of traumatic and damaging experiences are discussed by victims (Briere & Rickards, 2007). In this way, males who have

experienced CSA are able to occupy victim subject-positioning (Filipas & Ullman, 2006; Finkelhor, 1987; Matei, 2013).

CSA victims have incitement to trauma discourse which allows for appropriate symptoms of 'trauma' to be relayed during disclosure and thus, the male victim subject-positioning is legitimized (Epstein, 2003; Levett, 1990). Further to this, disclosure in the presence of a psychology professional or in another appropriate context allows for incitement to psychological discourse (Kramer, 2017). Psychological discourse describes technical terms which are used within a professional psychological contexts which are used by males in order to legitimize their worthiness of being a victim of CSA (Kramer, 2017). The use of psychological discourse legitimizes the male victims' experiences of CSA and reflects the normative constructions of what a sex abuse victim experiences both during and in the aftermath of CSA and the language that should be used in reference to such an experience (Berns, 2001; Cowburn, 2005; Matei, 2013; Mayne, 1993). As discussed by Kramer (2017), "…Definitions limit and regulate behaviours so that they are consistent with what is socially acceptable, socially expected and socially desirable." In this way psychological discourse perpetuates the 'correct' way that victims should experience and perceive CSA. Victims' self-perceptions of CSA experiences are thus reflective of the regulation of institutionalized discourses (Kramer, 2017).

Further to the use of psychological discourse, post-hoc constructions of abuse and trauma are unconsciously used by males in order to be perceived as victims in an appropriate manner (Davies & Rogers, 2006; Gorris, 2015). Post-hoc construction refers to the construction of a memory after the event occurred (Klein, 2001). The memory is constructed based on the incitement to discourse that has reshaped the ideas (Klein, 2001; Levett, 1990).

Overall, the use of psychological discourse has allowed for conditions of possibility to arise for males to occupy victim subject-positioning and as such, psychological discourse is used in 'confession' in order to validate the occupation of victimhood positioning by males (Kramer, 2017).

2.5 Conclusion - Sexual Abuse, Male Victimhood and South Africa

Men have been positioned as dominant and strong whilst women and children are positioned as vulnerable (Henderson, 2007). Perpetrators of crime are constructed to be male while victims are considered to be women and children (Kramer & Ratele, 2012). In South African law, sexual violence is closely associated with women and children and this creates great difficulty for males who experience CSA (Banda, 2006). Gendered discourse creates gendered subject-positioning which is associated with the binary biological sex of males and females within South Africa (Cowburn, 2005; Gymnich, Ruhl, & Scheunemann, 2010; Sunderland, 2004). Discourses of violence and abuse are related to hegemonic forms of masculinity which place males in positions of power rather than vulnerability (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Cowburn, 2005). Thus, the experience of MCSA is non-normative within South Africa. This creates male victims who are invisible (Gorris, 2015).

In South Africa, sex abuse is largely considered to be the penetration of a woman or child against their will (Banda, 2006; Berns, 2001; Kramer, 2015). South Africa is a patriarchal society which constructs normative male behaviour as that of being strong and dominant (Henderson, 2007). There are many different cultural groups across South Africa and the common denominator of all these groups are that the majority have patriarchal views constructing males as the less emotional, stronger and more stoic members of the group

(Kramer & Ratele, 2012). In doing this, males are excluded from being vulnerable as they are considered to be the protectors of the vulnerable woman and children and this cannot be interchangeable. As discussed by Kramer (2015, p.67), "The male sexual violence victim is made invisible through various intersecting gendered structures and discourses, despite the possibility that the consequences of any form of abuse may transcend gender roles."

Through the various discourses surrounding sex abuse, trauma and gender, male victims of abuse are able to legitimize their positioning as victims of CSA (Kramer, 2017). Gender gives rise to multiple masculinities which creates many different conditions of possibility for men in being seen as conceivable victims of sex abuse within South Africa (Davies, 2002; Davies & Rogers, 2006; Gorris, 2015; Kramer, 2015; Rogers & Davies, 2007).This may occur through the resistance of normative constructs of gender which allow for victim subject-positioning to occur (Kramer, 2017).

Sex abuse discourse dictates that victims of CSA must identify as traumatized in order to be taken seriously as victims (Naples, 2003). Those who experience MCSA feel the need to identify as 'damaged' in order to occupy victim subject-positioning (Levett, 1990). Further to this, psychological discourse dictates that through disclosure, a victim of MCSA must use the appropriate terms and show specific symptoms in order to occupy victim subject-positioning . Incitement to discourse leads to the use of certain terms and particular language in order to legitimize the MCSA victim's experiences of sex abuse (Epstein, 2003; Foucault, 1987).

Through engaging with the discourses surrounding MCSA there is an allowance for exploration of the way invisibility is created, within normative constructions of gender, for male victims within South Africa (Gorris, 2015; Kramer, 2017). Further to this, understandings related to the influence of gender discourse is significant in South Africa where masculinity is constructed to be dominant and strong and thus places men in superior positions that do not

give rise to vulnerability (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Cooper, 2002; Mahalik et al., 2007). The conditions of possibility that arise for men to occupy victim subject-positioning are influenced by normative discourses within South Africa (Kramer, 2017; Mahalik et al., 2007). This leads to the investigation of how male victims of CSA construct their experiences of abuse and the influence of gendered discourse on such constructions, particularly those surrounding masculinity, within South Africa.

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study used a qualitative research design by drawing on semi-structured one-on-one interviews lasting approximately 40 to 50 minutes. The purpose of the qualitative design was to allow for the analysis and interpretation of the form and content of participants' narratives relating to their experiences of CSA (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). Qualitative research was suitable for this study as it allowed for the collection of detailed data and for the extensive interpretation of participants' experiences (Babbie & Mouton, 2001). The study is framed within a social constructionist paradigm which allowed for greater understanding of the victim subject-positions that the MCSA victims expressed within their narratives (Gergen, 1985).

The research focused on distinguishing the discourse surrounding male victims of CSA and exploring the way in which these discourses create invisibility for male victims of CSA within normative constructions of gender, particularly masculinity. This was achieved through the use of Fairclough's (1989-1995) Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in order to allow for an analysis of the gender, trauma and sex abuse discourses drawn upon by the participants (Cowburn, 2005; Naples, 2003). This research forms part of a larger study within the University of the Witwatersrand: *Cultural conditions for identity disruptions in violence: Possible perpetrators and worthy victims?* The study aimed to investigate the conditions which enable and constrain the occupation of the victim or perpetrator subject-position within South Africa and thus, the current research study aligns with the broader study regarding content, research design and data collection (Kramer, 2011).

3.2 Participants and Sampling Strategy

This research targeted male participants who were sexually abused as children in South Africa. Participants were selected with the use of a purposive non-probability selection process (Babbie & Mouton, 2001). Participants were chosen based on the following inclusion criteria: males age 18 or older who had experienced contact sex abuse. Ethical approval was obtained from the University of the Witwatersrand Medical Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) under the umbrella study (see Appendix E). The participants were found through approaching various support networks such as Matrix Men and South African Males Against Sexual Abuse (SAMSOSA). The founders of these organisations allowed for a call for participation to be placed on various Whatsapp support groups for survivors of MCSA.

Thereafter, a call for participation was placed on various Facebook support pages and Instagram pages for males who have experienced sexual abuse in South Africa. The call for participation requested males, over the age of 18 (for ethical reasons), who had experienced contact MCSA to participate in an interview about their experiences. The Facebook post, calling for participants, was set to keep track of the number of people who viewed the post. The post was seen by over 1000 people, of which, seven males responded to the researcher via email. The seven male participants were all over the age of 18 and were interviewed based on their self-identifications as traumatised victims of CSA. Participants were contacted via email and individual interviews were conducted at a place convenient to each participant. Participants were verbally informed of the aims of the research and the research process and were given an information sheet which gave further insight into the purpose of the research (See Appendix A). It was verbally explained to the participants that they would sign informed consent forms which meant that their permission was given in full knowledge of any risks or benefits the

study may present (Musmade et al., 2013). Participants were briefed on their ethical rights within the interview process.

The victim profiles are detailed in the Findings chapter (Chapter 4.1). However, it is important to note that the participants all come from a position of high socio-economic status which means they have had access to education (Ward et al., 2018). All participants had completed matric and six of the seven participants had pursued tertiary education after school. This means that those victims of MCSA living in lower socio-economic status (SES) within South Africa were not interviewed. The implications of this are that those in a lower SES may have constructed their experiences differently as limited access to resources and education would have resulted in exposure to discourses that differ from those of the participants who came from higher SES areas within South Africa (Ward et al., 2018).

3.3 Data Collection

Data was collected over approximately four months. The research drew on semi-structured individual interviews (see Appendix D). The informal interviews allowed the participants to speak freely about their experiences in a comfortable environment (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). The semi-structured interview schedule allowed for the researcher to modify certain questions according to participants' answers (Fu, 2011). This further allowed for the interviews to be conversational (Cox, 2012). Interviews took place between June and July 2017 at various coffee shops that were convenient for the participants and at office space in Bryanston. Interviews took place with participants who had signed informed consent to be audiotaped (see Appendix C) and interviewed (see Appendix B). Interviews were recorded using two recording devices. Questions were developed in the form of a guided discussion allowing for a conversation to occur between the researcher and the participant. The conversational style of

the semi-structured interview allowed for the extraction of discourses that gave rise to particular conditions which created the possibility of the MCSA victim (Fairclough, 1985; McLaren, 2012). The interviews covered information regarding the participants' experiences of sexual abuse, perceptions of their perpetrators and understandings of masculinity within South Africa.

The interviews which took place in the coffee shops occurred with implications as it would be assumed that discussing a sensitive topic would be best in a private atmosphere. It is possible that the participants who discussed their experiences within coffee shops may have been ill at ease and thus, may not have constructed their experience the way they normally would have had they met in a private space. Further to this, coffee shops added to the noise of the recording creating difficulty in the data transcription process.

The interviews were recorded and the researcher took notes throughout the process regarding the details of the perpetrator of the sex abuse, the age at which the participant was abused and the details of the sex act that each participant experienced. The recordings were uploaded by the researcher onto a computer and were then uploaded into a password protected cloud-based system managed by the Principle Researcher of the larger study. The researcher then transcribed the interviews verbatim and the transcripts were also uploaded to the password protected cloud-based system. These interviews allowed for insight into the discourses which arose regarding gender, sex abuse and trauma. These discourses were drawn on by MCSA victims and allowed for analysis of the use of the language embedded within social and historical contexts (Foucault, 1982; Foucault et al., 1988).

3.4 Data Analysis

Once all of the data had been collected, the interviews were transcribed verbatim by the researcher and compiled into transcripts which could be analyzed (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) was used in order to identify discursive themes arising within the data (Fairclough, 1985). The analysis focused on critically engaging with gender subject-positioning, trauma subject-positioning and the victim subject-positions.

CDA was developed by Fairclough (1989-1995) to analyze discursive processes and subject-positioning. According to Blanche, Blanche, Durrheim and Painter (2006, p.558) CDA indicates "the act of showing how certain discourses are deployed to achieve particular effects in specific contexts". The process involves understanding how language is negotiated within cultural constructions. Fairclough's (1989-1995) method allows for a demonstration of the manner in which discourse allows for or restricts subject-positions within society. Further to this, Fairclough's (1989-1995) CDA demonstrates how discourses construct specific objects of knowledge within the context of power. In this study CDA was used to understand the negotiation of subject-positioning of 'victim' and 'male'.

The data was subjected to Fairclough's (1989-1995) model for CDA. Parker (1992), another critical discourse analysis researcher, states that, "Language is so structured to mirror power relations that often we can see no other ways of being, and it structures ideology so that it is difficult to speak both in and against it." Thus, CDA was appropriate for this study as language was used in a very specific manner, influenced by ideologies, which in turn placed participants' in very specific victim subject-positions (Parker, 2013). This allowed for multiple levels of analysis of the data. The first phase is known as 'textual analysis' which allows for the researcher becoming engrossed within the data (Fairclough, 1985). This occurred through

listening to the recordings of the interviews twice before beginning transcription in order to become immersed within the various stories. This allowed for the researcher to become more familiar with each of the participants' data but also allowed for the researcher to listen for emerging discourses within the participants' answers. This was crucial to allow for the researcher to become more familiar with the content of the interviews. Excerpts from the data were selected based on their relevance to the participant's subject-positioning as a male or a victim within South Africa. Discourses were identified within the transcripts and deconstructed in order to perceive the conditions of possibility for male victims of CSA.

The second phase is 'processing analysis' which occurs at the same time as the 'textual analysis' level (Fairclough, 1985). This level is the interpretative dimension which allows for the understanding of the content of the language produced by the participants and how the language has been influenced by discourse (Fairclough, 1985; Parker, 2013). The processing and textual analysis together allows for the production or resistance of the subject-positions which emerge within the transcripts (Kramer, 2017).

The final level of Fairclough's (1989-1995) model of CDA is 'explanation' where a social analysis of the conditions of possibility for MCSA are integrated into the analysis of discourses which have emerged within the data (Kramer, 2017; Parker, 2013). This stage is about the researcher's engagement with the data and the literature. 'Explanation' allows for the researcher to submerge in the data and conceptualize the research findings (Fairclough, 1985). This 'social analysis' stage forms the foundation to enable 'processing' and 'textual' analysis to take place (Fairclough, 1985). The 'explanation' section of the analysis allows for interpretation of data through the appropriate lens (Fairclough, 1985). It is at this point that the

surfaced discourses are examined and understood within the social-cultural context within which they have appeared (Kramer, 2017).

The researcher's own opinions and position regarding MCSA may have impacted the interview process and the analysis of the data. This means that the findings of this study are open to interpretation.

3.5 Self-Reflexivity

Qualitative research requires the researcher to consistently reflect on the research process (Finlay, 2002). It involves the process of exploring oneself as a researcher and the relationship between the researcher and the participants in order to allow for as much of an impartial analysis of the data as possible (Cox, 2012; Finlay, 2002). This means that the researcher must explore their own preconceptions and understand how these ideas may impact on any decisions made during the research process, especially relating to the way in which questions are asked in interviews and the way in which answers may be perceived by the researcher (Barron, 1999). The researcher must understand their relationship to the participants and how this relationship may impact on the answers given in the interview (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). In this instance, the researcher's preconceptions about trauma, sex abuse and sexuality may have impacted the way in which the data was interpreted (Barron, 1999).

As research intending to question and critique the formation of knowledge around males and victimhood and understand the production of certain subject-positions I had to engage in continual and critical self-reflexivity (Mruck & Breuer, 2003). Continued reflexivity was vital to avoid maintaining and reproducing the discourses that the research aims to understand and critique. This includes the culturally constructed discourse that males cannot be victims of MCSA and thus, traumatised subjects (Mruck & Breuer, 2003).

I was acutely aware of the way in which I was presenting my gender positioning as a female whilst in the presence of males speaking about their sex abuse experiences and caught myself at various points thinking about how 'inappropriate' certain remarks were in front of a female despite my insistence upon having no preconceived ideas about male or female positioning. Two of the participants made comments regarding my appearance in a sexual tone which made me quite uncomfortable. This confirmed my preconceived ideas around the male subject-positioning of degrading women without consequence and confirmed the ideas around women being subordinated by men. The participants stated, in this regard,

> *I couldn't sit and talk to you, for instance, I mean I would… I would have been staring at every bit of you and having fantasties in my head…* (P2)

> *This is quite good… You made me feel quite comfortable. You've got a nice smile for this."* (P3)

This indicated to me that I too have been influenced by social constructs and discourse around how men and women 'should' interact. It appeared that both participants felt in order to interact with me, as a female researcher - whilst telling me about their abusive subject-postioning, they had to occupy their masculine subject-positioning and comment about a female in a sexual manner to emphasize their masculinity. It is vital to take note of the manner in which I interacted with my subjects and the implications this has on the research interpretations when my own opinions are also influenced by the very discourses I aim to critique.

It was important for me to remain aware and question my manner of thinking while continuing with the research process. I remained aware of the role I played in the construction of knowledge and truth within the context of being the 'researcher'. To this end I made sure to debrief with colleagues and discuss my own understandings and perspectives regarding my role in being influenced by certain discourses within cultural contexts. Existing victim

discourse within my own ideology was discussed in order for critical engagement to occur with my data analysis. Preconceived ideas around victimhood - such as sex abuse only occurring in lower SES areas – was challenged when debriefing with colleagues and my role of being influenced by such discourse was discussed (Ward et al., 2018). It appeared that I was challenged by the fact that none of my participants came from low SES areas, thus debunking my previous ideologies. These ideologies were all created through the influence of discourse within a specific context. By continuing with this reflexive process, I was able to critically engage with my own analytical inclinations and this meant I could continuously question and reflect on discourses which were reproduced by me during this research period.

3.6 Ethical Considerations

Due to the sensitive nature of this research, it was important to consider the ethical implications of working with such a vulnerable population (Barron, 1999). Sex abuse leaves marked trauma in a person and the sensitivity of speaking about such a traumatic event must be taken into account (Chu, 2011). Ethics clearance for this project was obtained from the University of the Witwatersrand Non-Medical Research Ethics Committee (Protocol Number: H12/11/11) (See Appendix E). Each participant was given a letter informing them of what the study entailed (see Appendix A) and what was expected of them within the interview (Fisher, 2012). This letter informed the participant of the aims of the study, the contact details of the researcher, the procedures used in gathering data and information regarding the participant's right to withdraw from the study at any time and right to refuse answering questions during the interview process (See Appendix B). The participant then had the choice to sign the forms consenting to the interview and to the recording of the conversation (See Appendix C). The participants were then informed that the interview would be recorded but that only the researcher and the research supervisor would have access to this recording. The recordings were uploaded on to a computer and then saved in a password protected cloud-based system. The participants were informed

that the recordings from the interviews will be saved on a secure device in a password-protected file. None of the participants expressed concern regarding being audio-recorded and consent was given freely by all seven participants.

During transcription, all participant names were changed to provide anonymity for the participants. This was achieved by using pseudonyms such as P1, P2 and so forth as well as through the removal of any identifiable information that was given within the interview such as names of others or specific places that could identify the person. It is important to note that anonymity is not always possible to ensure (Fisher, 2012). If the participant had previously shared their story with the media prior to participation, then the interview details may be easily identifiable and link to the participant (Fisher, 2012). This was verbally discussed with participants when they were given the informed consent sheet and information page. All participants felt that they understood this risk and were all willing to continue with the interview.

Participation in this research project had no direct benefits for the participants. It was explained that the research would serve as a contribution towards a larger body of growing research in the field of MCSA. The participants were informed that the transcripts of the interviews may be used in such studies in the future and that it was understood that due to the sensitive nature of what was shared, anonymity would be taken very seriously.

The participants were further informed that it was possible that, due to the sensitive nature of the interviews, some of them may have felt distressed during or after the interviews (Barron, 1999; Fisher, 2012). Participants were informed of their rights to counselling post-research and were told that if they felt distressed they needed to inform the researcher who would in turn give them the contact details of a student psychologist for such counselling to occur. None of the participants felt the need for post-interview counselling. Most participants had sought

counselling prior to the study and wished to remain with their own counsellor.

With regards to the research outcomes, a summary of the results of the study will be available for participants if they request the results. The contact details of the researcher was left with each participant should they wish to follow up regarding the results of the study.

Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion

This research aimed to critically explore and distinguish the discourse surrounding male victims of CSA and aimed to examine how these emerging discourses created positions of invisibility within normative constructions of gender in South Africa. A further sub-aim was also investigated which focused on examining how MCSA experiences were influenced by gender discourse surrounding masculinity within South Africa (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Finkelhor et al., 1990; Hey, 2006).

This was achieved through the application of Fairclough's (1989-1995) Critical Discourse Analysis to seven interview transcripts conducted with South African men who had been sexually abused as children. The analysis focused on examining the way participants navigated their experiences within gendered discourse (Berns, 2001; Helliwell, 2018). There was specific focus on the discourse which enabled the participants to occupy or resist specific subject-positions (Foucault, 1982). This examination allowed for analysis of the way discourses were reproduced by participants. This aligned with Foucault's (1982) theory of the resistance and occupation of subject-positioning. Participants resisted their victim subject-positioning and felt they had to be positioned as 'traumatized' and 'damaged' in order to be taken seriously in South Africa (Goktan & Gupta, 2015; Kramer, 2016; Levett, 1990; Morrell et al., 2012; Sunderland, 2004b).

Four overarching themes emerged in this study: Resisting Victimhood, Incitement to Discourses of Damage, Reclaiming Masculinity and Childhood Vulnerability. Sub-themes emerged within each of the over-arching themes which helped in constructing particular subject-positions. Discourses concerning gender, sex abuse and trauma were all evident within the narratives of the participants. Thus, these discourses were taken into consideration within

the identified themes and sub-themes of the study. The findings of the study are presented thematically and summarized within Table 1 below.

Overarching Discursive Themes	**Discursive Subthemes**
Resisting Victimhood	Victim Discourse
	Blame, Shame and Guilt
Incitement to Discourses of Damage	Access to Psychological Support
	Psychological Language
	Post-Hoc Constructions of Trauma
Reclaiming Masculinity	Survivor Discourse
	Substance Abuse
	Sexual Behaviours and Interests
Childhood Vulnerability	Childhood Naivete
	Minimising Language

Table 1: Overarching Discursive Themes

4.1 Victim Profiles

Participants who took part in the study were males who had all experienced sex abuse in their childhood. Victimhood was constructed based on exposure to certain discourses which shaped perceptions of participant experiences (Foucault, 1982, 2012; Levett, 1990). Participants used discourses of gender, sex abuse and trauma in order to allow for occupation of victim subject-positioning within South Africa. Victim discourse was used in conjunction with other discourses in order to construct a fathomable male victim subject-position in a patriarchal

landscape such as South Africa. The MCSA victim was discussed as a condition which was created from the 'inconceivable' victim and as a result the interviews allowed for analysis of the discourses which provided possibilities for identification as a victim of MCSA.

The participants in this research consisted of seven self-identified victims of MCSA. All participants were South African males. These males were able to identify as victims despite gendered constructions of masculinity dictating that male victimhood is inconceivable (Fahlgren & Sawyer, 2011; Foucault, 2012; Kramer, 2015). This indicated that there were particular conditions which made identification as a victim of MCSA possible. The participants' individual characteristics are discussed below and further summarized in Table 2.

Participant 1 (P1) is a white homosexual male in his mid-60s with a BEd degree. P1 is a victim of repeated sexual abuse. This interview is the first time P1 has disclosed regarding his abuse. He was abused by his neighbour at the boarding house he lived in when he was 10 years old and later repeatedly raped by a priest within the Roman Catholic church at which he and his family were congregants. P1 positions his narrative on his homosexuality and the implications this has on his identification as a victim.

Participant 2 (P2) is a white heterosexual male in his mid-50s with a matric certificate education. He was victim of repeated sexual and physical abuse. P2 was sexually abused between the ages of 6 and 10 by his mother who later continued to abuse him physically. P2's family friend raped him when he was a child and he was then raped again by a youth pastor at his Methodist church.

Participant 3 (P3) is a heterosexual white male in his mid-30s with a BCom degree. P3 was sexually abused by his father's business partner when he was 11. P3 is the only participant in this study who reported the abuse to a prosecuting authority.

Participant 4 (P4) is a white heterosexual male in his mid-40s with a Bachelor's Degree. P4 was sexually abused between the ages of 6 and 10 by his older brother.

Participant 5 (P5) is a white heterosexual male in his mid-40s with a Bachelor's Degree. P5 disclosed his abuse for the first time in this study's interview. He was sexually abused and raped while he was on a holiday camp when he was 10 by his boss at the time.

Participant 6 (P6) is a white heterosexual male aged 40 with a BCom Degree. P6 was sexually abused at 10 years old by his teacher.

Participant 7 (P7) is a black 23-year-old heterosexual male studying towards a Bachelor's Degree. P7 was sexually abused by his uncle and later by a family friend.

Victim ID	**Age (years)**	**Race**	**Age of Abuse**	**Abuser**
P1	60-70	White	Between the ages of 10 and 16	Neighbour; Priest
P2	50-60	White	Between the ages of 6 and 18	Mother; Family Friend; Youth Pastor
P3	30-40	White	11	Family Friend
P4	40-50	White	Between the ages of 6 and 10	Brother

P5	40-50	White	10	Boss/Camp Leader
P6	40-50	White	10	Teacher
P7	23	Black	Between the ages of 6 and16	Uncle; Family Friend

Table 2: Victim Profiles

4.2 Resisting Victimhood

Gendered discourse is entrenched within cultural constructions which legitimize gender binaries (Berns, 2001; Cowburn, 2005; Gergen, 1985). Gendered subject-positioning is largely influenced by gender binary and dictates that positioning should match one's biological sex (Berns, 2001; Cooper, 2002; Litosseliti & Sunderland, 2002). The creation of such positioning means that females are more easily accepted in victim subject-positions whilst discourse surrounding sex abuse often excludes men from occupying victimhood subject-positioning in South Africa (Fahlgren & Sawyer, 2011).

All of the participants' had formed their own understandings of what it meant to be a victim whilst simultaneously wrestling with their masculinities. The participants all grappled with the improbability of being a victim in South Africa where there are very few subject-positions which allow for the simultaneous occupation of masculinity (Alaggia, 2005; Alaggia & Millington, 2008; Kramer, 2016; Kramer & Bowman, 2011). The emergent victimhood discourses were indicative of engrained social constructions that imply that only females can express and experience victimhood (Davies & Rogers, 2006; Gergen, 1985; Kramer, 2016; Lorber, 1990).

All seven participants drew on discourse which justified, and grappled with, their victim subject-positioning (Gavranidou & Rosner, 2003). All participants wrestled with occupying

victim subject-positioning as males which was indicatory of the presence of gendered constructions of masculinity (Berns, 2001; Cowburn, 2005; Gergen, 1985; Sunderland, 2004). This placed men in a position of being 'unworthy' victims in the context of South Africa that, to a large extent, only enables females to occupy victim subject-positions. In order to occupy victim subject-positioning participants negotiated conditions of possibility through discourse (Gorris, 2015; Kramer, 2016; Kramer & Bowman, 2011). The discourse used by the participants were learnt from macro-level discourse (Foucault, 1982, 1987, 2012). In particular, discourse surrounding survival was drawn upon and was regarded as being more masculine. This allowed participants to resist their victim subject-positioning. The use of discourse that empowered participants, rather than that which made them appear weaker, indicated that these participants were wrestling with their occupation of victitmhood in a largely patriachal landscape. Further discussions around guilt and self-blame further allowed for resistance of victim subject-positioning and indicated the influence of victim-blaming within South Africa.

4.2.1 Victim Discourse

Victimhood is connotated with weakness, vulnerability and fragility (Brickell, 2005). All of the participants in this study relied on the 'impossibility' of the male victim in order to produce narratives that distanced themselves from this victim positioning (Kramer, 2016). Participants' productions of victim discourse relied on these men inherently believing that they do not belong in the male-victim subject-position (Alaggia, 2005; Alaggia & Millington, 2008; Berns, 2001; Cowburn, 2005; Gergen, 1985; Sunderland, 2004). Participants resisted the possibility of male-victimhood and described how they did not think of themselves as victims at the time of the abuse and struggled to acknowledge their male-victim status.

The occupation of victim subject-positioning was not immediately evident to participants during childhood. The realization of their victim subject-positioning only occurred through their introduction to a particular way of thinking about their victimhood known as incitement to victim discourse (Foucault, 2012). As discussed by Epstein (2003, p.490), incitement to discourse is powerful in that it organizes discourses surrounding sex such that sexual meanings are sculpted around cultural understandings. Incitement to discourse can occur at any age but, in this instance, participants were informed of ways of constituting knowledge when they became adults and were slowly introduced to adult ways of thinking (Epstein, 2003; Foucault, 1987, 2012).

> *I basically took 30 plus years to acknowledge it myself... Last year was basically the first time I acknowledged what happened and openly talked about it um, and ja, so it's since then that I actually realized that I was a victim…* (P4)

Incitement to victim discourse has made P4 aware that he is a victim of sex abuse (Epstein, 2003). Prior to this exposure to discourse, P4 does not '*realize'* he is a victim of sex abuse because he has never been subjected to sex abuse and the meanings and consequences behind it. Further to this, the unlikelihood of male victimhood is so entrenched in normative constructions of what victimhood *should* look like that P4 grapples with, and resists, his occupation of the victim subject-positioning through his struggle to '*acknowledge'* his victimhood for more than 30 years (Cooper, 2002; Hansen, 2016; Kramer, 2016). The construction of victimhood as something which occurs to females results in male victimhood not being culturally acknowledged (Cooper, 2002; Herek, 1986; Kramer, 2015). This is then reflected by P4 as he cannot '*acknowledge'* his victimhood as he further reinforces what he has learnt through normative constructions of victimhood. Male victims are not '*acknowledged*' in normative constructions of sex abuse and within victim discourse.

> *I'm thinking to myself, it's only me, it's only happening to me, I'm going to keep quiet.* (P1)
>
> *It was interesting because my parent's had never spoken about sex but… it still felt wrong because why did he [stop] when my brother started coming closer… That was only when I realized but this isn't proper…* (P3)
>
> *I take part of the responsibility there. For a long time, I did take responsibility I led him on, it was my fault... Maybe it was me…* (P6)

Participants expressed disbelief at their victim subject-positioning and insisted upon some responsibility which reveals their own lack of belief in their worthiness as victims of abuse (Allen, 2002; Fahlgren & Sawyer, 2011; Kramer, 2015; Kramer & Bowman, 2011). P3 describes not knowing that this behaviour was inappropriate and expresses that he only knew this behaviour was unacceptable because the perpetrator stopped when P3's brother walked in on the act. P3 states he felt '*it was wrong*' and yet, he would not have known it was wrong until incitement to discourse dictated that sex between an adult and a minor was wrong (Epstein, 2003; Foucault, 1987, 2012). Prior to the incitement to sex abuse discourse participants may not have regarded their experiences as traumatic (Levett, 1990). It is only through introduction to 'damaging' discourses that the participants framed their experiences as traumatic (Kramer, 2017; Levett, 1990).

4.2.2 Blame, Shame and Guilt

Participation in non-normative sex violates social norms and is thus considered culturally unacceptable (Kramer, 2015). Normative constructions of victimhood dictate that it is females and not males who experience sex abuse. As a result, when a male does experience sex abuse it is considered to be abnormal and the victim takes on the responsibility of the action leading to self-blame, guilt and shame. The shame that is associated with male victimhood is closely associated to the normative construction of sex abuse victims being female and not male. The shame is thus due to violating the normative constructions of masculinity by experiencing sex abuse that is largely associated with females.

For many years I didn't think I was a victim, I thought I was the problem… (P1)

Victim does have like a… A bad connotation to it you know? (P7)

P1's narrative implies that one is a '*problem*' if one has been abused and this thinking is indicative of the normative constructions of gender discourse. This implies that males who defy normative constuctions of sex abuse, by becoming victims, must be a '*problem'* as they are placed in a subject-position that is not associated with masculinity. P7 states that being a victim has a '*bad connotation'* to it reflecting the negativity and unfathomability surrounding male victimhood but also the stigma of shame that is associated with being a victim in a patriachal landscape such as South Africa. It is evident that male victimhood has been constituted as 'unlikely' and places participants in a circumstance whereby their experience of non-normative sex abuse is constituted as a '*problem*'. The shame and guilt associated with male victimhood is thus created through this gendered discourse.

And all the time it was happening I didn't see it as abuse because I was gay. (P1)

Further guilt and blame was placed on P1 because of his sexuality. Homosexuality is not heteronormative and so the experience of sex abuse was attributed to being gay. In blaming his sexuality P1 takes responsibility away from the perpetrator and places it upon himself. By doing this he associates his abuse with his sexuality and blames himself for the sex abuse because of his homosexuality. P1 further states that he, '*…Liked the sex*' which adds to the growing sense of shame and guilt and the participant places himself in a position which makes him responsible for the act and positions himself as the '*problem'*. In doing so the participant makes himself the *'problem'* in his narrative reflecting his own influence of normative constructions of sex abuse. In associating his sexuality to the abuse, P1 resists his occupation

of the victim subject-positioning as homosexuality and victimhood are not associated with one another.

> *And the thing that was most confusing to me was that I actually asked for it. So I actually turned around to her and I said, 'Teach me how to make love'.* (P2)

P2 frames his narrative such that he takes on guilt for allowing the sex abuse to occur. This demonstrates how P2 feels guilty because of his inability to stop the sex abuse and this is complicated further by the perpetrator being a female family friend. Abuse from a woman is considered more shameful because the inability to stop a woman reflects negatively on normative constructs of masculinity. Normative contructs of masculinity indicate that men are powerful and dominant over women and not the opposite way around. Thus, P2 takes responsibility for his compliance in the sex abuse and is confused because of the non-normative sex abuse and the loss of masculinity through being abused by a female – a concept which is unfathomable because men, and not women, are portrayed as perpetrators within South Africa. In this manner P2 resists his victim subject-positioning.

> *I had IQ tests done and stuff and I did the whole MENSA thing and, and actually it makes you feel a bit guilty if you told how clever you are and… Because you amounted to so little in your life. You've got so little to show for your life and you feel a bit guilty. If I'm really this bloody clever – why haven't I been able to do so much more with my life? And I don't know how much of it I can blame on one guy and a couple of incidents of which one was overtly sexual…* (P3)

P2 discusses his guilt of not achieving what he percieves to be expected from a person with a high intelligence quotient (IQ) (Baudson, 2016). MENSA is an organization which deals with those who have a higher IQ than most people. It consists of only those with abnormally high intellectual capabilities (Baudson, 2016). P3 feels he, "*…amounted to so little*," and questions if his lack of success is attributed to the MCSA experience. However, P3 resists victim subject-positioning through blaming himself for his failures in life and down-playing the impact of his experience with MCSA by saying, "*I don't know how much of it I can blame on one guy and a*

couple of incidents of which one was overtly sexual…" P3 resists victimhood through his self-blame and the downplaying of the sex abuse through indicating that a few encounters with sex abuse could not have impacted his life so severely. However, the resistance of the victim subject-position further indicates the disbelief of the male participant of the possibility of being a male victim of CSA (Kramer, 2015). The encompassing of self-blame and guilt gives rise to conditions of possibility allowing for the resistance and denial of the existence of MCSA and the occupation of victim subject-positioning (Kramer, 2015).

In allowing for self-blame, guilt and shame relating to the experience of MCSA, participants have resisted their subject-positioning as victims. However, in comparison, the occupation of the victim subject-position is much more challenging for male victims. Further to this, it appears that participants were in denial of their sex abuse - further indicating that male victimhood is unfathomable and thus, the invisibility of the male victim is reinterated. It is only through incitement to certain discourses that participants are able to create worthy narratives that allow for male victimhood to exist and be fathomable.

4.3 Incitement to Discourses of Damage

Discourse concerning sexual abuse implies that in order for one to occupy the subject-position of sexual abuse victim, one must be traumatized and thus draw on discourses of damage (Kramer, 2017; Levett, 1990). Levett (1990) argues that the construction of sex abuse creates an expectation that the experience 'must be' traumatic known as incitement to discourses of damage. These discourses of damage create subject-positioning that implies that all victims must express that they have been traumatized in order to be taken seriously as victims of sex abuse and thus occupy the victim subject-position (Allen, 2002; Foucault, 1987; Kramer, 2015; Levett, 1990). Participants in this study constructed trauma as a necessary consequence of

abuse. This necessary construction meant that participants needed to use unconsciously learnt discourses in order to legitimize their victim subject-positioning.

4.3.1 Access to Psychological Support

Psychological language is used in order to legitimize one's claim to victimhood and trauma (Anderson et al., 2001; Litosseliti & Sunderland, 2002). Participants who expressed that they had access to psychological support, such as a psychologist or support group, had access to specific language which was used to frame their narratives in a particular manner (Alaggia, 2005; Kramer, 2015, 2016; Levett, 1990, 2016). The psychological support that participants had access to incited discourses of trauma and victimhood which meant that participants could frame their experiences in order for their positioning as victims to be taken seriously (Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010; Martin & Silverstone, 2013; Martin & Powell, 1994). Participants expressed that they had access to psychological support stating:

> *That's when my mom and them took me to see a doctor then the doctor said I need to see a… psychologist.* (P1)
>
> *I've been to many psychologists. I've been for lots of counselling* (P2)
>
> *I had to go from psychologist to psychologist some afternoons* (P3)
>
> *I see my counsellor um, once every three weeks um, I've got my accountability partner um, then I've got one or two other men um, we've got a very strong men's group at church* (P4)
>
> *I went to see a family GP who wasn't really helpful who told me to go see a psychiatrist, the psychiatrist said it was because of the drugs (laughs). Uh, crazy. Ja. Crazy. And um, then I ended up seeing a psychologist who didn't really help at that point in time* (P6)
>
> *I'm much better now cause I've been seeing a psychologist* (P7)

This is indicative that of the seven participants, six had access to psychological help. This means that these participants were exposed to psychological discourse which means that

incitement to psychological discourse would have occurred. The use of psychological language would thus lead to new discourse that allows for a much easier occupation of the victim subject-positioning. This gives explanatory power to the victim narratives. Furthermore, the ability to speak to someone in a professional capacity acts as a 'confession' in allowing the victims to 'confess' their sex abuse.

4.3.2 Psychological Language

Levett (1990) speaks about the framing of experiences as traumatic and 'damaging' in order for a victim to occupy victim subject-positioning. Levett (1990) discusses that, whilst the experience may have been inherently traumatic, the way it is described to others uses specific discourses of damage in order to create a fathomable narrative of sex abuse. Psychological illustrations of sex abuse and trauma framed participants' narratives in very specific ways and, through the unconscious use of language, participants were able to legitimize their claims to occupy victim positioning within South Africa.

> *The first ten years of my life is a blank. I don't remember much; I don't even know if I was abused. I would say a lot of my memories are repressed.* (P1)

> *I'll never forget. Never forget the very first time. I had a complete out of body experience. A complete dissociation, very first time it ever happened, and I found myself looking at myself from the ceiling, completely detached from my body…* (P6)

> *These...these very fragmented flashbacks, memories that you can't place and so I can trace it kind of back to that age, but I can't tell you...'* (P4)

'Repression', '*dissociation*' and '*fragmented flashbacks*' are psychological concepts which are considered to be symptoms of sex abuse and trauma according to trauma discourse (Chu, 2011). These 'symptoms' are considered to be 'damaging' to the victim and thus, legitimizes participants' occupation of victim subject-positioning (Kramer, 2017; Levett, 1990). The use of psychological language further reads as a type of 'self-diagnosis'. P1, P4 and P6 have had access to psychological support which has allowed for incitement to sex abuse and trauma

discourse (Epstein, 2003). The incitement to discourse has unconsciously allowed participants to frame their experiences as 'traumatic' and this allowed for victim subject-positioning to be enabled. Thus, discourse has been unconsciously used to further reinforce worthiness of victimhood. Failure to describe one's experience in this manner and frame it within psychological discourse results in the failure of victim subject-positioning.

4.3.3 Post-Hoc Constructions of Trauma

The construction of sex abuse as 'traumatic' occurs in the period after the sex abuse when the participant is exposed to discourse that prescribes that being a victim of sex abuse must imply that one is 'damaged' (Levett, 1990; Sunderland, 2004). 'Damaged' is a term which, for the purpose of this study, refers to a person who has experienced trauma and as a result has sustained psychological distress. Trauma as a socially constructed concept implies that sex abuse is not inherently traumatic but is constructed as traumatic when exposed to trauma discourses such as the definition as given by Barlow and Durand (2015) which discusses that trauma may emerge when experiencing or witnessing a threatening event which can lead to psychological distress (Berns, 2001; Levett, 2016; Litosseliti & Sunderland, 2002). Symptoms such as experiencing intrusive flashbacks, thoughts, memories may only emerge when the victim makes the connection between their experience and the symptoms attributed with trauma (Mayne, 1993). The post-hoc construction of trauma suggests that, at the time of the incident, the sex abuse was not inherently traumatic however, the attribution of trauma occurred after the event (Mayne, 1993).

> *I only realized that now…because... I didn't even know it was wrong.* (P1)
>
> *The way he was talking I wasn't aware of what he was talking about…* (P5)
>
> *I think afterwards I just you know, put it at the back of my mind and tried never think about it again... I was too young to understand anything, so I just carried on with my*

> *life… So um, obviously, at that point in time I didn't feel like a victim because I didn't know what I was doing…* (P7)

Participants only constructed the sex abuse experience was '*wrong'* based on their exposure to sex abuse discourses later in life. P7 did not '*understand*' what occurred because he was only exposed to discourses regarding sex abuse later in life. The construction of sex abuse as 'traumatic' only occurs post-abuse (Levett, 1990; Mayne, 1993; Sunderland, 2004). P7 suggests that he was, '*too young to understand anything*' indicative of his vulnerability as a child. This childhood vulnerability allows for the construction of victimhood and is thus a condition of possibility for creating male victim subject-positioning (Kramer, 2017; Robinson, 2013). Through the use of trauma discourse P7 is able to construct his experience as traumatic and thus occupy victim subject-positioning. P1 did not realize sex abuse between a minor and an adult was *'wrong'* because he was only exposed to such discourse later in life and those constructed his understandings of what the sex abuse meant post-abuse. Participants' expressed their resistance, as children, in identifying as victims of sex abuse. This was attributed to the construction of their experiences as abuse only occurring in adulthood after incitement to trauma discourse had occurred.

> *Strange, I remember his name and his surname till today* (P1)

P1 describes his ability to remember his perpetrator's name as '*strange'*. This is because P1 has been exposed to discourse which dictates that one should have certain symptoms when one has experienced sex abuse. One of these symptoms is memory loss which is anticipated in a child victim (Chu, 2011; Taylor, Asmundson, & Carleton, 2006). Thus, trauma discourse has dictated that in order to be damaged one must not recall the name of the perpetrator of the crime (Matei, 2013). P1 describes this as '*strange'* only because he has constructed it around the trauma discourse presented to him as an adult.

The use of discourse has allowed for the occupation of victim subject-positioning. However, despite many MCSA victims wanting to be acknowledged as victims, discourse surrounding masculinity continues to prevail (Brickell, 2005; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). This leaves the victims feeling the need to reclaim their masculinity whilst still occupying the victim subject-positioning. This means that gender discourse comes into play allowing for men to reclaim the masculinity that sex abuse has taken from them.

4.4 Reclaiming Masculinity

Sex abuse is demasculinizing and impacts on a man's ability to feel and act masculine (Ganzevoort & Sremac, 2016). Constructions of masculinity imply that men are, at all times, stoic and domineering which directly contradicts what it means to be a victim (Brickell, 2005; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Weiss, 2010). For the participants, engaging in 'masculine' acts such as substance abuse and sexual behaviours were rationalized as acts occurring in order to reclaim the masculinity that was taken from them in the act of sex abuse (Gymnich, Ruhl, & Scheunemann, 2010, p. 46; Mullen, Watson, Swift, & Black, 2007). However, this also indicated that the particpants used reckless behaviours as a way to indicate that they were 'damaged' by the abuse which allows for victim subject-positioning to be occupied more easily.

4.4.1 Survivor Discourse

Participants in this study drew on normative constructions of victimhood. Through the use of discourse, participants maintained their masculinity whilst occupying victim subject-positioning. This occurred through the use of survivor discourse. Survivor is a term that implies courage, perseverance and heroism (Maercker & Müller, 2004). The use of the term 'survivor' is more easily orientated with masculinity discourse (Berns, 2001; Figley, 2013; Jordan, 2013;

Maercker & Müller, 2004). Through the use of survivor discourse, participants were able to reclaim their masculinity which may have been 'lost' in their experience of CSA as this experience does not align with masculinity discourse (Javaid, 2017).

Survivor discourse was used as a rationalizing mechanism in providing the participants with a manner of reassuring themselves of their masculinity. Participants continued to have masculine qualities of a survivor, which is largely associated with strength, rather than the label of a 'victim' which is largely associated with weakness (Figley, 2013, p. 399; Gavranidou & Rosner, 2003; Jordan, 2013). The subject-positioning of men as 'survivors' relies on the likelihood of females being the 'victims' of sex abuse in South Africa and thus occupying a 'weaker' and less desirable role (Gavranidou & Rosner, 2003). Weiss (2010, p.277) discusses that men who are victimized, "…contradict hegemonic definitions of male sexuality that require men to be sexually potent, dominant, and in control." This is indicative of the loss of masculinity and social power that comes with males who have experienced sex abuse (Weiss, 2010).

In order to reclaim masculinity the use of more powerful, strengthening and dominant discourse is used. The use of 'survivor' has implications of strength, triumph, heroism and power which align with masculine discourse (Brickell, 2005; Connell, 2014). Participants felt the need to reassure themselves of their survivor, rather than victim, subject-positioning.

> *Survivor is possibly a… a stronger, better word for myself as opposed to someone that's suffered from something… I prefer to look at it and feel it from a… position of strength as opposed to a, a position of weakness.* (P6)
>
> *Victim does have like a… A bad connotation to it you know?* (P7)

P6 insists upon being referred to as a 'survivor' rather than a 'victim'. P6 implicitly describes how survivor implies strength while victim denotes weakness. P6 opposes strength versus weakness and in doing so, opposes survivor and victimhood. This opposition is indicatory of the normative constructions of gender which create specific subject-positions for males and for females (Cooper, 2002; Mahalik, Burns, & Syzdek, 2007). The idea of the 'masculine' male implies and relies on the construct of the female as being the more worthy victim (Kramer, 2016). P6 maintains his position of dominance and masculinity through the resistance of the victim subject-positioning. P6 uses the words 'suffered' and 'weakness' in association with the word 'victim'. Both of these terms are associated with negative connotations (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Gavranidou & Rosner, 2003; Jordan, 2013; Maercker & Müller, 2004). Furthermore, P6 is reclaiming his masculinity in this extract as he associates his experience of CSA as something he was a 'survivor' of rather than a 'victim'. In doing this, P6 resists victimhood and the 'weak' connotations it holds and aligns himself with strength and triumph which align with normative constructions of masculinity which aligns with Figley's (2013, p.399) understandings of a 'survivor' being perceived as, 'a source of strength' and a victim as, 'immobilized' . In this manner, P6 reclaims his masculinity and distances himself from the 'weak' and 'immobilized' victim subject-positioning (Figley, 2013, p. 399).

P3 speaks about the survivor subject-positioning further stating, *"Survivor I think is somebody whose moved on from it… Survivor is when you've come through it.*" P2 relies on the normative gender constructions which indicate that being male is a position of strength while being female is a position of weakness (Cooper, 2002; Hansen, 2016; Mahalik et al., 2007). Through the use of survivor discourse, P3 reclaims his masculinity and resists occupying victim subject-positioning (Annis & Merron, 2014). P2 relies on the implied vulnerability of a victim to

support his subject-positioning as a survivor and thus, aligns himself with masculine discourse (Naples, 2003).

P2 focuses on the concept of 'moving on' as an indicator of strength and perseverance. He negates his abuse and victim status through the reliance on the implied vulnerability and weakness associated with being unable to move forward after abuse (Gavranidou & Rosner, 2003). He associates the ability to move forward and persevere with traits of strength, perseverance, courage, triumph and heroism. In doing this P2 constructs his experience of CSA within masculine norms which place him as a 'survivor' in a heroic position (Anderson, Beattie, & Spencer, 2001; Hansen, 2016; Jordan, 2013). P3 negates his positioning as a victim as this is a non-normative construction of masculinity (Brickell, 2005).

P6 questions this subject-positioning stating: *"I was sexually abused so… Is one… in that case a victim of it?"* Both P6 and P3 resist the acknowledgment, and subject-positioning, of male victimhood. P6 attempts to negate his victim subject-positioning through rhetorically questioning if he is 'worthy' of occupying victim subject-positioning. Normative constructions of sex abuse dictate that females are largely associated with sex abuse and victimhood (Cooper, 2002). This makes it difficult for males who have been sexually abused to occupy victim positioning. P6 questions his victimhood because he has been influenced by gendered constructions of masculinity which indicates that a male victim of CSA is inconceivable and unfathomable (Kramer, 2016).

P1 expressed his own confusion regarding his non-normative experience stating, "*For many years I didn't think I was a victim, I thought I was the problem*." The word '*problem*' has negative connotations to it and P1 opposes this term with the word with '*victim*'. Gendered

constructions of masculinity have dictated that victim subject-positioning is only occupied by females. Any non-normative experience of sex abuse and victimhood is considered a 'problem' as it challenged the norms which have been culturally enforced. P1 resists the occupation of victim subject-positioning because of normative constructions which indicate that being a 'victim' and a 'male' are inconceivable.

The use of the survivor discourse is an attempt to reduce the risk of being labelled as a male victim and reinforces the power of hegemonic masculinity within South Africa as those traits of dominance and strength associated with survival, and thus masculinity, are glorified (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Cowburn, 2005; Figley, 2013; Javaid, 2017). Participants had to negotiate their subject-positioning as victims and used discursive strategies in order to resist occupying victim subject-positioning (Foucault, 1987).

4.4.2 Substance Abuse

The abuse of substances such as alcohol and drugs was central to many of the participants' narratives and was indicative of the reclaiming of masculine roles after being emasculated through victim subject-positioning (Crossley, 1996; Foucault, 1982; Perrone & Goldfrank, 1995, p. 10). Amidst social constructions, which imply the impossibility of the male victim, participants' engaged in reckless behaviours to reclaim their masculine subject-positioning (Davies & Rogers, 2006; Kramer, 2016; Wilsnack et al., 1997). This pattern of coping with the loss of masculinity, as per social norms, emerged in all of the participants' talk which expressed that participants had practised some form of substance abuse involving either alcohol abuse, drug abuse or both.

P6 discusses his abuse of alcohol by stating that he, "*started to try and find various ways of releasing it [the trauma].*" The use of alcohol as a mechanism to 'release' the trauma is a 'masculine' coping mechanism which occurs in response to the loss of masculinity through sex abuse and is a form of resistance to the victim subject-position. This is in line with Lemle and Mishkind (1989) who proposed that, 'drinking reaffirms a male's masculinity.'

> *The drugs were wonderful because it blocked out a lot of pain. Emotional and physical… I loved drugs. Anything and everything, which led to stealing because I needed money for drugs…I was a total fuck up. I was in a mental institute… I was really fucked hey. I was stealing, I was doing drugs, I wasn't using my degree. I was fucked up hey… I tell you I was - I was injecting heroine in my toes so that my parole officer wouldn't see tracks…* (P1)
>
> *A bottle a day alcoholic… I drank a lot…* (P2)
>
> *…You start to act out at a very young age, experimenting with alcohol and um, ja, just, just, really becoming naughty if you like?[And] It was a case of taking drugs because it made me feel uh, as if I belonged…* (P6)
>
> *I think maybe drinking a lot um, drinking a shitload actually um, and there was also a phase where I was very into drugs as well…* (P7)

The extracts indicate that they needed to cope with the 'damage' of the sex abuse (Levett, 1990). This coping occurred through the use of alcohol and drugs (Perrone & Goldfrank, 1995; Sanders, 2011). While the use of substances may be attributed to the need to cope with the trauma of the event, the use of substance abuse is also indicative of the need to enable masculine subject-positioning and resist victim subject-positioning (Lemle & Mishkind, 1989). The patriarchal context of South Africa has implied that substance abuse is 'masculine' and thus, must be embedded within men in order for them to be categorized as masculine. However, this also indicates that participants associate their substance abuse with being 'damaged' from the sex abuse which is indicative of incitement to trauma discourse that dictates that one must cope using substances and behave recklessly in order for victim subject-positioning to occur (Epstein, 2003; Levett, 1990).

Participants engaged with substance abuse in order to reclaim masculinity but also to resist victim subject-positioning (Lemle & Mishkind, 1989). This occurs because MCSA is non-normative and thus, the participants engage in reckless behaviours such as substance abuse, sexual behaviours and other actions in order to reclaim what they have lost through victimhood.

4.4.3 Sexual Behaviours and Interests

Four of the seven participants expressed an interest, and later an addiction, to pornography which began after the incident of sex abuse occurred and followed them into adulthood (Martin & Silverstone, 2013). All of these participants expressed that they felt pornography was fascinating and enabled them to learn about sexual acts. In particular, participants reflected on the fact that they thought that the CSA impacted on their thoughts about sex and greatly influenced them to have non-normative sexual thoughts (Berns, 2001; Cowburn, 2005). It appears that heteronormative ideas around sex are largely accepted by the victims of sex abuse whilst anything that deviates from the heteronormative discourse is not accepted (Tadele, 2011). There was also a sense amongst the participants that pornography addiction worked in a manner to allow for non-heteronormative sexual thoughts to be released (Tadele, 2011).

For example, P5 states that, "*So that was a escape part for me was pornography".* Here P5 uses *'escape'* similarly to the use of the word '*release*' in the previous sections. The pornography is seen as an escape from the reality of heteronormative sex ideas and allows for non-heteronormative ideas and fetishes to be explored. Some of these ideas included interests such as the act of anal sex and pornography depicting abusive sexual behaviours which are largely considered non-heteronormative in the modern depiction of sex abuse.

> *Already my mind was going into directions which I had - to which I hadn't been exposed before… I suppose through the pornography and so on, anal sex did become a bit of a fascination.* (P6)
>
> *Once you start watching pornography then that also then shapes you in its own way so how much is from the original act?* (P6)
>
> *After both of those incidences and now I mean, very recently, now I think my sexuality has um, like, started to um, like fuck with me…* (P7)

P6 speaks about the fascination he had with anal sex which he felt was non-normative. The association of anal sex to a non-normative act further entrenches the idea that heterosexual sex is constructed as normative and anything deviating from it is non-normative (Dean, 2013; Lugones, 2007; Matebeni & Msibi, 2015; Tadele, 2011). P6 further questions '*the original act,'* which here refers to his experience of CSA. He grapples with whether his experience of CSA influenced the type of pornography he was interested in watching. Sex abuse discourse dictates that one must be 'damaged' in order to be a victim of abuse (Levett, 1990). P6 equates his watching of non-normative pornography to his experience of CSA. In this manner, he describes his behaviour as 'damaged' through his deviation from normative pornographic content (Levett, 1990; Javaid, 2017). This allows for conditions of possibility to arise that allow for the occupation of victim subject-positioning (Kramer, 2017).

> *I think I still think that the …. normal pornography or the normal sex doesn't intrigue me anymore so I'd always like tend to do… like these crazy sex positions or like… these fetishes you know… I think definitely after the second one [incident of abuse] I started being into more like… extreme type of porn you know?* (P7)

P7 opposes normal and non-normal sex through the use of the terms, '*normal pornography*' and '*normal sex*' . Through opposing the two types of pornography, P7 reinforces the binary between sexualities. He emphasizes the differences between heteronormative and non-heteronormative sexualities which reinforces the binary between the two (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Cowburn, 2005; Figley, 2013; Javaid, 2017). Through opposing the two

types of pornography, P7 constructs his own behaviour as 'abnormal' and attributes this to being 'damaged' by sex abuse (Levett, 1990).

> *[I] very quickly got addicted to pornography because of… something in you remember the feeling… you actually feel better if this happens…* (P7)

Here pornography acts as a reminder of the feeling which occurred during sexual abuse which challenges the idea that sexual abuse may only be experienced as traumatic. This reflects Levett (1990)'s claims that children's understanding of sexual abuse at the time of the incident may not adhere to the strict - and expected – trauma outcomes which have been socially constructed. These interviews indicate that there may have been a pleasurable aspect to the sexual abuse that remains with the victim long after the abuse occurred but may not be spoken about due to societal norms which dictate how a trauma victim 'should' behave and 'should' be feeling (Dutton & Painter, 1993; Levett, 1990, 2016). As a result, is appears that the victims self-diagnose how they *should* feel regarding the sex abuse. In doing so participants created their own conditions of possibility for occupying victim subject-positions.

The engagement with reckless behaviours and survivor discourse is discursively linked to masculinity and the need to reclaim masculinity lost through the experience of CSA (Cooper, 2002; Miller, 2014). The compensation for experiencing CSA is engaging in reckless behaviours to reclaim what abuse has taken from the males. In order to find other avenues of occupying victimhood subject-positions more easily, participants made use of childhood discourse in order to place themselves in a subject-position which emphasized childhood vulnerability and innocence (Robinson, 2008).

4.5 Childhood Vulnerability

Childhood is considered to be a time of innocence and naivety (Aries, 1965; Robinson, 2008). Normative constructions of childhood place children in a vulnerable subject-positioning which constructs childhood as a time of 'specialness' (Lupton, 1999, p. 86). The sex abuse experiences occurred when participants were children allowing for a condition of possibility which allows for occupation of the victim subject-positioning (Kramer, 2017). The older a victim becomes, the harder it becomes to occupy male victim subject-positioning however, childhood constructions of innocence allow for the victim subject-position to be occupied more easily (Kramer, 2017). Sex abuse is constructed to be immoral and thus, victims of sex abuse feel guilt, shame and blame (Dorahy & Clearwater, 2012; Finkelhor & Browne, 1985). However, blame is alleviated through the use of discourse surrounding childhood vulnerability and male victimhood is more easily accessible (Anderson, Beattie, & Spencer, 2001; Epstein, 2003).

4.5.1 Childhood Naivete

Children are constructed as vulnerable because they lack knowledge. In particular, children are constructed as lacking in understanding regarding sexual behaviours (Lupton, 1999, p. 87). The child is thus considered to be blameless in the act of sex abuse due to their naivete (Finkelhor, 1994). This lack of knowledge results in conditions of possibility which allow for the occupation of victim subject-positioning as adults (Kramer, 2017).

> *Here's this trusted individual that is sharing all this with me… so not only am I special because I get attention and, and all the rest of it, I'm special because* (sharp intake of breath*) they, he's telling me and showing me all these things too…* (P6)

> *I liked it, I liked attention*. (P1)

P1 and P6 describe feeling '*special'* and getting '*attention'* which are child-like concepts. These feelings indicate the naivete of the child and the trust the child has in the perpetrator, and other adults, during childhood (Finkelhor, 1994). This constructs the child as innocent and in doing so removes guilt and blame from the child and allows for the occupation of victim subject-positioning for the participant as an adult (Kramer, 2017). Further to this, the idea that the child is so trusting indicates the child's vulnerability which gives rise to conditions of possibility under which male victimhood is made plausible.

P1 speaks about his bond with his perpetrator and the loss of the attention, stating:

> *And it was like a big... loss for me… That I'd met this guy that was good for me, good to me and kind to me* (P1)
>
> *My whole life I thought he was my first love…* (P1)

P1 speaks of parting with his abuser with a sense of loss rather than, as expected, a sense of relief . He does not seem to acknowledge this perpetrator as an abuser but rather seems to see him in a loving manner which is later emphasized when he states, "*I loved the first one if that's possible to say I loved him?*" He also describes the end of the sex abuse as a '*loss'* for him as a child. Normative constructs of sex abuse have dictated that one must have feelings of anger and fear towards the perpetrator (Middleton, Sachs, & Dorahy, 2017). Levett (1990) discusses that due to childhood innocence and naivety sex abuse is not necessarily perceived as 'traumatic'. It is only through incitement to trauma discourse that the sex abuse is constructed as 'damaging' (Epstein, 2013; Foucault, 1987; Levett, 1990). This suggests that children are not traumatized by the sex abuse incident itself but rather, are 'damaged' by the exposure to trauma discourse in adulthood long after the incident occured (Jennings & Deming, 2015; Levett, 1990; Rogers & Davies, 2007; Ullman, 2007).

P1 further states that he thought the first perpetrator was his, "*first love,*" indicative of the fact that as a child, a lack of exposure to sex abuse discourse resulted in P1 seeing his abuser as a lover instead of a perpetrator of abuse (Kiser et al., 2014; Middleton, Sachs, & Dorahy, 2017). He was only aware of the experience being abusive when he was exposed to trauma discourse. The participant views this perpetrator as his *'first love'* which is unacceptable within social norms and places P1 in a 'damaged' subject-positioning creating easy access to victim subject-positioning (Middleton et al., 2017).

These participants indicated that in order to be a sex abuse victim one must use discourses of 'damage' in order for one to easily occupy victim subject-positioning (Kramer, 2017; Levett, 1990). The use of discourses of 'damage' allow for a much easier transition into victimhood (Kramer, 2017; Levett, 1990). Further discourses of childhood innocence such as the use of minimizing language allowed for participants to further engage with their victimhood and occupy victim subject-positioning.

4.5.2 Minimising Language

Participants discussed their experiences occurring in childhood using language that presented themselves as vulnerable and 'young'. The construction of age was drawn upon in order to reinforce their experience occurring in the childhood stage of their life (Lupton, 1999, p. 87). Minimising language was used in order to over-emphasize youth in order to reinforce childhood innocence and vulnerability. Childhood innocence and vulnerability allow for the male victims to easily occupy victimhood as construction of the victim in association with the child provides a condition of possibility for victim subject-positioning.

It... it affected me at eleven years quite badly. (P1)

I mean fuck, I'm 12 years old, what do I know? (P1)

Basically [it] started when I was 6 years old… I think due to the age both of us might just not have been strong enough at that stage… Because he was just 5 years older than me… (P4)

The use of the participant's age, '*eleven years*' is indicative of the innocence associated with the child at such a young age. P1 draws on the construction of age in order to further emphasises childhood vulnerability (Lupton, 1999, p. 88). The occupation of victimhood subject-positioning is enabled through the emphasis of youth (Kramer, 2017).

I mean bear in mind at a very young age like that you don't really have control over your emotion or, or, or feelings… (P2)

I suppose as a child I was always wanting to please people um, and look, I didn't um, exactly know what he was talking about… (P5)

I didn't have a concept of his age, being only 10. (P5)

I was too young to make a decision of my own. (P5)

I'm not, I'm not sure but I think what, what, what does tend to happen is you almost become desensitized to it and then, in your little mind it becomes a case of its not such a big deal… (P6)

The first incident happened when I was a very young child like uh, I think in uh, primary school… Um, yoh… [I was] extremely young… You know cause I mean, I'm young, I didn't… I didn't know what I was doing and um, I think when someone older tells you to do something you do it regardless no questions asked…(P7)

The participants draw on minimising language with terms such as '*little mind'*, '*…a very young child', 'I was too young'.* The use of this language depicts the child as being very small and emphasizes the lack of knowledge regarding sex abuse. This reinforces childhood innocence which allows for the participant to more-easily occupy the victim subject-positioning (Robinson, 2008, 2013). It further reinforces that the participants were *very* young at the time

of the abuse which allows for easy occupation of victim subject-positioning as a child is a fathomable victim whilst a male is not. Use of the child victim subject-positioning allows for the particpants to easily make claims upon victimhood.

> *It would have been games where we build a hide out somewhere in the garden and that would have been our, um, we called it our 'ruimte mannertjie' – our space man game – and so it will always be either a spaceship somewhere or um, a hidden bunker on the moon or something like that that we will play and that's where it happened.* (P4)

P4 drew on childhood innocence in a different way, recalling a game he would play with his brother. In describing this game, P4 positions himself as a child victim and easily occupies victim subject-positioning through his innocent and naïve story which over-emphasises his childhood innocence. In doing this he shifts the blame to his perpetrator and places himself in a child-like subject positioning which makes his victimhood believable.

Participants drew on childhood constructions in order to construct their sex abuse experience as fathomable and possible (Finkelhor, 1985; Levett, 1990). Through the use of childhood this is made possible as a child victim is much more believable than a male victim and thus, the use of childhood discourse allows for traction and further emphasizes vulunerability in childhood (Kramer, 2017). This allows for males to occupy victimhood easily and allow for their experiences to gain visibility.

4.6 Critical Reflections of Key Findings

This research explores the discourses surrounding male victims of CSA and investigates the way in which these discourses create invisibility for male victims of CSA within normative constructions of gender (Kramer, 2017). Further to this, the research explores how the described experiences of CSA are influenced by gender discourse and its focus on masculinity in South Africa (Brickell, 2005; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Weiss, 2010). The construct

of trauma as a necessary component of identifying as a 'victim' enabled participants to occupy a 'damaged' victim subject-positioning (Levett, 1990) . This was evident in the participants' narratives as the reproduction of 'damaged' discourses enabled participants to occupy victim subject-positioning (Kramer, 2017; Levett, 1990). Participants drew on discourses of trauma, sex abuse and gender in order to enable their positioning as male victims of CSA. In addition, the participants relied on the inherent vulnerability of the 'child' in order to further validate their worthiness as male victims of CSA (Epstein, 2013; Foucault, 1987; Lupton, 1999).

The participants drew on normative constructions of gender (Cooper, 2002; Mahalik, Burns, & Syzdek, 2007). Whilst participants engaged with discourses of damage they also grappled with the fathomability of male victimhood in the patriarchal context of South Africa (Kramer, 2016). Participants reclaimed their masculinity through the use of substances and sexual behaviours in order to align themselves with social constructs of what it means to be 'masculine' (Gymnich, Ruhl, & Scheunemann, 2010; Mullen, Watson, Swift, & Black, 2007). Overall, participants felt the need to validate their worthiness as a male victim of CSA within South Africa through positioning themselves as 'traumatized' and especially *child*, male victims of sex abuse (Levett, 1990).

Chapter 5: Implications, Limitations, Recommendations and Conclusion

5.1 Theoretical and Practical Implications

The objective of this research was to distinguish the discourses which emerged in male victims of CSA and how these discourses produce positions of invisibility for male victims of CSA (Davies & Rogers, 2006; Gorris, 2015; Kramer, 2017; van Niekerk et al., 2015). Further to this, the research aimed to examine how the narratives of MCSA victims were influenced by gender discourse, particularly masculinity, within South Africa (Anderson, Beattie, & Spencer, 2001; Berns, 2001; Foucault, 1987; Kramer, 2015, 2017; Litosseliti & Sunderland, 2002). This was achieved through critical examination of the narratives of males who had been sexually abused as children. Key findings were examined through a Faircloughian (1989-1995) Critical Discourse Analysis, within a Foucauldian framework, which allowed for the examination of the way in which participants used discourse to either validate their occupation, or resistance, of victim subject-positioning (Kramer, 2017).

The study aimed to exemplify that normative discourses allow for the male victim of CSA to become fathomable (Cooper, 2002; Gergen, 1985; Hansen, 2016; Kramer, 2015; Matebeni & Msibi, 2015). Through the use of the theoretical tools mentioned above, and by observing how participants drew on normative constructions of sex abuse, gender and trauma, one implication from the study is that male victimhood is indeed possible. A second implication is that discourses of damage, such as those described by Levett (1990), are a necessary condition in order for participants to identify as male victims of CSA. This has further implications for how trauma, and sex abuse, is perceived and the expectations that are placed on victims' narratives in order for their experiences to be believed (Matei, 2013). The participants had to frame their CSA experience as one which was 'damaging' in order for them to occupy victim subject-

positioning which implies that narratives that are not framed according to normative constructions of sex abuse are not considered to be unfathomable (Levett, 1990). Despite there being acknowledgement of victims of sex abuse, the acknowledgment only occurs if normative constructs are present in the narrative of the victim (Cooper, 2002; Levett, 1990; Mahalik, Burns, & Syzdek, 2007; Matebeni & Msibi, 2015).

This reveals how there are particular ways of constituting knowledge based on context. In South Africa, masculinity is considered to be associated with strength while femininity is considered to be associated with weakness and thus, victimhood is associated with femininity (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Kramer & Bowman, 2011; van Niekerk et al., 2015). This means that male victimhood is difficult to occupy within South Africa as the patriarchal society relies on men being in a position of strength. However, discourses of damage reveal a 'weakness' in men that makes it difficult to disclose regarding CSA but also makes their stories unfathomable in the patriarchal landscape (Levett, 1990).

One of the practical implications following from this study is thus that is necessary to create awareness of the way in which knowledge regarding sex abuse and trauma is constituted as well as the way in which masculinity is framed in South Africa and the difficulties male victims face by disclosing in a patriarchal landscape. Significantly, this study contributes practically to the growing literature on MCSA and discourses of damage.

5.2 Study Limitations

The participants in this study consisted of male victims of child sexual abuse. One limitation is that this study examined the narratives of only those 7 participants. This is a small group of participants and thus limits the data that was collected in the study. A second limitation is the

recruitment process itself because the call for participation was largely through social media thus excluding many victims without access to the internet. The greater population of South Africa comes from a low socio-economic status (SES) and so, these results may not be an accurate portrayal of the trauma experienced by others within poorer regions of South Africa (Ataguba, Akazili, & McIntyre, 2011; Mayer & Barnard, 2015). This is necessary to consider as the participant narratives may differ from those who have lived in different cultural contexts characterised by limited resources. In particular, discourse would differ greatly depending on the social context.

In a low SES area, most inhabitants would not have exposure to psychological discourse and as such, their understandings of trauma would not be informed by psychological language. This means that the discourse influencing lower SES communities would differ greatly from the discourse that a community of higher SES would have been exposed to and thus the various narratives depend on different discursive mechanisms. Further to this, participants in this study had the opportunity to attend higher education institutions which means that they were able to have tertiary education should they have wished to do so (Visser, Juan, & Feza, 2015). This means that all participants were highly educated which would have further added to the way in which they framed their narratives (Visser et al., 2015).

Lower SES communities are at greater risk for violence (Dubow, Huesmann, Boxer, & Smith, 2016). This means that there would be higher incidences of sex abuse within these communities and greater incidences of violence which would change the data (Jewkes & Morrell, 2018; Zuze et al., 2016). This means that the perpetrator of the abuse and the level of violence involved in the sex abuse would be very different compared to the sex abuse within the middle-class to upper-class income bracket where violence is not as rampant. Furthermore, majority

of South Africa consists of black people, 76.4% as of 2011 (Statistics South Africa, 2011), and this study only interviewed one black male in contrast to six white males (Westermann, 2018). The fact that other racial groups are not represented in the study suggests that some victims of MCSA are more visible than others in South Africa.

5.3 Future Recommendations

Sex abuse is rampant worldwide however, South Africa is the rape capital of the world (Jewkes & Morrell, 2018). In light of this, this study has global relevance as it adds to the growing literature of sex abuse worldwide but also allows for more knowledge to be gained regarding South Africa and the sex abuse occuring here as compared to that occuring globally. This will allow for comparisons to be drawn regarding sex abuse and understandings of violence in context and its influence on sex abuse statistics.

In terms of the study limitations outlined above, it is recommended that future research targets populations that present with more varied racial, economic and cultural backgrounds within South Africa in order to explore the way trauma emerges in the narratives of male victims who have experienced CSA and to focus particularly on how constructions of masculinity, trauma and sex abuse shape these narratives and emerge differently across these contexts. A more varied participant pool would allow us to determine if trauma and MCSA presents differently at the intersections of race, culture and economy (Glaeser, Kahn, & Rappaport, 2008).

It is further recommended that the research is viewed in a global context of sex abuse incidents to understand the impact of a violent landscape as compared to sex abuse in less violent contexts. Lastly, future research efforts should examine the vulnerabilities of male children within South Africa and investigate a way of implementing interventions at a childhood level.

Lastly, future research efforts should examine the vulnerabilities of male children within South Africa and investigate various ways of intervening at a childhood level.

5.4 Conclusion

The aim of this research was to distinguish the discourse surrounding male victims of CSA and explore the way in which these discourses create invisibility for male victims of CSA within normative constructions of gender (Kramer, 2017). The research further aimed to assess how the narratives of MCSA victims were manipulated by gender discourse, particularly masculinity, within South Africa (Litosseliti & Sunderland, 2002). This was achieved through examining the discourses used by the participants during their interviews. The interviews were then subjected to Fairclough's (1989-1995) Critical Discourse Analysis. This allowed for examination of the manner in which normative constructions of sex abuse, trauma and gender influenced the way participants framed their sex abuse narratives (Hansen, 2016; Mahalik et al., 2007). The research illustrated that discourses of damage are a necessary condition for the occupation of victim subject-positioning and thus, allow for male victims of CSA to become visible (Levett, 1990).

Participants both occupied and resisted victim subject-positioning. Subject-positioning allowed for the participants to justify and resist victimhood as, in their minds, their abuse can only be attributed to their own actions. This was indicative of the difficulty of being both a victim and a male in a patriarchal landscape that glorifies male strength and views victimhood as a weakness (Kramer, 2017). As such, the various participant narratives reflected that victim subject-postioning was challenging for males as constructions of masculinity in South Africa created a strong and stoic man and thus, did not allow for male vulnerability (Henderson, 2007). Thus, occupation of victim subject-positioning was only made possible through the use of

discourses of damage and the use of narratives reflecting childhood innocence (Levett, 1990; Robinson, 2013). Childhood innocence allowed for participants to create post-hoc constructions of their abuse which allowed for them to further occupy victim subject-positioning (Robinson, 2013).

This study falls within the social constructionist paradigm which highlights the normative constructions of sex abuse, trauma and gender (Gergen, 1985). It illustrated how males are consistently viewed in a position of strength and that victimhood is considered a weak position which cannot be associated with masculinity (Henderson, 2007; Kramer, 2017). The study has thus revealed that occupation of victim subject-positioning is only possible for males who have been sexually abused as children if discourses of damage are used. This revealed that trauma is a necessary result of sex abuse and it is thus used as a tool to occupy victim subject-positioning (Levett, 1990). This allows for male victims to become visible and fathomable. This study thus provides an understanding of the discourses which are used by male victims in order to allow for visibility in their sex abuse narratives.

References

Alaggia, R. (2005). Disclosing the Trauma of Child Sexual Abuse: A Gender Analysis. *Journal of Loss and Trauma*, *10*(5), 453–470. https://doi.org/10.1080/15325020500193895

Alaggia, R., & Millington, G. (2008). Male Child Sexual Abuse: A Phenomenology of Betrayal. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, *36*(3), 265–275. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10615-007-0144-y

Aldridge, M., & Luchjenbroers, J. (2007). Linguistic manipulations in legal discourse: Framing questions and 'smuggling' information. *International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law*, *14*(1), 85–107.

Allen, A. (2002). Power, Subjectivity, and Agency: Between Arendt and Foucault. *International Journal of Philosophical Studies*, *10*(2), 131–149. https://doi.org/10.1080/09672550210121432

Alexander, K. W., Quas, J. A., Goodman, G. S., Ghetti, S., Edelstein, R. S., Redlich, A. D., … Jones, D. P. H. (2005). Traumatic Impact Predicts Long-Term Memory for Documented Child Sexual Abuse. *Psychological Science*, *16*(1), 33–40. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.00777.x

Anderson, I., Beattie, G., & Spencer, C. (2001). Can Blaming Victims of Rape be Logical? Attribution Theory and Discourse Analytic Perspectives. *Human Relations*, *54*(4), 445–467. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726701544003

Anderson, D. K., & Saunders, D. G. (2003). Leaving An Abusive Partner: An Empirical Review of Predictors, the Process of Leaving, and Psychological Well-Being. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *4*(2), 163–191. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838002250769

Annis, B., & Merron, K. (2014). *Gender intelligence: Breakthrough strategies for increasing diversity and improving your bottom line* (First edition). New York: Harper Business, An imprint of HarperCollins Publishers.

Aries, P. (1965). *Centuries of childhoods: A social history of family life.* New York: Vintage Books.

Ataguba, J. E., Akazili, J., & McIntyre, D. (2011). Socioeconomic-related health inequality in South Africa: evidence from General Household Surveys. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, *10*, 48. https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-9276-10-48

Babbie, E. R., & Mouton, J. (2001). *The practice of social research* (South African ed). Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.

Back, S., & Lips, H. M. (1998). Child sexual abuse: victim age, victim gender, and observer gender as factors contributing to attributions of responsibility. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *22*(12), 1239–1252. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134(98)00098-2

Badoe, E. (2017). A critical review of child abuse and its management in Africa. *African Journal of Emergency Medicine*, *7*, S32–S35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.afjem.2017.09.002

Banda, F. (2006). Women, Law and Human Rights in Southern Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, *32*(1), 13–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057070500493720

Barlow, D. H., Durand, V. M., & Hofmann, S. G. (2018). *Abnormal psychology: An integrative approach* (Eighth edition). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Barron, K. (1999). Ethics in qualitative social research on marginalized groups. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, *1*(1), 38–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/15017419909510736

Barth, J., Bermetz, L., Heim, E., Trelle, S., & Tonia, T. (2013). The current prevalence of child sexual abuse worldwide: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Public Health*, *58*(3), 469–483. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-012-0426-1

Berns, N. (2001). Degendering the problem and gendering the blame: Political Discourse on Women and Violence. *Gender & Society*, *15*(2), 262–281. https://doi.org/10.1177/089124301015002006

Baudson, T. G. (2016). The Mad Genius Stereotype: Still Alive and Well. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7*, 368. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00368

Blanche, M. T., Blanche, M. J. T., Durrheim, K., & Painter, D. (2006). *Research in Practice: Applied Methods for the Social Sciences*. South Africa: Juta and Company Ltd.

Borgida, E., & White, P. (1978). Social perception of rape victims. *Law and Human Behavior*, *2*(4), 339–351. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01038986

Breslau, N. (2002). Gender differences in trauma and posttraumatic stress disorder. *The Journal of Gender-Specific Medicine: JGSM: The Official Journal of the Partnership for Women's Health at Columbia*, *5*(1), 34–40.

Brickell, C. (2005). Masculinities, Performativity and Subversion: A Sociological Reappraisal. *Men and Masculinities*, *8*(1), 24–43. https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X03257515

Briere, J., & Rickards, S. (2007). Self-Awareness, Affect Regulation, and Relatedness: Differential Sequels of Childhood Versus Adult Victimization Experiences. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, *195*(6), 497. https://doi.org/10.1097/NMD.0b013e31803044e2

Briggs, S., Goldblatt, M. J., Lindner, R., Maltsberger, J. T., & Fiedler, G. (2012). Suicide and trauma: A case discussion. Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy, 26(1), 13–33. https://doi.org/10.1080/02668734.2011.652657

Butler, J. (1986). Sex and Gender in Simone de Beauvoir's Second Sex. *Yale French Studies*, (72), 35. https://doi.org/10.2307/2930225

Butler, J. (1988). Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory. *Theatre Journal*, *40*(4), 519–531. https://doi.org/10.2307/3207893

Butler, J. (2010). Performative agency. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, *3*(2), 147–161. https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2010.494117

Carpenter, R. C. (2003). 'Women and Children First': Gender, Norms, and Humanitarian Evacuation in the Balkans 1991–95. *International Organization*, *57*(04). https://doi.org/10.1017/S002081830357401X

Carpenter, R.C. (2005). Women, Children and Other Vulnerable Groups: Gender, Strategic Frames and the Protection of Civilians as a Transnational Issue. *International Studies Quarterly*, *49*(2), 295–334. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0020-8833.2005.00346.x

Chaudoir, S. R., & Fisher, J. D. (2010). The disclosure processes model: Understanding disclosure decision-making and post-disclosure outcomes among people living with a concealable stigmatized identity. *Psychological Bulletin*, *136*(2), 236–256. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018193

Chu, J. A. (2011). *Rebuilding Shattered Lives: Treating Complex PTSD and Dissociative Disorders*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Clark, D. B., Lesnick, L., & Hegedus, A. M. (1997). Traumas and Other Adverse Life Events in Adolescents With Alcohol Abuse and Dependence. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *36*(12), 1744–1751. https://doi.org/10.1097/00004583-199712000-00023

Connell, R. W. (2014). *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Stanford: John Wiley & Sons.

Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. *Gender & Society, 19*(6), 829–859. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639

Cooper, B. (2002). Boys Don't Cry and female masculinity: reclaiming a life & dismantling the politics of normative heterosexuality. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, *19*(1), 44–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/07393180216552

Copenhaver, M. M., Lash, S. J., & Eisler, R. M. (2000). Masculine Gender-Role Stress, Anger, and Male Intimate Abusiveness: Implications for Men's Relationships. *Sex Roles*, *42*(5), 405–414. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007050305387

Cowburn, M. (2005). Hegemony and discourse: Reconstruing the male sex offender and sexual coercion by men. *Sexualities, Evolution & Gender, 7*(3), 215–231. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616660500231665

Cox, R. D. (2012). Teaching Qualitative Research to Practitioner–Researchers. *Theory Into Practice*, *51*(2), 129–136. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2012.662868

Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act. (2007). *Government Gazette.* (No. 30599).

Crossley, N. (1996). Body-Subject/Body-Power: Agency, Inscription and Control in Foucault and Merleau-Ponty. *Body & Society*, *2*(2), 99–116. https://doi.org/10.1177/1357034X96002002006

Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, *20*(1), 43–63. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.1990.tb00174.x

Davies, M. (2002). Male sexual assault victims: a selective review of the literature and implications for support services. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *7*(3), 203–214. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789(00)00043-4

Davies, M., & Rogers, P. (2006). Perceptions of male victims in depicted sexual assaults: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *11*(4), 367–377. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2006.01.002

Dean, J. J. (2013). Heterosexual Masculinities, Anti-homophobias, and Shifts in Hegemonic Masculinity: The Identity Practices of Black and White Heterosexual Men. *The Sociological Quarterly, 54*(4), 534–560. https://doi.org/10.1111/tsq.12036

Demetriou, D. Z. (2013). Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity: A critique. *Theory and Society, 30*(3), 337–361. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1017596718715

Diamond, I., & Quinby, L. (1988). *Feminism & Foucault: Reflections on Resistance*. Massachusetts: Northeastern University Press.

Domhardt, M., Münzer, A., Fegert, J. M., & Goldbeck, L. (2015). Resilience in Survivors of Child Sexual Abuse: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *16*(4), 476–493. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838014557288

Dorahy, M. J., & Clearwater, K. (2012). Shame and Guilt in Men Exposed to Childhood Sexual Abuse: A Qualitative Investigation. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, *21*(2), 155–175. https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2012.659803

Dubow, E. F., Huesmann, L. R., Boxer, P., & Smith, C. (2016). Childhood and adolescent risk and protective factors for violence in adulthood. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *45*, 26–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2016.02.005

Dutton, D. G., & Painter, S. (1993). Emotional attachments in abusive relationships: a test of traumatic bonding theory. *Violence and Victims*, *8*(2), 105–120.

Epstein, S. (2003). An Incitement to Discourse: Sociology and the History of Sexuality. *Sociological Forum, 18*(3), 485–502. Retrieved from JSTOR.

Fahlgren, S., & Sawyer, L. (2011). The power of positioning: on the normalisation of gender, race/ethnicity, nation and class positions in a Swedish social work textbook. *Gender and Education*, *23*(5), 535–548. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2010.511605

Fairclough, N. L. (1985). Critical and descriptive goals in discourse analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 9*(6), 739–763. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(85)90002-5

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routeledge

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Oxford: Polity Press, Blackwell Publishing

Fairclough, N. (1995) cited in Janks, H. (1997). Critical discourse analysis as a research tool. Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education, 18(3), 329-342

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing Discourse*. London: Routledge

Fairclough, N. (2012). Critical discourse analysis. *International Advances in Engineering and Technology*, 7, 452-487

Figley, C. R. (2013). *Trauma And Its Wake*. London: Routledge.

Filipas, H. H., & Ullman, S. E. (2006). Child Sexual Abuse, Coping Responses, Self-Blame, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, and Adult Sexual Revictimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *21*(5), 652–672. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260506286879

Finkelhor, D. (1984). *Child sexual abuse : new theory and research*. New York: Free Press.

Finkelhor, D. (1987). The Trauma of Child Sexual Abuse: Two Models. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *2*(4), 348–366. https://doi.org/10.1177/088626058700200402

Finkelhor, D. (1994). The international epidemiology of child sexual abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *18*(5), 409–417.

Finkelhor, D., & Browne, A. (1985). The traumatic impact of child sexual abuse: A conceptualization. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *55*(4), 530–541. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.1985.tb02703.x

Finkelhor, D., Hotaling, G., Lewis, I. A., & Smith, C. (1990). Sexual abuse in a national survey of adult men and women: Prevalence, characteristics, and risk factors. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *14*(1), 19–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/0145-2134(90)90077-7

Finlay, L. (2002). Negotiating the swamp: the opportunity and challenge of reflexivity in research practice. *Qualitative Research*, *2*(2), 209–230. https://doi.org/10.1177/146879410200200205

Fisher, P. (2012). Ethics in Qualitative Research: 'Vulnerability', Citizenship and Human Rights. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, *6*(1), 2–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/17496535.2011.591811

Fortier, M. A., DiLillo, D., Messman-Moore, T. L., Peugh, J., DeNardi, K. A., & Gaffey, K. J. (2009). Severity of Child Sexual Abuse and Revictimization: The Mediating Role of Coping and Trauma Symptoms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *33*(3), 308–320. https://doi.org/10.1177/036168430903300306

Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry*, *8*(4), 777–795. https://doi.org/10.1086/448181

Foucault, M. (1987). *The History of Sexuality: The use of pleasure*. New York: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison* (2nd Vintage Books ed). New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (2012). *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. New York: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.

Freyd, J. J. (1998). *Betrayal Trauma: The Logic of Forgetting Childhood Abuse*. Cambridge, MA, US: Harvard University Press.

Fu, Y. (2011). Designing qualitative research. *Organization Management Journal*, *8*(3), 193–195. https://doi.org/10.1057/omj.2011.23

Ganzevoort, R. R., & Sremac, S. (2016). Masculinity, Spirituality, and Male Wartime Sexual Trauma. In Y. Ataria, D. Gurevitz, H. Pedaya, & Y. Neria (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary Handbook of Trauma and Culture* (pp. 339–351). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-29404-9_21

Gavranidou, M., & Rosner, R. (2003). The weaker sex? Gender and post-traumatic stress disorder. *Depression and Anxiety, 17*(3), 130–139. https://doi.org/10.1002/da.10103

George, W. H., & Martínez, L. J. (2002). Victim Blaming in Rape: Effects of Victim and Perpetrator Race, Type of Rape, and Participant Racism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26*(2), 110–119. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.00049

Gergen, K. J. (1985). The Social Constructionist Movement in Modern Psychology. *American Psychologist, 40*(3), 266–275. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.40.3.266

Glaeser, E. L., Kahn, M. E., & Rappaport, J. (2008). Why do the poor live in cities? The role of public transportation. *Journal of Urban Economics*, *63*(1), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jue.2006.12.004

Goktan, A. B., & Gupta, V. K. (2015). Sex, gender, and individual entrepreneurial orientation: evidence from four countries. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal, 11*(1), 95–112. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-013-0278-z

Goodrich, P. (1987). The Role of Linguistics in Legal Analysis. In P. Goodrich (Ed.), *Legal Discourse: Studies in Linguistics, Rhetoric and Legal Analysis* (pp. 63–81). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-08818-8_4

Gorris, E. A. P. (2015). Invisible victims? Where are male victims of conflict-related sexual violence in international law and policy? *European Journal of Women's Studies*, *22*(4), 412–427. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506815605345

Gotell, L. (2002). The Ideal Victim, the Hysterical Complainant, and the Disclosure of Confidential Records: The Implications of the Charter for Sexual Assault Law. *Osgoode Hall Law Journal*, *40*(3), 251–295.

Gray, M. (2006). The progress of social development in South Africa. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, *15*, S53–S64. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2397.2006.00445.x

Gymnich, M., Ruhl, K., & Scheunemann, K. (2010). *Gendered (Re)Visions: Constructions of Gender in Audiovisual Media*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Hansen, M. P. (2016). Non-normative critique: Foucault and pragmatic sociology as tactical re-politicization. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *19*(1), 127–145. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431014562705

Hatchell, H. (2006). Masculinities and Violence: Interruption of hegemonic discourses in an English classroom. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *27*(3), 383–397. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596300600838843

Heber, A. (2012). Criminal, Crime Victim, or John Smith? Constructions of Victimhood and Perpetratorship Among Swedish Probationers. *International Criminal Justice Review, 22*(2), 171–191. https://doi.org/10.1177/1057567712443964

Helliwell, C. (2018). Sex/Gender Distinction. In H. Callan (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology* (pp. 1–2). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118924396.wbiea1393

Henderson, H. (2007). Feminism, Foucault, and Rape: A Theory and Politics of Rape Prevention. *Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law & Justice*, *22*(1), 225. https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38M90226M

Herek, G. (1986). On Heterosexual Masculinity: Some Psychical Consequences of the Social Construction of Gender and Sexuality. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *29*(5), 563–577. https://doi.org/10.1177/000276486029005005

Herman, J. (2012). CPTSD is a distinct entity: Comment on Resick et al. (2012). *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, *25*(3), 256–257. https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.21697

Hey, V. (2006). The politics of performative resignification: translating Judith Butler's theoretical discourse and its potential for a sociology of education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *27*(4), 439–457. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690600802956

Hobbs, A. (2013). Masculinity Studies and Literature. *Literature Compass, 10*(4), 383–395. https://doi.org/10.1111/lic3.12057

Holmes, W. C., & Slap, G. B. (1998). Sexual abuse of boys: Definition, prevalence, correlates, sequelae, and management. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *280*(21), 1855–1862.

Javaid, A. (2017). The Unknown Victims: Hegemonic Masculinity, Masculinities, and Male Sexual Victimisation. *Sociological Research Online*, *22*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.5153/sro.4155

Jennings, J. L., & Deming, A. (2015). Review of the Empirical and Clinical Support for Group Therapy Specific to Sexual Abusers. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 1079063215618376. https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063215618376

Jewkes, R., & Morrell, R. (2018). Hegemonic Masculinity, Violence, and Gender Equality: Using Latent Class Analysis to Investigate the Origins and Correlates of Differences between Men. *Men and Masculinities*, *21*(4), 547–571. https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X17696171

Jordan, J. (2013). From victim to survivor - and from survivor to victim: Reconceptualising the survivor journey. *Sexual Abuse in Australia and New Zealand*, *5*(2), 48.

Kaiser, A. (2012). Re-Conceptualizing "Sex" and "Gender" in the Human Brain. *Zeitschrift Für Psychologie*, *220*(2), 130–136. https://doi.org/10.1027/2151-2604/a000104

Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with Patriarchy. *Gender & Society*, *2*(3), 274–290. https://doi.org/10.1177/089124388002003004

Kehily, M. J. (2008). *An Introduction to Childhood Studies*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Kiser, L. J., Stover, C. S., Navalta, C. P., Dorado, J., Vogel, J. M., Abdul-Adil, J. K., … Briggs, E. C. (2014). Effects of the child–perpetrator relationship on mental health outcomes of child abuse: It's (not) all relative. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *38*(6), 1083–1093. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2014.02.017

Klein, W. M. P. (2001). Post Hoc Construction of Self-Performance and Other Performance in Self-Serving Social Comparison. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*(6), 744–754. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201276009

Kramer, S. (2015). Surfacing (im)possible victims: A critical review of the role of gender, sexuality and power in constructing the conditions of possibility for South African victims of female sex crimes. *Sexualities*, *18*(3), 346–372. https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460714544808

Kramer, S. (2016). Cultural conditions for identity disruptions in violence: Possible perpetrators and worthy victims? *International Journal of Psychology*, *51*, 297.

Kramer, S. (2017). *Female-Perpetrated Sex Abuse: Knowledge, Power, and the Cultural Conditions of Victimhood*. South Africa: Routledge.

Kramer, S., & Bowman, B. (2011). Accounting for the 'invisibility'of the female paedophile: An expert-based perspective from South Africa. *Psychology & Sexuality*, *2*(3), 244–258.

Kramer, S., & Ratele, K. (2012). Young Black Men's Risk to Firearm Homicide in Night Time Johannesburg, South Africa: a Retrospective Analysis based on the National Injury Mortality Surveillance System. *African Safety Promotion: A Journal of Injury and Violence Prevention*, *10*(2), 16-28–28.

Lemle, R., & Mishkind, M. E. (1989). Alcohol and masculinity. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, *6*(4), 213–222. https://doi.org/10.1016/0740-5472(89)90045-7

Levett, A. (1990). Childhood Sexual Abuse and Problems in Conceptualisation. *Agenda*, *6*(7), 38–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.1990.9675091

Levett, A. (2016). A Study of Childhood Sexual Abuse among South African University Women Students: *South African Journal of Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124638901900302

Litosseliti, L., & Sunderland, J. (2002). *Gender Identity and Discourse Analysis*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2011). *Qualitative communication research methods* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE.

Lorber, J. (1990). *The Social construction of gender*. California: Sage Publications.

Lovell, T. (2003). Resisting with Authority: Historical Specificity, Agency and the Performative Self. *Theory, Culture & Society, 20*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276403020001918

Luchjenbroers, J., & Aldridge, M. (2007). Conceptual manipulation by metaphors and frames: Dealing with rape victims in legal discourse. *Text & Talk - An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse Communication Studies*, *27*(3), 339–359. https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2007.014

Lugones, M. (2007). Heterosexualism and the Colonial/Modern Gender System. *Hypatia*, *22*(1), 186–219. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2007.tb01156.x

Lupton, D. (1999). *Risk and Sociocultural Theory: New Directions and Perspectives*. New South Wales: Cambridge University Press.

Maercker, A., & Müller, J. (2004). Social Acknowledgment as a Victim or Survivor: A Scale to Measure a Recovery Factor of PTSD. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, *17*(4), 345–351. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOTS.0000038484.15488.3d

Mahalik, J. R., Burns, S. M., & Syzdek, M. (2007). Masculinity and perceived normative health behaviors as predictors of men's health behaviors. *Social Science & Medicine*, *64*(11), 2201–2209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.02.035

Martin, P. Y., & Powell, R. M. (1994). Accounting for the "Second Assault": Legal Organizations' Framing of Rape Victims. *Law & Social Inquiry*, *19*(04), 853–890. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-4469.1994.tb00942.x

Martin, E. K., & Silverstone, P. H. (2013). How Much Child Sexual Abuse is "Below the Surface," and Can We Help Adults Identify it Early? *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, *4*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2013.00058

Matebeni, Z., & Msibi, T. (2015). Vocabularies of the non-normative. *Agenda*, *29*(1), 3–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.2015.1025500

Matei, M.G. (2013). The Linguistic Mechanisms of Trauma Discourse. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 92*, 517–522. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.08.711

May, L. (2017). *Applied Ethics: A Multicultural Approach*. Boston: Routledge.

Mayer, C. H., & Barnard, A. (2015). Balancing the Scales of Gender and Culture in Contemporary South Africa. In S. Safdar & N. Kosakowska-Berezecka (Eds.), *Psychology of Gender Through the Lens of Culture: Theories and Applications* (pp. 327–349). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-14005-6_16

Mayne, A. (1993). Discourse on Damage: The Debate Continues. *Agenda*, *9*(16), 19–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.1993.9675246

McLaren, M. A. (2012). *Feminism, Foucault, and Embodied Subjectivity*. Albany, New York: SUNY Press.

Middleton, W., Sachs, A., & Dorahy, M. J. (2017). The abused and the abuser: Victim–perpetrator dynamics. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, *18*(3), 249–258. https://doi.org/10.1080/15299732.2017.1295373

Miller, M. W., Wolf, E. J., & Keane, T. M. (2014). Posttraumatic Stress Disorder in DSM-5: New Criteria and Controversies. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *21*(3), 208–220. https://doi.org/10.1111/cpsp.12070

Morrell, R., Jewkes, R., & Lindegger, G. (2012). Hegemonic Masculinity/Masculinities in South Africa: Culture, Power, and Gender Politics. *Men and Masculinities*, *15*(1), 11–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X12438001

Mullen, K., Watson, J., Swift, J., & Black, D. (2007). Young men, masculinity and alcohol. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, *14*(2), 151–165. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687630600997816

Mumby, D. K. (1998). Organizing Men: Power, Discourse, and the Social Construction of Masculinity(s) in the Workplace. *Communication Theory, 8*(2), 164–183. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1998.tb00216.x

Mruck, K., & Breuer, F. (2003). Subjectivity and Reflexivity in Qualitative Research—The FQS Issues. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 4*(2). https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-4.2.696

Musmade, P., Nijhawan, L., Udupa, N., Bairy, K., Bhat, K., Janodia, M., & Muddukrishna, B. (2013). Informed consent: Issues and challenges. *Journal of Advanced Pharmaceutical Technology & Research*, *4*(3), 134. https://doi.org/10.4103/2231-4040.116779

Naples, N. A. (2003). Deconstructing and Locating Survivor Discourse: Dynamics of Narrative, Empowerment, and Resistance for Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse.

Journal of Women in Culture and Society, *28*(4), 1151–1185. https://doi.org/10.1086/368323

Nurcombe, B. (2000). Child Sexual Abuse I: Psychopathology. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, *34*(1), 85–91. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1440-1614.2000.00642.x

Nybell, L. (2001). Meltdowns and Containments: Constructions of Children at Risk as Complex Systems. *Childhood*, *8*(2), 213–230. https://doi.org/10.1177/0907568201008002005

O'Malley, K. (1996). The 1993 Constitution of the Republic of South Africa - The Constitutional Court. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, *8*(2), 177–191. https://doi.org/10.1177/0951692896008002004

Paine, M., & Hansen, D. (2002). Factors influencing children to self-disclose sexual abuse. *Faculty Publications, Department of Psychology*. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/psychfacpub/59.

Parker, I. (2013). Discourse Analysis: Dimensions of Critique in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *10*(3), 223–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2012.741509

Parker, I. (2014). *Discourse Dynamics (Psychology Revivals): Critical Analysis for Social and Individual Psychology* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Perrone, J., & Goldfrank, L. R. (1995). Substance abuse and trauma. *Current Opinion in Critical Care*, *1*(6), 509.

Phoenix, A., & Frosh, S. (2001). Positioned by "Hegemonic" Masculinities: A Study of London Boys' Narratives of Identity. *Australian Psychologist, 36*(1), 27–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/00050060108259628

Pipe, M.-E., Lamb, M. E., Orbach, Y., & Cederborg, A.-C. (2013). *Child Sexual Abuse: Disclosure, Delay, and Denial*. Psychology Press.

Richter, L. M., Mathews, S., Nonterah, E., & Masilela, L. (2018). A longitudinal perspective on boys as victims of childhood sexual abuse in South Africa: Consequences for adult mental health. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *84*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2018.07.016

Robinson, K. H. (2008). In the Name of 'Childhood Innocence': A Discursive Exploration of the Moral Panic Associated with Childhood and Sexuality. *Cultural Studies Review*, *14*(2), 113.

Robinson, K. H. (2013). *Innocence, knowledge, and the construction of childhood the contradictory nature of sexuality and censorship in children's contemporary lives*. London; New York, NY: Routledge.

Rogers, P., & Davies, M. (2007). Perceptions of Victims and Perpetrators in a Depicted Child Sexual Abuse Case: Gender and Age Factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *22*(5), 566–584. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260506298827

Sadock, B. J., Kaplan, H. I., & Sadock, V. A. (2007). *Kaplan & Sadock's Synopsis of Psychiatry: Behavioral Sciences/clinical Psychiatry*. Philadelphia, US: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Segalo, P. (2015). Trauma and Gender: Trauma and Gender. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 9*(9), 447–454. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12192

Setati, M., & Adler, J. (2000). Between languages and discourses: Language practices in primary multilingual mathematics classrooms in South Africa. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, *43*(3), 243–269. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011996002062

Shafer-Landau, R. (2017). *Oxford Studies in Metaethics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sorsoli, L., Kia-Keating, M., & Grossman, F. K. (2008). 'I keep that hush-hush': Male survivors of sexual abuse and the challenges of disclosure. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *55*(3), 333–345. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.55.3.333

Statistics South Africa. (2016). *Community Survey 2016, Statistical Release* (Census No. P0301). Retrieved from Statistics South Africa website: http://cs2016.statssa.gov.za/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/NT-30-06-2016-RELEASE-for-CS-2016-_Statistical-releas_1-July-2016.pdf

Sullivan, R., & Lasley, E. N. (2010). Fear in Love: Attachment, Abuse, and the Developing Brain. *Cerebrum: The Dana Forum on Brain Science*, *2010*. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3574772/

Sunderland, J. (2004). Discourse, Discourse Analysis and Gender. In J. Sunderland, *Gendered Discourses* (pp. 5–26). https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230505582_1

Tadele, G. (2011). Heteronormativity and 'troubled' masculinities among men who have sex with men in Addis Ababa. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, *13*(4), 457–469. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2010.540082

Tang, K., Qu, X., Li, C., & Tan, S. (2018). Childhood sexual abuse, risky sexual behaviors and adverse reproductive health outcomes among Chinese college students. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *84*, 123–130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2018.07.038

Taylor, S., Asmundson, G. J. G., & Carleton, R. N. (2006). Simple versus complex PTSD: A cluster analytic investigation. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, *20*(4), 459–472. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2005.04.003

Ullman, D. S. E. (2007). Relationship to Perpetrator, Disclosure, Social Reactions, and PTSD Symptoms in Child Sexual Abuse Survivors. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, *16*(1), 19–36. https://doi.org/10.1300/J070v16n01_02

Unger, R. K. (1989). *Representations: Social Constructions of Gender*. Amityville, New York: Baywood Publishing Company.

Van Niekerk, A., Tonsing, S., Seedat, M., Jacobs, R., Ratele, K., & McClure, R. (2015). The invisibility of men in South African violence prevention policy: national prioritization, male vulnerability, and framing prevention. *Global Health Action*, *8*(1), 27649. https://doi.org/10.3402/gha.v8.27649

Visser, M., Juan, A., & Feza, N. (2015). Home and school resources as predictors of mathematics performance in South Africa. *South African Journal of Education*, *35*(1). https://doi.org/10.15700/201503062354

Ward, C. L., Artz, L., Leoschut, L., Kassanjee, R., & Burton, P. (2018). Sexual violence against children in South Africa: a nationally representative cross-sectional study of prevalence and correlates. *The Lancet Global Health*, *6*(4), e460–e468. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30060-3

Weatherred, J. L. (2015). Child Sexual Abuse and the Media: A Literature Review. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, *24*(1), 16–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2015.976302

Weiss, D. S. (2012). Introduction to the special feature on complex PTSD. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, *25*(3), 239–240. https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.21711

Weiss, K. G. (2010). Male Sexual Victimization: Examining Men's Experiences of Rape and Sexual Assault. *Men and Masculinities*, *12*(3), 275–298. https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X08322632

West, C., & Fenstermaker, S. (1995). Doing Difference. *Gender & Society*, *9*(1), 8–37. https://doi.org/10.1177/089124395009001002

Westermann, D. (2018). *The African Today*. Routledge.

Wilsnack, S. C., Vogeltanz, N. D., Klassen, A. D., & Harris, T. R. (1997). Childhood sexual abuse and women's substance abuse: national survey findings. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, *58*(3), 264–271. https://doi.org/10.15288/jsa.1997.58.264

Wilson, M., & O'Brien, E. (2016). Constructing the ideal victim in the United States of America's annual trafficking in persons reports. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, *65*(1–2), 29–45. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-015-9600-8

Young, M. D., & Skrla, L. (2012). *Reconsidering Feminist Research in Educational Leadership*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Zuze, T. L., Reddy, V., Juan, A., Hannan, S., Visser, M., & Winnaar, L. (2016). *Safe and sound?: violence and South African education*. http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11910/9541

Appendices

Appendix A: Participant Information Sheet

PSYCHOLOGY
THE SCHOOL OF HUMAN AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (SHCD)

Private Bag 3, Wits, 2050 • Tel: 011 717 4541 • Fax: 011 717 4559 • E-mail: psych.SHCD@wits.ac.za

Dear Sir,

My name is Chloé Heylen, and I am a researcher in the field of Psychology at the University of the Witwatersrand. The aim of my research is to interpret the understandings male victims of child sex abuse have of their own experiences. Usual understandings of violence focus on female child victims. This research will therefore give male victims of child sex abuse an opportunity to tell their story in their own words. The results of the study will allow for a greater understanding of the experiences of male victims of child sex abuse and will also provide a foundation for future research in the area. I would like to invite you to participate in this study.

Participation in this research is voluntary. You may choose to leave the study at any point and you have the right to refuse to respond to any questions that you do not wish to answer during the interview. Participation in this research will involve being interviewed by myself, at a time and place that is convenient for you. The interview will last approximately one hour. With your permission this interview will be recorded so that what you tell me can be analysed correctly. All of your responses will be kept confidential, and no information that could identify you will be included in the final research reports and publication outputs. However, if at any point your story was public knowledge or appeared in the media, you may be identifiable as anonymity

cannot be assured. This possible breach of privacy may or may not bring about negative consequences. This said, I will do whatever I can to make sure that it remains unlikely that the results in the final reports point toward your identification. Additionally, the interview questions and study procedure attempt to present minimal risk to you as a participant. The questions asked during your time with the researcher may sometimes be difficult to answer or you may find that your discussions with the researcher may upset you and remind you of hard times. If you feel sad or troubled after the interview, you will be offered counselling or psychological services by a student psychologist who will be on standby, free of charge. Further counselling is offered at the Emthonjeni Centre and CCDU at the University of the Witwatersrand campus. You may also find that the discussions with the researcher help you to understand your situation better and allow you to know more about trauma and your experience as a child.

The interview material (audio files and transcripts) will not be seen or heard by any person within the University of the Witwatersrand at any time and will only be seen and studied by myself and my research supervisor. All audio recordings will be destroyed immediately after they have been transcribed and these anonymous transcriptions will be kept in a secure place by the researcher throughout the study. You may refuse to answer any questions you would prefer not to, and you may choose to withdraw from the study at any point.

If you choose to participate in the study, please fill in your details on the form below. For any further information I can be contacted via e-mail at . The chairperson of the Human Research Ethics Committee (non-medical), Tommasso Milani, can be contacted telephonically on (011) 7174262 should you want to discuss anything with him.

This research will contribute both to a larger body of knowledge on the experiences of male child sex abuse victims and it is hoped that there will be the possibility of this study adding to your own understanding of your circumstances. A one-page summary of the research results will be made available on request.

Sincerely,

Chloé Heylen

I have read and understood the Information Sheet

Signed _____ Date_____

Appendix B: Consent to be Interviewed

PSYCHOLOGY
THE SCHOOL OF HUMAN AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (SHCD)

Private Bag 3, Wits, 2050 • Tel: 011 717 4541 • Fax: 011 717 4559 • E-mail: psych.SHCD@wits.ac.za

Informed consent to be interviewed

I_____ hereby consent to being interviewed by Chloé Heylen for her study on the experiences of male victims of child sex abuse.

I understand that:

- Participation in this interview is voluntary.
- I may refuse to answer any questions I would prefer not to.
- I may withdraw from the study at any time.
- No information that may identify me will be included in the research report, and my responses will remain confidential.
- Direct quotes from this interview may be used in the research report.
- There are no direct risks or benefits involved in my participation.

Signed_____

Date_____

Appendix C: Consent to be Audiotaped

PSYCHOLOGY
THE SCHOOL OF HUMAN AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (SHCD)

Private Bag 3, Wits, 2050 • Tel: 011 717 4541 • Fax: 011 717 4559 • E-mail: psych.SHCD@wits.ac.za

Informed consent to be audio-recorded

I_____ hereby consent to my interview with Chloé Heylen for her study on the experiences of victims of male child sex abuse.

I understand that:

- The audio recordings and transcripts will not be seen or heard by any person in this organisation at any time and will only be processed by the researcher.
- All audio recordings will be destroyed after the research is complete.
- No identifying information will be used in the transcripts or the research report.
- The transcriptions will be kept in a safe place throughout the research process.
- Direct quotes from the interview may be used in the research report.

Signed_____

Date_____

Appendix D: Interview Schedule

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: MALE VICTIMS OF CHILD SEX ABUSE

INTRODUCTION

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study. The main aim of this interview process is to allow for you to share your thoughts and feelings about your experience and how it affected you. We will talk about your experience and how you have dealt with it. Additionally, there will be questions concerning any effects that the sexual abuse experience has had on your life. Finally, we will cover your current life, relationships and your own understandings and ideas about sexual abuse.

I would also like to assure you that all of the information that you give me during the interview will be kept confidential and your identity will remain anonymous. When I transcribe this interview, no identifying details concerning you, your family or others involved in your story will appear in the document. As soon as I have completed the transcription, the digital recordings will be deleted. Do you understand this?

If you are happy to proceed, please read the consent forms for your participation as well as for the digital recording and then sign them as an indication that you both understand these forms and accept what is written on them. Please feel free to ask me anything concerning these forms, the information sheet and your interview.

I know that some of the questions I am going to ask you may be difficult for you to answer. Please take your time and feel free to indicate any discomfort that you may have. You are also free to refuse to answer any of my questions. I assure you that I will conduct the

interviews with respect for both you and your circumstances and I will attempt to make you feel as relaxed as possible. Should you feel that you would like to speak to a counsellor after the interview, I will make provision for that. At the end of the interview I will ask you if you need a counsellor and we can set up a meeting for you if need be. You will be offered counselling services by a student psychologist who will be on standby, free of charge. I will now switch on the recorder.

QUESTIONS*

- Would you describe yourself as a victim of sex abuse? Explain your answer.
- Let's start with some background history. Tell me about the events leading up to the perpetration, what your life was like and what you were doing. If you were a child before the perpetration happened, tell me about your childhood and your family. If you were an adolescent, describe who you lived with and the people you had relationships with? If you are comfortable enough, please also describe your sexuality, your sex life and what you understood about sex before the abuse occurred).
- Did you know your perpetrator? If no, how did he/she find you? If yes, please describe your relationship to him/her.
- Detail your perceptions of the person that perpetrated against you - how would you describe him/her as a person?
- Please explain the perpetration to me in as much detail as you can remember. Tell me how it started, how many times it occurred and what your perpetrator did to you. I realise how difficult it must be to talk about this so please take as long as you need in answering this question.
- How did you feel during the incident?
- How did you feel after the incident?

- How do you feel about the incident now?
- How has your life changed since the incident? Think back to the things that you told me about your life before the perpetration when you answer this question.
- How did your attitude towards sex change after the incident?
- What were your feelings around the person that perpetrated against you? Tell me specifically about your feelings around being abused by a man/woman.
- Have you ever reported the perpetration? If not, why? If so, to whom?
- Have you ever spoken to a friend, family member, religious figure, social worker, counsellor, psychologist or any other person about the perpetration? If so, what was their reaction to the fact that you were perpetrated against?
- How have you personally dealt with the perpetration?
- Throughout this interview I have used the term, 'perpetration'. Do you feel that this accurately describes your experience? Explain your answer.

TERMINATION

Thank you for sharing your story with me. I really appreciate your honesty and the fact that you trusted me enough to talk to me. I know how difficult it must have been to talk about this. Is there anything else you would like to share with me? How did you feel during the interview? How do you feel now that we have come to the end of the interview? Do you feel that you require counselling as a result of the interview process?

*** The questions in this schedule are to be treated as guidelines and the order and content do not necessarily need to be followed rigidly. Some of the questions can simply be used as prompt questions where the respondent has left out detail. The questions outlined in the schedule serve as ideal points to be covered in the interview**

Appendix E: Ethical Clearance Certificate for Main Study

Research Office

HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE (NON-MEDICAL)
R14/49 Kramer

CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE	**PROTOCOL NUMBER: H15/11/11**
PROJECT TITLE	Cultural conditions for identity disruptions in violence: Possible perpetrators and worth victims?
INVESTIGATOR(S)	Dr S Kramer
SCHOOL/DEPARTMENT	Human & Community Development/
DATE CONSIDERED	23 October 2015
DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE	Approved unconditionally
EXPIRY DATE	19 January 2019

DATE 20 January 2016 **CHAIRPERSON** _____
(Professor J Knight)

cc: Supervisor : N/A

DECLARATION OF INVESTIGATOR(S)

To be completed in duplicate and **ONE COPY** returned to the Secretary at Room 10005, 10th Floor, Senate House, University.

I/We fully understand the conditions under which I am/we are authorized to carry out the abovementioned research and I/we guarantee to ensure compliance with these conditions. Should any departure to be contemplated from the research procedure as approved I/we undertake to resubmit the protocol to the Committee. **I agree to completion of a yearly progress report.**

_____ _____/_____/_____
Signature **Date**

PLEASE QUOTE THE PROTOCOL NUMBER ON ALL ENQUIRIES