

https://dspace.org/

Victims' social constructions of residential robbery and the use of violence in South Africa.

Sewsunker, Tashmika

2022

https://hdl.handle.net/10539/34197

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

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND JOHANNESBURG



VICTIMS' SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONS OF RESIDENTIAL ROBBERY AND THE USE OF VIOLENCE IN SOUTH AFRICA.

NAME: TASHMIKA SEWSUNKER

STUDENT NUMBER: 733732

SUPERVISOR: PROF. BRETT BOWMAN

This research report is submitted to the Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters in Social and Psychological Research.

DECLARATION

I declare that this research report is my own, unaided work. It is being submitted for the Degree of Masters in Social and Psychological Research at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination at any other University.

T. Sewsunker
(Signature)

30-05-2022
(Date)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest and sincerest gratitude to the following people, without whom the completion of my Masters Research would have not been possible:

-To my supervisor, Prof. Brett Bowman, thank you for giving me the opportunity to be a part of this field of research. Your insight, guidance and support have kept me motivated throughout this process. This would have not been possible without you.

- To my mum, Joyce and my dad, Ajith, your constant support, dedication to my education, numerous sacrifices, patience and love have allowed me to push forth each day to accomplish my dreams. Thank you for being my inspiration every day. I love you both.

- To Trishana, Randhier and Aarayna, thank you for being my voices of encouragement and listening to my ideas at all odd hours as well as sharing your own ideas with me. Thank you for believing in me even when I didn't believe in my ability to complete this research. Your love and support mean everything.

- To each person who has motivated me throughout this process, thank you for pushing me toward the finish line. Your presence, reassurance and understanding have meant a great deal to me and I appreciate each of you.

-Finally, to each participant, thank you for sharing your experiences with me. You have been the cornerstone to this research and I am truly grateful to each of you.

This research is dedicated to my mum and late dad.

ABSTRACT

This research study aimed to explore victims' social constructions of residential robbery and the use of violence in the South African context. Violence and crime are embedded into the very fabric of South African society and pervade all aspects of life. While there is an extensive literature on crime and violence, residential robbery is a crime on which there is very little information. Also, very few studies focus on victims' accounts despite them being at the centre of crime and having the ability to share information to enhance the limited knowledge on residential robbery and the use violence in its enactment. The study not only aimed to supplement existing literature, but also provide a novel alternative lens by exploring the relationship between morality, bio-politics and the inherent value of life against property in relation to residential robbery and violence.

Eight participants were selected for this study. Participants were selected from various racial backgrounds, across genders and ranged from permanent skilled workers to part time minimum wage workers all of whom owned their own houses. Participants also belonged to different socio-economic groups varying from poorer-income communities to middle-higher income communities and were all directly affected or exposed to acts of residential robbery. Data was obtained through the use of semi structured interviews that were conducted face to face with each participant. Data was then analysed using Parker's Discourse Analysis which provided a comprehensive step by step guide to examining participants' discourses and constructions surrounding residential robbery.

The discourses cohered around three basic organising meaning structures; foundational discourses, core moral discourses and existential and power discourses. Each section included sub-sections that provided more detailed social constructions and discourses used by victims' surrounding the relationship between residential robbery, violence, morality and bio-politics. Foundational discourses comprise of the initial constructions and discourses discussed by victims' including; poverty and unemployment, race, crime of opportunity, gender and state failure. Core moral discourses consider various constructions of moral attitudes, behaviours within society and the link between morality and residential robbery. While lastly, existential and power discourses deal with the interplay between life versus 'things', the exchange between power, vulnerability and fear and lastly the politics of death

This study demonstrated the intricate discursive relationships that exist between morality, power, violence and the enactment of residential robbery. Victims' draw on discourses

surrounding these particular constructs to account for residential robberies. Morality and life holds significantly different meanings and value for different people from different social classes. On one hand, life remains scared and important for some while to others it's regarded as dispensable and a commodity which can be traded in the pursuit of wealth and material gain. By understanding residential robbery and violence from multiple lenses and different sources we have the ability to build a more holistic picture for future context in South Africa.

Keywords: residential robbery; violence; victims; morality; bio-politics; discourses; social constructions

.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Cover page 1

Declaration 2

Acknowledgements 3

Dedication 4

Abstract 5

Table of contents 7

Chapter 1

1.1 Introduction 10

1.2 Rationale 10

1.3 Research aims 12

1.4 Research questions 12

1.5 Chapter descriptions 12

Chapter 2

2.1 Introduction 14

2.2 Literature review 14

2.2.1 The nature and history of violence in South Africa 14

2.2.2 Conceptualizing robbery 16

2.2.3 Understanding violence and crime in South Africa 18

2.2.4 Death, power and politics 22

2.2.5 Morality, bio-power and residential robbery 24

2.2.6 Conclusion 26

Chapter 3

3.1 Introduction 28

3.2 Methodology 28

3.2.1 Research design 28

3.2.2 Participants 29

3.2.3 Data gathering 30
3.2.4 Procedure 31
3.2.5 Data analysis: Discourse analysis 32
3.2.6 Reflexivity and rigour 34
3.2.7 Ethics 36
3.2.8 Conclusion 37

Chapter 4

4.1 Introduction 38
4.2 Analysis and discussion 38
4.3 Foundational discourses 39
4.3.1 Poverty and unemployment 39
4.3.2 Race 44
4.3.3 Crime of opportunity 48
4.3.4 Gender 50
4.3.5 State failure 54
4.4 Core moral discourses 58
4.5 Existential and power discourses 62
4.5.1 Life versus things 62
4.5.2 Power, vulnerability and fear 66
4.5.3 The politics of death 71
4.6 Conclusion 74

Chapter 5

5.1 Introduction 75
5.2 Summary of analysis 75
5.3 Limitations and future recommendations 79
5.4 Final conclusion 82

Chapter 6

6.1 Reference list 84

6.2 Appendices A-E 93

6.2.1 Interview schedule 93

6.2.2 Participant information sheet 94

6.2.3 Consent form for interview 95

6.2.4 Consent form for recording 96

6.2.5 Ethics clearance number 97

CHAPTER 1

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Violence is a global phenomenon that pervades every aspect of life for many people around the world (World Health Organization, 2002). In South Africa, crime and violence are not recent phenomena; it is embedded into the very fabric of South African society. Apartheid was a system of legislated racism which enforced inequality and exclusion. This led to unequal opportunities in employment and education, leaving marginalised groups without legitimate routes out of poor conditions and poverty (Bowman, Kramer, Salau & Matzopoulos, 2022). Decades of political violence and a legacy of inequality bequeathed a 'culture of violence' to South Africa (Bruce, 2006), which is deeply rooted in the notion that crime and violence is a legitimate and normative form of social and individual action.

In the face of frequent and dramatic economic and social upheaval, individuals in society symbolically reassert their power through the use of crime and violence. In modern society 'power' lies differentially in people, in bodies and in the processes of deciding between the rights over life and death and ultimately choosing what to do with that power (Rabinow & Rose, 2003). Morality despite being a system of values that governs our lives is not fixed. It is a contingent construct, changing and adapting to the situations in which we find ourselves based on socially defined realities (Prinz, 2008). It is a distinction that needs to be made in order to understand and conceptualize robbery and the broader aspects of violence.

While there is extensive research and literature into crime and violence in the South African context, very few studies focus on victims' social constructions of residential robbery as well as the implications of such social constructions for how to better understand the recalcitrance of violence despite many of years aimed at its primary prevention. In South Africa, the research studies undertaken often tend to focus on the causes of violence and crime, prevention techniques, potential psychological and health effects on victims or the historical progression of crime and violence in society – this study is an attempt to supplement existing research as well as provide an alternate lens from which to understand and conceptualize residential robbery and the use of violence.

1.2 RATIONALE

In South Africa, robbery is considered to be one of the most feared acts of crime due to its pervasive nature and the frequent acts of violence that co-occur with it (Bowman, Kramer,

Salau, Kotze & Matzopoulos, 2018). However, according to Zinn (2010) residential robbery is a crime on which there is very little information. The only substantial information on robbery is provided by the statistics produced annually by National Victim Surveys and the South African Police Services (Bruce, 2010). While studies have focused on the nature of crime, its prevalence and risk factors, victims' accounts of residential robbery and violence are limited. It is often suggested that a victim's voice goes underexplored in accounting for violence itself; however, they are at the very centre of crime and have the ability to share detailed, rich information to enhance the limited work on robbery violence. To obtain a more holistic representation of crime and establish how and why violence occurs and escalates during residential robberies, the accounts and constructions of the victims' themselves are necessary.

In contemporary mainstream research on violence and robbery there's a fundamental absence of an explicit recognition of the role of morality in its enactments (Bowman, Stevens, Eagle, Langa, Kramer, Kiguwa & Nduna, 2015). Moral discourses in relation to crime and violence are prominent in both academic and public domains, however, 'there have been few attempts made at theorizing crime and violence as being embedded in a range of fluid and contradicting moral economies' (Bowman et al, 2015, p. 245). Victims, perpetrators and scholars draw on a number of different moral orders to account for violence (Bowman et al, 2015). Morality is inherently linked to society which ultimately defines individuals' moral codes salient in the governance of life and death. This research provides an opportunity to understand the way in which morality influences robbery, why violence is enacted and to what extent it impacts decisions over the loss of life and the perceived value placed on 'things'.

Bio-political theorists like Foucault and Agamben do not take for granted that life is inherently valuable. As a rule of perception, they think that for different people some lives are regarded as more valuable than others which reflects a political position in relation to morality and to life. Bio-power embeds itself into all aspects of human life. It governs how people differentially value and promote life in relation to power. In modern society, absolute power no longer lies solely in 'sovereign bodies' – it is challenged and controlled by those who have the ability to make decisions over life and death. Power is exercised is three ways; the right to kill, to permit life and to expose to death. Understanding the underlying relationship and effects of bio-power on residential robbery, enactments of violence, morality and ultimately life versus 'things', is a novel perspective embedded within this research.

This research is rooted in a social constructionist perspective that emphasises the contingencies of moral and subjective positions. Within the 'social constructionist approach, the main idea is that how we understand and perceive the world, the objects (including people) and the events within it does not necessarily reflect the nature of that world but rather is a product of how the world is represented or produced through language' (Burr & Dick, 2017, p.60). Discourses which are derived through language are considered to be broad meaning systems that not only describe people, events or the world as a whole, but influence the way in which people act and what they do (Burr & Dick, 2017). A social constructionist perspective therefore offers a suitable framework to explore the discourses and language used to construct residential robbery and the use of violence in its enactment.

1.3 RESEARCH AIMS

This research study aimed to explore victims' social constructions of residential robbery and the use of violence in the perpetration thereof.

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

-How do victims construct residential robbery?

-How do victims construct the use of violence during residential robberies?

1.5 CHAPTER DESCRIPTIONS

CHAPTER 2: reviews the literature that contextualises the framework of this research study surrounding residential robbery, violence, morality and bio-politics. It provides a comprehensive outline of literature starting with the nature and history of violence experienced in South Africa both pre and post-apartheid. It addresses various definitions that help theorise crime and violence and establishes the drivers that perpetuate these factors within society. Furthermore, the review provides a statistical and theoretical overview of residential robbery in South Africa and discusses the theoretical concepts of Foucault's bio-power, Agamben's bare-life and Mbembe's necro-politics. It focuses on concepts of morality and its role within modern society, while also establishing a relationship between residential robbery, morality and bio-politics.

CHAPTER 3: outlines the methodological considerations of this research study. It provides details on the research design, sampling and recruitment methods, the means of data collection and analysis, as well as the procedure followed to obtain the necessary

information. It also provides a section on self-reflectivity and the steps I had taken to ensure research rigour. The ethics considered for this research study is also discussed.

CHAPTER 4: delivers the analysis and results of this research study. It comprises of three main sections including foundational discourses, core moral discourses and existential and power discourses. Within each of these, lie sub-sections that provide more detailed social constructions and discourses used by victims' surrounding residential robbery, violence, morality and bio-politics.

CHAPTER 5: lastly concludes this research study with a detailed summarised outline of the analysis. Furthermore, it addresses the limitations and challenges of the research and provides future research recommendations. Lastly it provides a section on my final concluding statements about the study as a whole.

CHAPTER 2

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter offers an in depth overview of the literature surrounding residential robbery, violence, morality and bio-politics. It addresses various definitions, provides statistical information and outlines theoretical concepts relating the topics mentioned above. The literature focuses on the following; the nature and history of violence in pre and post-apartheid South Africa, understanding crime and violence, conceptualising residential robbery, the theoretical framework of bio-political power and it expression in modern society and lastly morality and its link to bio-politics and residential robbery. It concludes by giving a comprehensive summary of the main points of the literature review.

2.2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.2.1 THE NATURE AND HISTORY OF VIOLENCE IN SOUTH AFRICA

Violence is an issue that has plagued many lives in South Africa. Multiple discourses are used by people to talk about violence. Crime and violence in South Africa represent both a unique (given the ongoing political and economic struggles) as well as complex (transitions of political power and social acceptance of violence) ideology, primarily due to legacies of apartheid (Abrahams, 2010). Apartheid in South Africa was a system of institutionalised violence that fostered a culture of racism and was rooted in violence across racial barriers (Abrahams, 2010). According to Galtung (1969), prominent social norms and aspects of social culture are often used to legitimise violence. He referred to this as cultural violence and stated that, this type of violence shows itself in beliefs, attitudes and prejudices e.g. racism, xenophobia (Galtung, 1969).

Violence and crime in South Africa began increasing in the 1980s and took a dramatic upturn in the 1990s (Ndlela, 2020). In the transition period between 1990-1994 ‘the bloodiest political violence of the apartheid era was witnessed’ (Kynoch, 2013, p.283). It was expected that violence and crime post 1994 would decrease, however, South Africa still has high levels of crime and violence, for example residential robbery has gone up by 130% between 2003 and 2016 (Ndlela, 2020; South African Institute of Race Relations, 2016).As the peoples perceived political legitimacy of the government in the country at the time declined, oppositions to racial and unequal policies intensified and the distinction between criminal and political behaviour became blurred (Pretorius, 2008). Crime and violence were justified as a

way of fighting the 'system' and continued as a legitimized and normative defence (Van Der Merwe, 2013). On one end, weakened social controls created marginalized groups that were dependent on crime and violence as means of survival; while on the other end, crime and violence were used as rationalised corrective measures to address the injustices of the past. (Ndlela, 2020).

Violence is a construct that is multifaceted and it is due to this that it is not encapsulated in a single universally accepted definition. Violence can be defined in a number of ways depending on who defines it and for what purposes (World Health Organization, 2002). According to Schinkel (2004) violence itself has not been the focus of social inquiry, rather what has been vastly looked at are the outlines through which violence ascribes itself, leaving us with meanings given to these specific manifestations. This, however, is not violence, these are external to violence, only mere additions that are used to measure and place value on the 'shape' that violence takes on (Schinkel, 2004).

According to the World Health Organization (2002, p.4) violence is 'the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation'. This definition, however, focuses on physical forces, effects and intentions but does not consider violence where force is not used. Galtung (1969) defined 'direct violence' as violence that is directly exercised by one person onto another (there is both a perpetrator and a victim). This type of violence is both physical and psychological and involves behaviours that threaten life (e.g. murder, assault, abuse etc.). Varying definitions throughout the social sciences serve specific purposes each meeting its own particular ends. Hamby (2017) defined violence as an aggressive act that may result in extreme physical injury or harm including sexual assault, common assault, robbery or even death.

According to the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (2019), violence is a result of a complex interaction between factors relating to society, communities, family and individuals themselves. Some individual level drivers of violence include socioeconomic marginalisation, gender inequality, poverty and poor education (CSRV, 2019). The risk factors at the community level include, access to weapons, alcohol abuse and drugs (Willman, Gomez, Gould & Newman, 2019). Lack of social inclusion, economic mobility and the poor fulfilment of democratic expectations exasperate violence at the societal level

(Willman, 2019). Galtung (1969) defined structural violence as the systematic way in which organisations or institutions promote social injustice and prevent particular groups of people from equal access to goods, services and other opportunities to meet their basic needs. Examples of these injustices include; apartheid, unequal access to health care/education, poverty, poor living conditions etc. The use of violence is considered by some people as a legitimate tool to improve social and economic situations (Brankovic, 2019).

2.2.2 UNDERSTANDING CRIME AND VIOLENCE IN SOUTH AFRICA

Understanding crime is complex. Crime is defined and conceptualised based on different ideological and scientific viewpoints (White & Perrone, 2010). Starting with a broad definition, crime involves the breaking of rules or laws within society (White & Perrone, 2010). Legally, it is conceptualised as actions which are prohibited by law and punishable by imprisonment (Schiller, Murphy & Black, 2012). Some theorists define crime in relation to violence. According to Felson (2009) a crime may involve an act of violence, however, particular acts of violence may not necessarily account for acts of crime. Therefore, while crime and violence may co-occur in certain instances, one is not a prerequisite for the other to take place. Crimes according to Willman et al (2019) are actions that violate any laws regardless of whether or not it involves violent behaviour or actions. Crime is driven by a number of systematic factors that occur at individual, societal and ecological levels. Some of these drivers include poverty, poor social environment, disrupted family dynamics, inequality, lack of education and unemployment (Schiller et al, 2012).

In South Africa, crime and violence has historically been regarded as a criminal justice problem (Abrahams, 2010). In order for any criminal justice system to work, there has to be a high level of public trust in the system (Olutola & Bello, 2016). Public trust in the police for example would thrive in an environment that fosters fairness, equity and professionalism (Olutola &Bello, 2016). Political trust (trust in the government and police) by the public is necessary as it exemplifies the essence of democratic legitimacy (Pillay & Mantzaris, 2017). Research has suggested that higher levels of political trust show decreases in corruption, quality government, low crime, economic growth and public compliance (Loria & Kumagai, 2020). The role of the police and the government is to secure the lives of the public and the ability to do so is often associated with increased levels of trust (Olutola & Bello, 2016). Prior to 1994, state institutions like the police were less effective in preventing crime as they more reactive and repressive rather than proactive in communities (Abrahams, 2010).

In post-apartheid South Africa the legitimacy of the police continues to be undermined to the point where the public view the police as the 'enemy' and distrust is prevalent due to increased levels of police brutality, misconduct and corruption (Olutola & Bello, 2016). Corruption in any institution (government and police) is considered to be a significant factor that affects public trust (Pillay & Mantzaris, 2017). Other factors such as bribery, lack of merit in recruitment processes, lack of accountability, attitude and non-compliance with laws lead to the deterioration of trust in the police and their abilities to serve and protect communities (Olutola & Bello, 2016). While factors that lead to decreased trust in the government includes public exposure to violence, unemployment, lack of transparency and social, financial and economic disparity (Loria & Kumagai, 2020). An extremely low level of public trust has the ability to cause an increase in violence leading to a fragmentation of society (Pillay & Mantzaris, 2017).

Crime not only degrades political trust but the social cohesion amongst the public (Schiller et al 2012). Social cohesion refers to the 'togetherness' of a society, one where people from different racial and socioeconomic groups have a sense of belonging within their communities (Schiller et al, 2012). Under the legacy of colonial rule and apartheid in South Africa, racial groups were marginalised and restricted from financial resources, economic opportunities and political participation all of which created a divide between people, especially the poor and the rich (Meiring, Kannemeyer & Potgieter, 2018). This divide continues in post-apartheid South Africa with inequality (social, economic, financial and material) and race being identified as the biggest contributors to a lack of trust and social cohesion (Meiring et al, 2018).

Social cohesion has a number of different positive and negative implications for different groups in South Africa. It promotes nationalism, fosters a shared sense of identity, trust and pride and encourages solidarity among citizens (Palmary, 2015). On the other hand, cohesion creates 'non-citizens', a group which is excluded and subjected to acts of racism, segregation and even violence (Palmary, 2015). It results in the common mistrust of 'outsiders' or foreigners leading to xenophobia and other negative behaviours or actions (Abrahams, 2010). Foreign nationals are often used as 'scapegoats' for the lack of employment opportunities, poverty, overcrowding in informal areas and crime which results in high levels of violence against them (Abrahams, 2010).In South Africa, the gap between the poor and rich continues to grow still making it one of the most economically unequal countries in the world (Meiring et al, 2018). For many South Africans violence prevails in every aspect of life and to some

extent has become a normalised occurrence despite the efforts to reduce violence in the post-apartheid era (Willman et al, 2019). In a global setting, South Africa is still considered to be one of the most violent countries (Willman et al, 2019).

2.2.3 CONCEPTUALIZING RESIDENTIAL ROBBERY

Residential robbery is considered to be a sub-category of aggravated robbery (SAPS, 2012). Firstly, I will define robbery with aggravating circumstances (RAC). RAC is a wide-ranging category that involves the intentional and forceful appropriation and unlawful removal of property belonging to others under aggravating circumstances (SAPS, 2012). RAC may involve the use of deadly weapons for the purpose of subduing, threatening or harming victims (SAPS, 2017). Even when no weapons are used but threats are made with potential escalations into violence it is still considered RAC (SAPS, 2017). Residential robbery is 'defined as the intentional and forceful appropriation and unlawful removal of property from residential premises belonging to other people' (SAPS, 2012, p.2).

Robbery has a particular value in relation to understanding and conceptualizing violence. Robbery is a form of contact crime which refers to those incidents in which individuals themselves become targets. Victims are an instrumental means through which perpetrators can gain access to property and other valuable items (South African Police Services, 2020). The intent is to deprive people of their property through the use of force, fear or intimidation which generally occurs with the use of a weapon in robberies with aggravating circumstances (RAC) (SAPS, 2020). The most common weapons used during robberies include guns, knives, metal bars, blunt or sharp objects and pangas (Statistics South Africa, 2020). In a study conducted with 30 convicted robbers in South Africa; it was found that violence was used during the residential robberies particularly when victims showed resistance (Zinn, 2010). Most fatalities and injuries that occurred were caused due to victims' resistance as perpetrators would have rather been 'shot' than exposed to a risk of harm (Zinn 2010).

Levels of robbery are often difficult to measure accurately (Bruce, 2010). There are two reasons for this, firstly for acts of robbery to be reported in the official statistics, victims need to report accounts and their incidences need to be recorded; however, many victims do not report, so robbery statistics are presumably underreported (Statistics South Africa, 2019). Secondly, statistics on robbery with the use of violence is subject to scrutiny as in the years gone by there have been reports of police and other officials 'cooking statistics of crime'

(Bruce, 2010). Since 2010, statistics available on residential robbery has shown a consistent year on year increase (De Kock & Kriegler, 2015).

In 2018/2019 there were 22,431 cases of robberies at residential premises recorded, showing an increase of 0.8% from the previous year (SAPS, 2019). In 2019/2020 there was a decrease in these cases by 5.8% with only 21,130 cases being recorded (SAPS, 2020). Over a 10 year period, however, robberies at residential premises have been on the rise by 25.1% (4241 cases) (SAPS, 2020). There is considerable provincial variation in residential robbery across the country. For example, several provinces recorded decreases in the number of cases with the highest decrease being in the Northern Cape by 15.9% (255 cases) (SAPS, 2020). In two provinces including KZN and Mpumalanga cases increased by 9.4% (393 cases) and 10.8% (115 cases) respectively (SAPS, 2020). By looking at provincial data, we can evaluate trends of underreporting and establish which cities or areas are most affected by residential robberies and other forms of crime or violence.

Individuals who become victims of residential crime are robbed of not only their property but may also be subjected to assault, rape or even murder (SAPS, 2019). During residential robbery, guns were recorded as the most commonly used weapon to incite violence or threaten victims as it accounted for 64.7% (11,614) of a national sample of 17,941 cases (SAPS, 2020). Knives were the second most common weapon used accounting for 19.9% (2494) based on the national sample (SAPS, 2020). In Zinn's (2010) study on robbery, perpetrators acknowledged that they used violence or the threat of violence to overcome resistance from victims. Torture (using irons, boiling water etc.) is also used as a means to force victims to give over their valuable items (Zinn, 2010). Using violence or lethal force is believed to be morally justifiable and practical to perpetrators (Bowman et al, 2022). Based on the moral reasoning of perpetrators 'the material ends justify the lethal means and/or lethal force is most effective for overcoming resistance and/or killing the victim offers the best protection against retaliation (e.g. police and jail) (Bowman et al, 2022, p.5).Men and women may experience residential robbery differently. Women may become more subjected to torture in an attempt to force male victims to cooperate and provide the necessary information to perpetrators (Zinn, 2010). Research also suggests that women may be exposed to emotional and sexual violence during robberies while men are more likely to be exposed to assault and physical violence (Lamb and Warton, 2016). During robberies perpetrators are more likely to take items that can be easily disposed of for money to ensure a means of living, finance extravagant lifestyles or feed drug problems (SAPS, 2020).

Zinn (2010) suggested that robberies were more likely to occur on weekends between 8pm-4am due to relaxed and less vigilant atmospheres. Similar findings were recorded by SAPS (2020), statistics revealed that robberies occur when victims are most vulnerable between 6pm-12am as they are often relaxing at home, cooking or watching TV. Robberies continue to occur through to the early hours of the morning when victims are less vigilant or security systems are not activated (SAPS, 2020). According to the national findings, robberies were likely to occur throughout the week with the highest incidents occurring on Fridays and the lowest on Mondays (SAPS, 2020). Similar trends were recorded in 2018/2019 (SAPS, 2019). During a residential robbery, perpetrators use various ways to gain access to properties. Based on the annual crime statistics in 36.2% (6 065) of cases victims were threatened with weapons to gain entry, followed by perpetrators breaking doors/gates or locks in 35% (5 872) of cases (SAPS, 2020). It is also beneficial to differentiate and examine the distribution of crime and violence in low income communities verses middle-higher income communities. Although much attention is given to the problems in middle-higher income communities, it is generally discussed that low income communities bear the weight of high levels of robbery and violence (Luthango, van Donk & Wegner, 2018). Low income communities are left most vulnerable to victimisation as they have access to fewer resources (e.g. lights, security), a lack of adequate housing structures, decreased police accessibility and little access to victim support (Luthango et al, 2018). All these factors contribute to making violence and robbery easier to occur within these areas (Luthango, 2018).

Zinn (2010) found that perpetrators were males between the ages of 16-26 years. In the annual crime statistics released by SAPS (2019), nearly all arrested perpetrators were males ranging between the ages of 18-30 years old. Zinn (2010) also found that all perpetrators had committed other crimes such as petty theft etc. before engaging in residential robberies. In his perpetrator profile Zinn (2010) the sample of 30 perpetrators ranged in race and 83% were South African while 17% were from other African countries. While there is local involvement in residential robbery, research studies have shown that South Africans blame foreign nationals for increased criminal activities within the country (Nkwede, Obona & Joseph, 2019). Research studies have shown that South Africans often exclude and blame foreign nationals for unemployment rates, increased criminal activities and misuse of services (Nkwede et al, 2019).

Linking back to social cohesion, foreigners are regarded as the ‘non-citizen’. They are subjected to alienation, discrimination and hostility which create a predisposition for violence

to occur against them especially within low income communities (Crush & Ramachandran, 2014). Negative perceptions and fear are disseminated through public discourses; this leads to the constant labelling of foreigners as 'perpetrators' and allows them to become 'scapegoats' for any challenges faced within society (Crush & Ramachaandran, 2014).

Existing literature indicates that crime and violence often take place between people who are familiar to, or know each other (Louw & Shaw, 1997). Acquaintance violence refers to all crime and violence in which the acquaintance and victim are known one and other this may include family members, partners, friends etc. (CSVR, 2007). Stranger violence refers to all crimes and violence in which the perpetrator is unknown to the victim. Robbery is considered to be a stranger crime; however, perpetrators are not always unfamiliar as victims may in certain instances know their perpetrators (particularly by sight) (CSVR, 2007). According to the annual statistics, some residential robberies were conducted by ex-employees of victims who had knowledge about the residences they targeted (SAPS, 2019).

In most instances perpetrators gather information about a household before they plan to rob it (SAPS, 2019). In his study, 77% of perpetrators stated that they chose their victims based on having some inside information about them from gardeners, domestic workers or other service providers. This may not be the case in all instances, as according to Felson and Clarke (1998) opportunity plays a role in all crimes. Everyone is at risk of becoming a victim when an opportunity becomes viable. It is opportunity that creates the criminal (Felson & Clarke, 1998). They also concluded that the most opportune targets are those individuals who have been victimised previously (Felson & Clarke, 1998). Re-victimisation occurs for two reasons; the first is that individuals as well as places that have enduring qualities attract perpetrators (van Raalte, 2013). The second reason is that after an initial crime, victims experience a certain change which increases their chances of becoming a recurring target (van Raalte, 2013).

Zinn (2010) found that victims are targeted because of their wealth and not necessarily due to their race while visible signs of affluence in certain communities also attract criminal attention. A central and important idea to highlight from the above is that – how we equate the value of our property varies amongst different communities and people (Kaus, 2010). For some, there is a general belief that no material wealth or object regardless of its value is worth one's life. 'Things' can be replaced whereas life cannot be. To others however, objects

and ‘things’ may be valued more than life itself. These items or ‘things’ become an essential part of one’s life and for most, it cannot be easily replaced.

Zinn (2010), reported that perpetrators were motivated largely by ‘greed’ as 65% committed robbery in order to procure wealth while only 35% for a means of survival. In South Africa people have a desire for recognition and self-respect which is often shown through their accumulation of wealth (Kaus, 2010). They achieve this through conspicuous consumption, where the visible expenditure on goods demonstrates one’s status and a higher position in society (Kaus, 2010). Perpetrators want to engage in conspicuous consumption and therefore use any means necessary to achieve it. Furthermore, in the study 97% of the sample acknowledged that they engaged in residential robbery for economic gain and the risk of being caught was lower than other crimes (Zinn, 2010). In South Africa poverty, unemployment and wealth gaps are often discussed as reasons behind crime. The inability to break the cycle between unemployment and poverty is believed to lead to criminal activities (Ndlela, 2020). From the sample of 30 perpetrators, 76% were unemployed; however, some had left their employment to engage in residential robbery full time (Zinn, 2010). Among some perpetrators, robbery and crime are regarded as a means of survival that stems from need and desperation while to others; it’s a ‘legitimised’ means of accumulating things. Robbery can be considered a modern day form of deduction or appropriation of goods, wealth and life. It was historically practised as a form of principle or law and legitimised by sovereign powers according to Foucault (1978).

2.2.4 DEATH, POWER AND POLITICS

In the History of Sexuality, Foucault (1978) argues that for centuries politics has involved an exertion of power most notably of a sovereign who was characterized by a particular right – the right to make decisions over life and death (Dean, 2004). ‘The extent that the sovereign exercises his right to life only by exercising his right to kill, or by refraining from killing, the sovereign right as the power of life and death is in reality the right to take life or to let live’ (Foucault, 1978, p.136). Sovereigns exercised power through a means of deduction (taking away from as a form of law or principle) which was the right to appropriate, goods, services, labour, tax, wealth and blood from subject. Foucault (1978) discussed a shift in mechanisms of power from the right over death toward life and to administer life. Foucault uses the term ‘bio power’ to refer to the shift in the government of life from the sovereign’s right to take life to nation-state government’s right to let die.

Bio power is not a means of deduction but rather a means of production which looks to exert positive influences on life in an endeavour to administer, enhance and reproduce it (Foucault, 1978). According to Foucault bio power replaced the ancient sovereign right to 'take life or let live' with a transformed power of fostering life or disallowing it to a point of death -'make live and let die (Ojakangas, 2005). This new power over life (bio power) manifests in two main forms. The first is the discipline of the body; human bodies are treated like machines-economically useful and productive (what he refers to as anatamo-politics). Bio power appears to create more effective, disciplined populations. The second is the regulation and control of populations (what he refers to as bio politics) intertwined with mechanisms of life such as health, birth and mortality. By the 19th century these two dynamics were conjoined with particular technologies of power and in trying to establish themselves emerged as one in which life became a political object. Life as a political object came to be seen as valuable, sacred and of equal worth and therefore needed to be protected and sustained (Hall, 2007).

Unlike Foucault, Agamben believed the power of the sovereign has never in a true sense been displaced by 'bio power' but rather remains intertwined within bio political mechanisms (Agamben, 1998). In his work Agamben refers to an ancient archaic figure in Roman law as a necessary equivalent of a sovereign-homo sacer or the 'sacred man' (Corral, 2015). According to this law the homo sacer could be killed with exemption but not sacrificed as he was considered alien to both religion and law (Corral, 2015). In modern society 'the sacred man' does not exist as one clear figure suggesting that all human life is reduced to the position of homo sacri (Corral, 2015). Human rights depend upon being recognised as a citizen, since homo sacri are alienated living outside the law and its protection they are not citizens (Agamben, 1998). In every political order a sovereign entity exists whether it's a group, a single person or vested within all citizens (Agamben, 1998).

Agamben suggested that a sovereign entity has the ability to place itself outside of the law by suspending the validity of law; however, it retains its ability to make 'sovereign decisions' (Agamben, 1998) through which it establishes juridical orders, thereby reducing those it excludes into 'bare life' – leaving them vulnerable, without rights, a form of non-citizen and those it includes into citizens protected and encompassed within the law (Oksala, 2010). Western politics according to Agamben establishes itself through exclusion which is concurrently an inclusion of bare life referring to this dynamic as an exception (Ojakangas, 2005). Since being placed in the ban by law the 'scared man' finds himself in eyes of the law while at the same time living in this state of 'betweenness' in a no man's land beyond the

protection of the law (Ojakangas, 2005). Sovereignty and homo sacer imply one another; they cannot exist without each other. These are important concepts in understanding the dynamics of residential robbery – a victim cannot exist without a perpetrator; one is elevated to the status of a sovereign and the other is reduced to bare life. There is also another dynamic to take into consideration. Residential robbery is a performative act which sets the stage for perpetrators' and victims' to make crucial and key decisions about life and 'things'. Each group attaches significantly different value as to the importance of life, whose life is more valuable and how much 'things' are worth.

2.2.5 MORALITY, BIOPOWER AND RESIDENTIAL ROBBERY

Humans are fundamentally social beings (Uzoigwe, 2013). By existing as social beings, humans have the opportunity to build levels of rationality and relationships – through these networks of interrelationships humans are able to realize 'themselves' (Ayala, 2010). Morality or 'moralis' in Latin literally means customs, habits, way of life (Prinz, 2008). Ultimately morality refers to the distinction between wrong or right conducts or behaviours (Uzoigwe, 2013). It is accepted that there are moral principles and in order for humans to be considered as moral social beings they need to conform to these principles that guide and protect the activities in society (Heathwood, 2012).

The norms by which a human's moral actions are judged vary to a certain degree amongst different societies and from different cultures. Western, middle class morality protects and places value on the sanctity of life versus the value we place on the things we own (property); to different people, however, how we construct morality surrounding life versus things is unequal. Some moral and social norms such as not stealing from others or killing another human are considered widespread and ultimately universal principles (Ayala, 2010). It is widely accepted that morality governs decisions over life and death, but who makes those decisions and why those decisions are made is essential to understand in modern society. It is also important to understand that moral decisions are always context dependent, for example when a life that is considered valuable and worthy of living is threatened, the lives of the people around that person may be devalued. There is an existing interplay between morality and power.

In social theory the link between morality and crime has been a very old one articulated in the seminal work of sociologist Emile Durkheim (Hilbert, 1986). Durkheim refers to a state of 'anomie' – a situation of normlessness – ineffective regulation of common norms of

individual desires and as consequence one is left without moral guidance while pursuing ones 'desires' (Rauch, 2005; Hilbert, 1986). Durkheim wrote about the normality of crime in societies. Societies cannot be devoid of violence or crime; it is a normal occurrence. Crime therefore performs a positive function within society, as it would disappear altogether as society progresses and reaches new states of complexity (Hamlin, 2009). Durkheim related anomie to crime in which he stated that people often don't have the ability to satisfy their wants and needs and therefore may engage in property crime to obtain or maintain a standard of living (DiCristina, 2016).

In South Africa, the value of property versus life varies amongst different communities largely due to factors such as inequality, social exclusion and unemployment (CSVR, 2010). Internationally research shows that high trends of inequality equates to high trends of violence, indicating that inequality is a major driving force of violence (CVSR, 2010).Issues of violence and crime highly affect low income communities. However, due to this existing 'social inequality' – media and policies attention tend to focus largely on the impact within higher income communities (CVSR, 2010). This raises a moral question as to whose life is represented as more important and why, as a society do we place value more on possessions than we do humanity. How people construct the importance of these two objects (possessions versus humanity) is to a large degree subjective. In society, materialism and value are arranged from most important to least important based on what individuals deem central to their own lives (Kaus, 2010). Although culture and society often dictates which values are essential, peoples choices are guided and influenced by a number of different circumstances (Kaus, 2010). In his work Singer (1972) made an interesting point suggesting that moral attitudes are shaped by the needs of the society in which we live. People feel the need to help others within their own communities and more affluent individuals are more likely to experience a sense of 'moral obligation' in which they feel a moral duty to give to those in need (Singer, 1972).

Mailer as cited in Hall (2007) puts forward the notion of 'death in modernity'; people live their lives as if they are already destined to die, as their lives are inundated with the potential threats of death. The challenge comes in when conflict in choices arise (something becomes more valuable for my life to continue which results in the death of someone else). Death in a sense cleanses society and the power exposing people to death guarantees the power to life and continued existence; however, how do we decide who must die for others to live. If Agamben is right and we are all homo sacer, then we are all victims exposed to sovereign

powers (anyone who holds the power over our life and our death). In his work on Necropolitics, Mbembe (2003) articulated how political and social power are used to dictate who gets to live and who has to die. Within the framework of necro-power, "the calculus of life passes through the death of the other" (Mbembe, 2003, p.18) meaning that the life of one person comes at the expense of the death of a more vulnerable person. Necro-power according to Mbembe is more than just the right to kill but encompasses the right to expose others to death, slavery and other forms of violence (Mbembe, 2003). It analyses "contemporary forms of subjugation of life to the power of death" in which groups of people (often marginalised) are forced to remain in different states between life and death (Mbembe, 2003, p.39). Mbembe (2003) recognised that people are subjected to life conditions which confer upon them what he called the 'status of the living dead'. For these marginalised people living so close to death, life is not something that is valued or pursued. Residential robbery can be considered a precarious site in which the value of life, death and 'things' converge. It presents the opportunity to determine whose lives are considered more valuable and at what cost.

2.2.6 CONCLUSION

Residential robbery is a crime which affects all South Africans and pervades all communities regardless of race, gender or socio-economic positions. The literature review presented above provided a detailed overview of different factors and theoretical frameworks that may relate to or influence constructions and discourses on residential robbery and violence. To begin, I considered the historical occurrence of violence in the South African context. Violence became legitimised and normative through political struggles of the past. I went on to discuss multiple definitions of violence that exist due to its multifaceted nature while conceptualising some of the driving factors behind the occurrence of violence. I also presented multiple definitions on crime to evaluate the difference between crime and violence. I discussed the individual, societal and ecological drivers of crime which included factors such as – poverty, unemployment, poor social environment and lack of education. High levels of crime and violence erode public trust in state departments such as the police, government and judicial systems. This leads to either a breakdown in social cohesion among citizens or results in violence directed toward foreigners.

I gave definitions on residential robbery and examined the statistics on it provided by the South African Police Services annual reports. These statistics, however, are not considered

completely accurate and it is believed that officials 'cook crime statistics' and many crimes go underreported. Statistics on residential robbery showed a general increase in the number of cases from 2019-2020. Most residential robberies involve the use of weapons such as guns and victims' may be exposed to other crimes. Based on existing literature, I presented an overview on when and where residential robberies are likely to occur, who may be affected, who perpetrators may be, what drives or motivates them towards crime and what is likely to be taken. Opportunity plays a role in individuals becoming targets and violence is used as a means to control victims' and ensure their co-operation.

The influence of bio-political power on residential robbery and violence was considered. I looked at the theoretical frameworks articulated by Foucault, Agamben and Mbembe concerning sovereign power, bio-power, bare life and necro-politics. These frameworks govern rights over life and death and establish whose lives are considered to be more important than others. Life under bio-power is considered to be sacred, valuable and worth protecting. However, based on these principles, life has different value and meaning to different people. Sovereign power looks to control life and dictate between who can live and who must die while necro-power places marginalised groups into a state of living death making their lives invaluable. I went on to discuss the link between morality and crime. Starting with a definition of morality, I then went on to discuss the role morality plays in how people value their life versus their 'things'. I drew on the theoretical framework of Durkheim's 'anomie' to examine the relationship between the breakdown of morality in society and residential robbery. Lastly I considered the connection between morality, bio-political power, violence and the enactment of residential robbery. Having now provided an overview of the literature, in my next chapter I offer a detailed outline of the methodological components of the study.

CHAPTER 3

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter considers the methodological aspects of this research study. It outlines and discusses the particular approach used for research design and the techniques utilised for the selection and recruitment of participants as well as data gathering and analysis. It also provides a section on self-reflectivity and outlines the steps taken to ensure research rigour. Lastly it discusses the ethical considerations that were made for this research study.

3.2 METHODOLOGY

3.2.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

A qualitative approach was best suited for this research as it aimed to look at victims' discourses and social constructions of residential robbery and the use of violence in the South African context. Qualitative research is defined as " an inquiry process that looks to explore and understand a social or human problem by building a complex, holistic picture, analysing words, reporting detailed views of information and conducting the study in a natural setting" (Hossain, 2011, p. 144). A qualitative approach allowed me to draw data from the words, language and constructions used by participants', and critically analyse, interpret, conceptualise and reflect on the accessible information (Flick, 2009).

Participants' construct their social realities based on their interaction with their environment and different social contexts, these realities are considered to be subjective rather than objective (Da Silva & Sagvaag, 2008). A qualitative approach was therefore suitable for this research study as it allowed me to interact and communicate with participants' to gain a deeper understanding of how they make sense of, or interpret their social realities and other social phenomena and the meanings they ascribe to them' through their discourses and constructions (Richie, Lewis, Nicholls & Ormston, 2013). Social realities and phenomena should be studied through interpretation and analysis (Da Silva & Sagvaag, 2008); therefore by utilising a qualitative approach, I was able to become an important part of this research process, by being the subjective instrument responsible for collecting and interpreting the data (Creswell, 2007). Using this approach resulted in detailed and rich data gained from participants' through transcribed interviews, which allowed for a thorough analysis and interpretation of their discourses and constructions of residential robbery and the use of the violence.

3.2.2 PARTICIPANTS

Eight participants were interviewed for this study, this was considered a sufficient number for the type of data required and analysis used for the procurement of interesting and valid data once interviews were conducted and transcribed. I wanted to access participants' first-hand accounts, constructions and discourses of residential robbery and the use of violence, therefore it was essential that all the participants' were directly exposed to or victims' of residential robbery.

As illustrated in the literature above, low income communities are often more affected by high rates of violence and residential robbery. Based on this, I chose to select participants from both low income and middle to higher income communities to gain a variety of different constructions and discourses. Also, people within these communities attach different values and importance to the things they own and the lives which they have. It has also been discussed that there is a large wealth gap that exists in South Africa, placing people in different socio-economic positions which in turn affects how they experience crime and also how they talk about it. Measures of socio economic status often include factors such as wealth of the household and employment (Doolan, Ehrlich & Myer, 2007). Therefore as an inclusion criterion, I selected participants who were employed as either permanent skilled or 'white collar' workers or part time minimum wage workers who occupied or owned their own household. According to the literature, women and men face different forms of violence and experience residential robbery differently. It is for that reason that participants ranged in gender in order to engage with these various accounts.

'Race' as a social category still retains significant social currency in South Africa and continue to influence social realities of people. It is therefore important in understanding and shaping discourses of everyday accounts of residential robbery and violence. In the literature, race has played a historical role in formulating wealth gaps and entrenching marked differences in employment, enactments of crime and violence and even creating marginalised groups within communities. As part of the selection criteria, I therefore chose to select participants from varying racialised backgrounds. To operationalise and ensure these specific criteria were met, I met with participants and discussed the inclusion markers with them and through a process of elimination (asking questions pertaining to the criteria) I gained a working sample.

These criterion markers used in this study were not for the purposes of comparison but rather to engage with and gain a variety of different discourses regarding residential robbery and the use of violence. Sampling in qualitative research is not aimed at empirical generalizability but rather it aims to gain insights into a particular phenomenon. Respondents were sourced through the use of snowball, heterogeneous and purposive intensity sampling. In qualitative research, snowball sampling is a popular technique that is used (Parker, Scott & Geddes, 2019). It relies on referrals and networking in which the researcher initially starts with a small group of individuals who meet the research criteria (Parker et al, 2019). The initial group of participants were then asked to recommend and refer other participants they knew of who also met the criteria until enough participants were obtained (Parker et al, 2019). It is a method that is convenient and flexible. Maximum variation sampling or heterogeneous sampling is a purposive technique that involves looking at a variation of characteristics of a population such as gender, socioeconomic status, ethnicity etc. (Alvi, 2016). It helps researchers gain a variety of perspectives and greater insights into the phenomenon they are researching (Alvi, 2016).

Purposive sampling is a method that is used for the purpose of identifying and selecting material which is detailed enough when dealing with limited resources (Palinkas, Horwitz & Green, 2013). It allows researchers to identify and select individuals or groups that are available to participate in the study and who exhibit a degree of experience or knowledge regarding the particular phenomenon under investigation (Palinkas et al., 2013). Intensity sampling is a process which allows the researcher to choose a small number of cases which are information rich and intensely manifest the phenomenon at hand; these, however, are not deviant or extreme cases (Patton, 1990). This form of sampling requires the researcher to have prior information regarding variations of the phenomenon under observation in order to choose intense samples (Patton, 1990).

3.2.3 DATA GATHERING

To collect data for this research, semi- structured in-depth interviews were used. Interviews are mainly utilized with the purpose of eliciting participant's observations of their social realities and lives as depicted in their own accounts in order to gain insight into their subjective experiences, discourses and social spheres (Fossey, Harvey, Mcdermott & Davidson, 2002). Interviews have been regarded as an essential tool available to social researchers (Alshenqeeti, 2014). How individuals construct their world and their attachment

of meanings to the 'things' that occur in that world are not always directly accessible to the researcher (Alshenqeeti, 2014). Using an interview is just one method utilized to find out about constructions of 'objects' that are not directly observable. The researcher has the ability to build up rapport with a participant and provides a space for the participant to speak freely compared to for example focus groups.

Each interview was conducted face to face but separately and was based on an interview schedule that contained particular topics for discussion. This was not, however, used as a strict schedule of questions but rather as a guide (see Appendix A). Semi structured interviews allow for the exploration of more precise topics based on a schedule of different open ended questions that are used with the intention of guiding the discussion in a flexible but focused manner (Edwards & Holland, 2013). Using open ended questions allows participants to share their thoughts and ideas in their own words (discourses) (Edwards & Holland, 2013). It permitted flexibility in how and when questions were asked and allowed me to use probing questions to allow for discussion as well as comparison across interviews (Edwards & Holland, 2013).

In depth interviews have been described as forms of conversations. Keegan and Ward (2003, p.138) regard interview discourses as 'conversations with purpose'. This reproduces the 'fundamental process through which knowledge about the social world is constructed in normal human interaction' (Keegan & Ward, 2003, p.138). The aim in conducting an interview in this manner was to allow more naturalistic conversations with participants regarding the topics rather than strict question and answer sessions. This particular kind of interviewing process provided 'pieces' of talk from the participants and once the interviews were transcribed these 'pieces' of talk were examined.

3.2.4 PROCEDURE

I used specific criteria that emerged from literature in order to define a purposive sample required for this study which was discussed above. In order to gain access to a workable sample, I reached out to known victims of residential robbery via phone or social media. I then asked the initial participants to refer other known victims of residential robbery and I made contact with them via phone, email and social media. Potential participants were contacted and an initial meeting was set up in order to further discuss the study and I formally invited them to participate. This initial meeting as well as interviews were held at a place that was comfortable and convenient in order to ensure the safety of myself and each of the

participants. The severity of the crimes committed the number of people involved and potential levels of trauma varied amongst the participants; therefore I ensured that all participants were debriefed after each interview and all were referred to free Victim Support counselling if they required it.

I confirmed that all participants had been directly exposed to acts of residential robbery by asking relevant questions pertaining to (when/how the event occurred, location of occurrence and current employment situation). Each participant was given an information sheet (see Appendix B) which explained the aim and the nature the research and what would be required of each of them as participants, i.e. completing a face to face interview which would be audio voice recorded. For potential participants were willing to participate, I had set up a convenient time and place to meet with each of them. Those individuals that wanted to participate in the research were provided with two forms to fill out, comprising of an interview participation consent of participation (see Appendix C) and the other allowing the voice recording of the interview (see Appendix D). Once forms were handed back, I administered the questions based on a semi-structured interview schedule (see Appendix A) and audio voice recorded each participant's response in order to transcribe the interview for the purpose of analysis

3.2.5 DATA ANALYSIS: DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Once the data was collected using in-depth semi structured interviews, it was transcribed and then analysed through the guided use of Ian Parker's (1992) Discourse Analysis (DA). DA rests on the assumption that language is the driving force in shaping meaning and making sense of the world (creating social reality).

The term 'discourse' is used to denote anything related to the use and analysis of language from face to face talk, interactions (nonverbal), symbols and texts and largely comprehends the nuances in conversation (Biggerstaff, 2012; Shaw & Bailey, 2009) Parker (1992, p.5) defines discourse as 'a system of statements which constructs an object'. Parker as cited in Augoustinos, Walker and Donaghue (2006, p.61) suggests that the 'primary function of discourses are to bring objects into being thereby creating the status of reality with which object are endowed, they position us in various subject positions so that discourses invite us to take on certain roles and behaviours'.

Parker (1992) outlines 20 Steps or levels of discourse analysis. To begin (step 1) I created objects of the study as texts (participant responses were transcribed from audio into texts). As suggested by Parker, pieces of discourses goes beyond verbal and nonverbal forms; texts hold meanings that are reproduced and can be interpreted (Parker, 1992). I explored the texts using a form of free association (the meaning I associated with the text) (step 2) (Parker, 1992).. Parker (1992) denotes two levels of objectification or reality of what kinds of objects discourses can be about. By using DA, I was required to question what objects were being referred to, after which I described them (e.g. Violence, morality, robbery) (step 3) and subsequently engaged in speaking about talk/discourse as objects (step 4) (Parker, 1992).

After talking about discourses, the focus shifted to the subjects that were contained in the study. Step 5 was concerned with identifying what types of individuals (participants) were spoken about in this discourse – some of who were identified as objects already (such as victims and perpetrators). After this process, I reflected on what they had said in the discourse (step 6). The process then involved presenting a picture of the world which outlined themes found in the discourse by grouping coherent statements that fitted into similar topics (step 7). I then took into consideration how texts using these discourses dealt with objections to particular terminologies being used (step 8). Parker (1992) denoted that one of the features of discourses is that they refer to other discourses. With this in mind, I compared contrasting discourses and complementary discourses that formed other reference points within the text (step 9). I then identified overlapping aspects of discourses that denoted the same object from different perspectives (e.g. violence is injurious, violence is harmful, violence is detrimental and violence is useful) (step 10).

The next two steps outlined by Parker (1992) involved looking at how discourses reflect on themselves and their own ways of speaking. Discourses were explored by drawing on other texts (step 11) in order to illustrate the discourse as it occurs (e.g. literature review, other studies done on similar topics) while secondly taking into consideration the terms that were used to refer to/describe the discourse (step 12, this required a consideration of political/moral choices e.g. discourses surrounding ‘race’). Parker (1992) highlights the importance of the historical emergence of discourses. Discourses are in no way static and require an acknowledgment of how and where discourses emerge (step 13) while also ensuring its historicity and describing how discourses have changed (step 14)

Parker (1992) introduced 6 final steps that centred on critical theory while looking to uncover existing power relations. Institutions become reinforced and benefit when discourses are used (step 15) or subverted (step 16) and I tried to identify those institutions. Discourses not only support institutions but also reproduce relations of power. I focused on the types of people that either benefited or lost from using particular discourses (step 17), while also taking into account which people would either want to promote or oppose discourses (step 18). The last levels of Parkers (1992) analysis deals with the repercussions surrounding discourse ideologies in two ways, the first demonstrates how discourses join other discourses which are oppressive (step 19) and finally demonstrates how discourses allow dominant groups to relate their accounts to justify their present while inhibiting discourses which are subjugated from making history. I used Parkers form of DA as it is best suited to identifying relations of power, the nature of which are reflected in my bio-political framework and the questions about morality and life. DA allows us looks beyond the literal meanings that exist in language; rather it endeavours to help us understand varied discourses that shape interaction and language in context and how meaning is constructed from those contexts.

3.2.6 REFLEXIVITY AND RIGOUR

According to Haynes (2012), reflexivity deals with the researcher's own awareness of their role in the research processes and practices. It allows researcher's to acknowledge how they affect research outcomes. Reflexivity involves an understanding that the object of the study and the researcher are continuously affected by each other throughout the entire research process (Alvesson & Skoldburg, 2000). It focuses on how the researcher's thinking came to be, how preconceived ideas and knowledge change based on new information and understanding and how this ultimately affects the research (Haynes, 2012). It requires researchers to remain self-conscious about their own prejudices, bias and assumptions (Lynch, 2000). Reflexivity also involves levels of interpretation; focusing on how we think, read and make sense of texts and objects around us (Lynch, 2000). It allows us to conceive, interpret and identify alternative ways of thinking (Lynch, 2000).

The quality of qualitative research is dependent on the skills of the researcher (Morris, 2015). The data and analysis can be influenced by the researchers own subjective biases (Morris, 2015). As a female researcher who grew up in South Africa, I have also been exposed to violence and residential robbery through media, family and friends. I tried to stay aware of my public social knowledge and separate it from the private lived accounts of my

participants. To do this, I kept a separate notebook to reflect on my own perceptions and emotions during the interview process. While analysing the interviews, I referred back to my notebook to ensure that I was being true to the participants' accounts rather than my own. In qualitative research, the researcher actively interprets and represents the social realities of the participants. Language and the meaning behind it may often be understood and interpreted differently. I tried to be as transparent as possible through the entire process and remain cognisant of the views my participants wanted to express.

During the research process the researcher plays an integral part and is the instrument responsible for gathering information, concepts and observing behaviour (Mohajan, 2018). I tried to ensure that each participant was able to have their interview done in English. This allowed me to effectively convey the questions, engage with the responses and it supported a natural flow of conversation in a safe, comfortable environment. While researchers have no control over how participants present themselves, it is still crucial to encourage an open, honest conversation. I kept the setting of the interview casual by conducting it in a space the participants felt most comfortable in while remaining professional to the interview structure. While using a list of interview questions to guide the conversation (see Appendix A), I encouraged participants to speak freely and established the interview as a free conversation. I asked participants follow up questions and tried to probe for additional information. If participants feel comfortable with the researcher, they are more likely to give accurate accounts (Anderson, 2010). Lastly, with this being a sensitive topic I did not want to re-traumatise my participants. I tried to make sure that all my participants felt safe and were aware that help was available to them if necessary. I ensured they had access to counselling facilities and made them aware of it before and after their interviews.

Another crucial part of the research procedure is to ensure rigour. In qualitative research, rigour is used as a way to establish confidence or 'trustworthiness' in the research study and its findings (Hadi & José Closs, 2016). Qualitative rigour comprises of 4 components which include; credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Hadi & José Closs, 2016). To ensure credibility of this research, I personally conducted all the interviews and reviewed and transcribed 7 out of 8 interviews. One interview was reviewed and transcribed by a qualified translator as it was conducted in another language. These transcripts and recordings were shared with my supervisor (with the informed consent of participants) to ensure research integrity. In the findings section, I provided the exact accounts and words of the participants to ensure that true and accurate reflections of participants' experiences were

given. The aim of this research was to gain a first-hand account of victims' who experienced residential robbery and not to generalise results to different populations. However, in terms of transferability, I outlined specific demographic criteria for the selection of my participants and provided a detailed description of why this was necessary to the study. The same data collection method was applied to all participants who ranged in age, gender, socio-economic background and residential community.

In terms of dependability, I firstly provided a detailed outline of my thought and decision-making process. In the methodology section I discussed and gave a detailed summary of why I chose qualitative research design, how participants were selected and why specific demographic criteria was used in the selection process. I described the data collection procedures and why discourse analysis was the best technique for interpreting and presenting the findings. To ensure confirmability, I remained self-aware and reflexive throughout the study by keeping notes on my own personal attitudes and feelings. I took into account how my subjective thoughts may have affected the research as a whole. I then provided a detailed self-reflexivity section in which I addressed these specific challenges and how I mitigated them to provide an objective research study.

3.2.7 ETHICS

Ethical clearance was obtained from the University of the Witwatersrand prior to the start of the research (Certificate number: MASPR/17/007 IH). Participation in this research was entirely voluntary and no one was forced in any way to take part. Each participant was informed verbally about the research and was invited to be a part of it. Those who were willing to participate and met the specified requirements were briefed on the content of the study and given an information letter regarding the research (see Appendix B). Due to the nature and subject matter of the research regarding morality, violence and robbery asking participants to relive or recollect parts of their experiences may have left them feeling vulnerable. In order to avoid causing distress it was made clear to the participants both verbally and in their consent letter what the focus of the topic was. Participants were informed verbally and via an information sheet handed to them that they were required to have a face to face interview that would be conducted over approximately a 45 minute period. They were also informed that their interview would be audio voice recorded for transcription and analysis purposes. Each participant had the right to withdraw their participation and/or responses from the study any time prior to the completion of my write up.

Participants were informed that this research included no benefits for their participation. They were also assured that the audio voice recordings of their interviews would be destroyed after a 3 year period. They were further advised that direct quotations would be used in the presentation of findings but were guaranteed that I would use pseudonyms, non-identifiable information etc. in order to ensure anonymity and partial confidentiality. Once participants agreed to the above they were required to sign a consent form acknowledging their participation in this study (see Appendix C) and provide their consent to be audio voice recorded (see Appendix D). After each interview was completed I ensured that each participant was debriefed. If the participants felt distressed at any point after the study I ensured that counselling was made available to them if required. Contact emails of my supervisor and I were made available if participants required further information and feedback would only be made available upon completion of my write up and on request from the participant (see Appendix B).

3.2.8 CONCLUSION

This chapter took into consideration and outlined the research methodology that was utilised in my study. I positioned my use of qualitative research design and described how my sample was selected, how data was collected and the method utilised for data analysis. I further discussed my reasoning for the use of these particular research techniques. I presented a self-reflection in which I acknowledged the role and effect I had on the research and outlined the steps I took to ensure research rigour. I also provided a detailed summary of the ethical considerations that were made during this study. Having now provided a detailed description of the methodology, in my next chapter I present a thorough account of my analysis of the data.

CHAPTER 4

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter offers a comprehensive summary of the analysis of this research. I divided the analysis into three main sections which include; foundational discourses, core moral discourses and existential and power discourses. There are a number of sub-sections that give a more detailed understanding and explanation of victims' constructions of residential robbery and the use of violence. Foundational discourses comprise of the initial constructions and discourses discussed by victims' including; poverty and unemployment, race, crime of opportunity, gender and state failure. Core moral discourses consider various constructions of moral attitudes, behaviours within society and the link between morality and residential robbery. Existential and power discourses deal with the interplay between life versus 'things', the exchange between power, vulnerability and fear and lastly the politics of death.

4.2 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In order to begin the analysis, it is first essential to outline the participant's across the selection criteria that were described in detail above. I have listed each participant and provided demographic details that may be pertinent to their use of particular discourses and constructions of residential robbery and the use of violence. I also provided this outline to give a clear indication of which participants I am referring to in the analysis.

Table 1
Demographic data pertaining to participant selection criteria

Participants	Race	Gender	Socio/economic	Employment
P1	Black	Female	Low income	Part time
P2	Indian	Male	Middle/higher	Permanent
P3	Indian	Male	Middle/higher	Permanent
P4	Indian	Male	Middle/higher	Permanent
P5	Indian	Male	Middle/higher	Permanent
P6	Black	Female	Middle/higher	Permanent
P7	White	Female	Middle/higher	Permanent
P8	Black	Male	Low income	Part time

The research utilized the above mentioned method of discourse analysis. As a starting point the analysis began with looking for discursive categories on a surface level based on the constructions and discourses that emerged from the data. In doing so the analysis was conceptualized based on 3 broad sections which were further divided into more granular and in-depth sub-sections. Each section represents and contributes to its own particular function based on the participants' individual and collective constructions of residential robbery and violence. The analysis was set out in a 'hierarchical' manner in order explore how participants' constructed their discourses; starting from the foundations and building into ideas that are more intricately related to morality, the construction of life and the importance of 'things'. The analysis also sought to establish the link and overlap between these constructs as a whole.

4.3 FOUNDATIONAL DISCOURSES

To begin, the analysis first focuses on how participants drew on what I have called foundational discourses to construct residential robbery and the use of violence. '*Foundational discourses'* makes up the fundamental components that provide the platform and the concrete base for participants' initial constructions. It is made up of several concepts which are discussed by participants and include – poverty and unemployment, race, opportunity, gender and lastly state failure. Participants' used these concepts to construct residential robbery and the use of violence in its enactment.

4.3.1 POVERTY AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Amongst the majority of participants, poverty and unemployment were used as justificatory discourses for residential robbery in South Africa. To some participants unemployment fosters poverty and poverty promotes continued unemployment. According to the collective accounts of some participants', "the poor" become desperate in their effort to sustain their lives. Participants constructed the link between poverty, unemployment and the desperation faced by individuals within particular social classes as below;

> *"I think it comes to a point where you are the bread winner of your family and if you see your one year old kid is crying and you have no food for the kid, I'm trying to, if I were to put myself in their position what would I do to get money to buy the food. Okay not to get money to get food you can either work you can do some gardening you can do this and that but if you go those avenues and you still get nothing and you*

become desperate, so I think it's more out of desperation and the lack of employment opportunities"-P2

"Look it's gonna happen, there's a lot of poverty in this country. If they eradicate poverty we won't have these burglaries all these guys want to do is actually provide for, to provide for their families"-P3

"Firstly there's desperation where and if you just look at, where people just get desperate based on circumstances. Unemployment is high in this country so the support structures are difficult, grants can only get you so much in so that-that desperation will definitely lead to crime"-P5

Constructing residential robbery as an act of desperation implies that individuals have no choice or control over their actions. They are constrained by their social and economic conditions. When people are subjected to particular life conditions – such as poverty, they seemingly calibrate morality and legitimacy on the basis of everyday struggle. Participants constructed the idea that although robbery is a crime – it may be a legitimate strategy for survival in the context of living in poverty.

According to P5, unemployment marginalizes people and government support schemes such as grants only provide financial assistance to a certain limited extent. Responsibility for crime in these accounts is therefore not placed on the individuals but rather on the circumstances of the country – *"a lot of poverty in this country"* (P3), *"unemployment is so high"* (P5). In his account, P3 made a point that if poverty was not a prevalent factor in society or did not exist altogether, there would be no necessity to steal or engage in crime. These economic discourses account for and legitimise robbery as a means of survival in an unequal society.

P2 constructed the actions of people who engage in crime as being justified by trying to mentally place himself in a disadvantaged situation. He accounted for bread winners facing challenges of providing for and feeding their families and it not being enough. According to his account, although crime should not be the first choice, it is understandable after numerous attempts at finding honest labour yield no actionable results. 'In the post- apartheid context in South Africa, many previously disadvantaged groups still continue to be educationally and economically marginalized resulting in the continued trend of racial inequalities in the country' (Bowman, et al, 2022, p.16). Employment is not guaranteed and this often leaves people frustrated and without alternative options especially if there is a family dynamic involved – *"all these guys want to do is actually provide for, to provide for their families"* (P3).

In his account, P2 draws on patriarchy – men are socially constructed as providers, breadwinners and heads of households. Providing financially is accounted as being a legitimate way for men to express their masculinity. Residential robbery provides an opportunity for perpetrators to meet their needs for survival, which in turn legitimises their patriarchal standing of being a provider.

Some participants on the other hand, constructed a continuous state of poverty and unemployment as being caused by individual's lack of initiative. According to these participants, residential robbery is not committed as an act of desperation based on circumstances, but rather as a convenient alternative to hard work for some individuals.

> *" If you look at people coming out of this country they're going and trying to sell things here look at vendors. I mean the hawkers on the street, look at-at the guys on the street, they are creating employment for themselves. Our guys can do just the same, so it's 2 fold, if you want to stay there you'll always remain, there if you want to move on and better yourself and help your family there's always an opportunity to do that"*-P3

> *"I believe when you come into this life you come in with nothing. I believe you should work for yourself you should work hard. You got hands. Even cripples you see them working, you see people crippled, handicapped they are working so I-I don't think there's a reason for anyone to take something that doesn't belong to you, unfairly something that you didn't work for…I believe it's more of laziness"*-P6

> *"Some guys don't want to work she want to steal, that's why she is doing like this if you going to work you can't to steal another people, she is lazy but to come to robbery"*- P8

In their accounts, some participants suggested that poverty and unemployment are not viable justifications for actions leading to residential robbery and other crimes. In unfavourable social and economic conditions people can choose to either -*"stay in poverty or go and find something to do to eradicate the poverty"* (P3). In his account, P3 suggested that there is always an opportunity to make an honest living and create a life that is not based on crime. He made reference to foreigners creating legitimate means of work to survive. By selling 'things', they push themselves out of poverty and unemployment. "*Our guys can do just the same*" (P3), there is no excuse for locals to not create the same opportunities for themselves, it's a choice. There is also an underlying patriarchal discourse in his account.

P3 recognised that men should take every opportunity to better their lives and that of their family; to create work and provide an income. Unemployed men should aim to be financially responsible and capable for their families.

Poverty does not restrict people's potential to generate employment for themselves. For some participants, employment is constructed as being an individual's responsibility rather than that of the government's to provide. For these participants, desperate individuals are not victims of their circumstances and therefore can be held accountable for their own situation and actions. In her account, P6 constructed individuals from different social classes as having the ability to work regardless of their circumstances, backgrounds and even disabilities. "*Even cripples you see them working, you see people crippled"* (P6), accounts for the idea that even people who are more at a physical disadvantage do not resort to robbery. It implies that perpetrators who engage in robbery are to some extent morally 'crippled'. They are damaged and corrupted by their own actions and should not be shown understanding or compassion.

For some participants, using social and economic disparities as a cause to take from others is unfair and unjustifiable. Both P6 and P8 constructed the perpetrators who resort to robbery as being *"lazy".* They account for perpetrators as having the choice to either work or to commit robbery. Robbery is often chosen as it is seen as 'easy money', something that can be gained quickly and effortlessly. P6 and P8's accounts suggest a moral flaw or weakness that exists among these perpetrators. In the face of the decision to make money through hard work or easy money through robbery, the latter is chosen without a sense of moral regard for victims' and their hard work to obtain their possessions.

Difficult social and economic conditions have the ability to distort the lines between what people need and what they desire or want in comparison to others. Participants engaged with this idea and had the following to say:

> *"Some of them take because they don't have what another person [has], they need that and they gonna see, they also want to live a good life and so they take. They just take because now, they don't have and they want to be the same so they trying to line with everything, not thinking it's wrong for them to do that"*-P3

> *"People sometimes uh show off with the fancy cars and stuff like that and they- they asked to be robbed"*-P4

Participants constructed "the poor" or unemployed as not acting out of "need", but out of "want" for the things that they don't have. *"It's got more to do with what you have and what you don't have, that is what turns you into a criminal"* (P7). Another participant echoed this view. "*The division between poor and rich in this country especially is huge, so I'm not saying it's right but it's almost, you can almost understand where the people are more or less coming from"* (P5). P5 accounted for his position by reporting that this division between groups promotes crime and makes it allowable to a certain degree. Due to the disparity, individuals from more disadvantaged social classes may not find themselves in a position to achieve what they want. 'South Africa is a country where the gap between access to valuables and property and the personal and collective resources required to multiply them remains a key challenge' (Bowman et al, 2002, p.19).

According to this account, perpetrators want to demonstrate their own status and position in their communities which is achieved through having 'things' and possessions others may not have. To engage in this conspicuous consumption, however, they have to use any means necessary in order achieve it. They are constructed as being motivated by the need or rather the want to possess what others have, therefore, it becomes understandable that they find alternative means to engage in a life they want even if it is not morally acceptable.

In his account, P3 reasons that people take from others because they also want a good life. *"They also want to live a good life and so they take"* (P3) – a good life for perpetrators becomes synonymous with having 'things' and by taking from others, they have a means to participate in the particular lifestyle they are looking for. Not having something, but deeply desiring it motivates people to take from others. "*They want to be the same so they trying to line with everything, not thinking it's wrong for them to do that*" – P3 drew on a discourse of accumulation. People are driven to grow their wealth and possessions by any means necessary with little to no regard for how they do it or the consequences that come with engaging in illegitimate acts of accumulation.

P4 drew on accountability, suggesting that the blame or responsibility does not lie with the person committing the crime, but rather the victim themselves. Showing off what you have to people who don't have, creates desirability for those possessions. Perpetrators also want to engage in conspicuous consumption showing status through extravagance, expenditure and possessions – "*they asked to be robbed*" (P4).Therefore in his account, P4 constructed the idea that victims need to be more self-aware and acknowledge the role play in their own robberies.

This sort of victim-blaming insists that. Victims who visibility shows off their possessions place themselves in a vulnerable position to be robbed.

4.3.2 RACE

When responding directly to the question, *"who is at risk of residential robbery and why?"* participants drew on discourses relating to race. In South Africa, everyone is exposed to crime either directly, through the accounts of others or via social media (Geffen & Silber, 2009). While crime is reported across South Africa, constructions of crime among particular racial groups often vary. In their accounts, participants had the following to say about race and its link to residential robbery:

> *"I think obviously more whites live in suburbs where they have more money, it used to be like that so yes they will be targeting those areas but more and more"*-P7

> *"The guys when they came in here they were like, oh no wena we never expected to see a black man here, wena we never expected to black people here we wanted white, we wanted white, we wanted white but now, we blacks why don't you just go back, you weren't here to rob black people or you have discovered that we black you can just take your weapon and go but no they still robbed us"*-P6

By stating that it's *"obviously more whites"*, P7 emphasises that this information is clear, expected and is something that people would not be surprised to hear. She used racialised discourse to reflect awareness that simply being white and living in a more affluent community automatically puts white people at higher risk of being robbed residentially. For P7, living in a particular area affirms a status of having more wealth and despite numerous changes within society, the racial group affected does not change. In her account, P6 constructed perpetrators as having a clear racial agenda and expectation of who they want to target. To position herself, she drew on the perpetrators own use of racial discourse, "*no wena we never expected to see a black man here, we wanted white"*. The likelihood or possibility of non-white individuals living in a particular area and participating in a degree of wealth was (according to P6's account), not considered by these perpetrators.

Their discourse joins wealth in South Africa with whiteness, but also draws on the common trope that residential robberies are racialised by the perpetrators. This racialisation serves to imply that residential robberies afford robbers an agency that inverts the logic of power in South Africa. In her account, P6 suggested that while race may be a secondary factor of who

is targeted, not meeting particular wealth profiles or a racial expectation does not act as a deterrent against residential robbery – "*you weren't here to rob black people or you have discovered that we black you can just take your weapon and go but no they still robbed us* " (P6)..

Some participants on the other hand drew on racial discourse to construct residential robbery as a crime that affects all racial groups in South Africa, "*I think it's across the board it, it just doesn't happen to one race group it's, it's ya across board, it's not one"* (P4). In his account, P4 suggested that no racial group is left untouched or unaffected. Race is not constructed as a factor which makes people more susceptible targets or places them at higher risk of being robbed. Other participants with similar race-inflected discourses went on to say the following:

> *"I think no racial group is left untouched. If you wealthy there's more of a chance, and if your poor it's just uh a matter of timing. I'm tryna get the right words but uhm, if there something to be taken it will be taken irrespective"*-P5

> *"I don't think it's a racial thing, they rob whoever their victim is they don't care about the race , or what they could, they get to you, they rob you"*-P6

For P5, the risk of being robbed is not based on race but rather having something of value that can be taken. Being subject to residential robbery is non-discriminate. P5 accounts for class being a contributing factor to residential robbery. The wealthy are targeted as they have considerably more to take from, and the poor because there is always someone who is poorer and in need or want of something. If the opportunity presents itself to take something, it will be taken regardless of race or socioeconomic circumstances. According to P6, residential robbery is not a racial crime but rather one of accessibility and impulse – "*they get to you, they rob you*" (P6). If perpetrators are presented with an ideal situation and have the ability to gain access to the victim and their possessions, then it becomes almost inevitable that the opportunity will be taken irrespective of race. They act on their impulse to take when presented with the right conditions to do so.

According to the accounts of participants in low income communities' race is not constructed as being a factor that places people at higher risk of being robbed. Within this community, everyone is at risk of being targeted. They are not only exposed to residential robbery, but other crimes as well. *"People robbing people on the street of their handbags, cellphones. You send a child to the shop, somebody takes money away from the child, they get robbed"* (P1). P1 drew on a discourse of fatalistic criminality – crime is continuous and inevitable and no choices, actions

or events stop the inevitable from occurring. Perpetrators are constructed here as ordinary people. This makes the distinctions between perpetrators and non-perpetrators within these communities difficult. Everyone is either a potential criminal or a potential victim a dynamic which stems from the effect of poverty. No one is left untouched by acts of criminality; it perforates within the community from innocent children to anyone who is considered a viable and easy target. Other participants had the following to say:

> *"They just go randomly. They just go wherever they feel like. There is no specific people that they are targeting actually… in Extension 1 there is no electricity and the street lights are not working"*- P1

> *"She is getting robbed everyone, because you know what I'm poor but you've got someone that's poorer than me. If she is passing my house, she is seeing the TV, or the radio is gonna take she is stealing from everybody, poor, rich same she is stealing for poor she is stealing for rich"*-P8

According to P1's account, victims are chosen without conscious decision. Each individual is at risk because they form a part of the community. She went on further to discuss the communities struggle with lack of resources. According to her account, the entire community becomes vulnerable to being victims of crime because they have limited or no access to basic provisions such as electricity. The poor conditions make the situation ideal for perpetrators because without proper resources; catching or exposing them becomes harder for the community. Poverty creates a risk for people becoming victims and alternatively it also creates a risk for people becoming perpetrators. Everyone is exposed to either one or both dynamics. Like middle to higher income communities, low income communities also have wealth gaps. In reality there are always people who more disadvantaged and have less than the victim themselves. Being from a more disadvantaged social class does not exclude individuals from experiencing crime. This reflects a counter discourse to the common racialisation of crime, in accounts which often join victimhood to whiteness and perpetration to blackness. It is not only wealthy 'white' people that are targets but everyone is a potential victim. For P8, having simple luxuries such as a TV or radio can make you a target. It's a differentiating factor, placing those that have items of value at higher risk. Although the wealth gap divides the community, the risk of falling victim to residential robbery affects both groups equally.

Participants further drew on racialised, outsider, xenophobic discourses when identifying individuals or groups they believed were to blame for crimes such as residential robbery in South Africa. Based on their accounts, a majority of participants placed foreigners at the forefront of crime.

> *"I don't know whether it was Zimbabwean or DRC whatever, but it was foreign languages, so I'm saying that could also be contributing to this, because people are coming here, land of opportunities and they can't find jobs and they not going to go back"*-P2

> *"People from out, from out of the country are coming in taking these jobs and that's where it starts…if you are a foreigner in this country you, the skin colour to our colour is totally different uh you'll know when and the voice is different … for me personally the robberies that we had were all foreigners"*-P3

> *"I believed they were Zulu people because they were speaking Zulu, Wasambeti, Bots, someone told me no they could also be from Zimbabwe, because Zimbabwe people they also speak Zulu"*-P6

In their accounts, participants constructed foreigners as an 'other', distinguishing their differences in language, speech and even skin colour from that of local citizens. In their anti-foreigner sentiments, participants used these perceived differences to justify that they were targeted by foreign nationals. In her account, P6 initially constructed perpetrators as local citizens based on their language and dialect. Her construction of local citizens being perpetrators changed, however, when the people from her community said that foreigners also use and are able to speak South African languages "*someone told me no they could also be from Zimbabwe, because Zimbabwe people they also speak Zulu*" (P6).

Some partitpcants constructed foreigners as outsiders who look to participate in South Africa's wealth and resources at the expense of local people. In their accounts, both P2 and P3 echoed similar views in that foreigners come into South Africa seeking betterment through employment opportunities. When they, however, fail to find employment, they do not return to their own countries but rather continue to live off South African resources and participate in other actions in order to maintain and sustain their lives. This is constructed as being a contributing factor for the high rates of residential robbery in the country. The inability to find a job is considered a catalyst for foreigner's engagement in crime. Local-'s' involvement in crime becomes underrepresented as the blame is shifted elsewhere.

A dynamic between 'us' versus 'them' is created, where foreigners become the 'scapegoats' of collective violence and the embodiment and representation of local citizens' unfulfilled expectations (Steinberg, 2018). The participants' use of racialised, xenophobic discourse reflects intolerance towards difference, constructing foreigners as contributors to a failing society rather than victims of one.

4.3.3 CRIME OF OPPORTUNITY

Some participants constructed residential robbery as a crime of opportunity. *"They would just observe and see if there can be an opportunity for them to get into the house. That is how they do… the door was not properly closed/locked…they forced it open with a crowbar*" (P1). In his account, P1 suggested that perpetrators go looking for opportunities. Once they find something they're looking for, they observe and wait for the most opportune moment to engage in the crime. While some participants had previously advocated that poverty, need and failing character (blurred dynamic between victim and perpetrator) in low income communities' motivated residential robbery and crime, other participants discussed an alternative perspective. Some participants accounted for residential robbery as being easier to carry out in low income communities as the level of accessibility to a house is higher due to lack of security or other deterrents. This was also a factor discussed by participants' residing in middle to higher income communities.

> *"They were driving past my place and my gate was opening and it was an opportunity, an opportune moment for them. It wasn't something that was planned, so I think if I was a bit more careful maybe it wouldn't have happened but it didn't pan out that way but yeah"*-P2

Some participants constructed their residential robberies as unplanned, random acts that occurred while engaging in their ordinary daily activities. P2 engaged with a discourse of risk of victimhood. He reported that his own lack of awareness or care put him at higher risk and made him more vulnerable. Furthermore, had he been more aware or cautious of his situation, he would have not failed to ensure his safety or been at risk for falling victim to an act of residential robbery – "*maybe it wouldn't have happened"* (P2). P2's account conveys an underlying discourse of self-blame leading to victim blaming. A victim becomes a victim not because they were targeted, but because they did something that made them more vulnerable or jeopardised their own safety. Although attempts are made by individuals to reduce opportunities, this does not necessarily prevent crimes from happening.

> *"It's about opportunity, that's what I was missing, it's about that opportunity. Where if it's there, it will be taken you know, I mean whether it be desperation or whatever, if the opportunity's there, that temptation is there, it will happen"*-P5

On the other hand, while P5 also accounted for opportunity driving crime, his discourse of risk of victimhood and perpetration was directed both at the situation and at perpetrators themselves. He accounted for there always being a motivation or underlying reason for criminal's actions, whether it is desperation or temptation. If the opportunity is present, something will be taken regardless – "*it will happen"* (P5). If perpetrators find their chance to engage in residential robbery, then the risk of victimhood increases regardless of attempts to ensure self-safety.

Participants went on to account for and construct the multiple residential robberies that they were exposed to on more than one occasion.

> *"That was the one and then the last one was couple months back uh in March this year, April, April this year we had a robbery at 5 o clock in the morning at home… they tried 7 times after that to break in"*-P2

> *"Actually I was out and they broke in the front door, they broke in there, so it's been a few, quite a few instances at the one house, but the frequency of it was more alarming cause it happened almost every other month within a short space of time"*-P5

Some participants engaged with a re-victimisation discourse, having been affected by crime on multiple occasions within a short space of time. While being exposed to several or more instances of robbery, P2's account reflected the underlying idea that some perpetrators wait for opportune moments in which their victims are most vulnerable or least threatening. On the contrary, P5 constructed the actions of the perpetrators as being more brazen and open as they *'broke in the front door'*, showing no fear of being caught or confronted. He referred to his re-victimisation as *'alarming'*, something that was disturbing, uncommon and unusual. In his account, there is an apprehensive dynamic that moves between residential robbery and re-victimisation being widely and constantly encountered and the threshold of when it moves into becoming an 'alarming' occurrence. According to P5's account, perpetrators had almost continual 'open access' to his house. This could represent an underlying assertion of power and authority by perpetrators over P5's personal space. By gaining way into his house more than once, perpetrators developed a sense of 'right' or 'entitlement' over his space and his 'material wealth'.

4.3.4 GENDER

In their research study on crime in South Africa, Lamb and Warton (2016) concluded that gender is associated with different accounts of violent crime. Participants constructed residential robbery through their use of gendered discourses. They identified how gender roles and expectations play a significant part in their accounts. They further used gendered discourses to evaluate the violence that they were exposed to, and how that differed based on their gender roles.

In their accounts, male participants discussed the use of physical violence they were exposed to, recognising that the violence used against them was a means to subdue, constrain and overpower them in this volatile situation.

> *"I've practiced when a guy's got a gun and it's touching my head, if his got the gun right here and he's touching my head, I know I can disarm him and put him on the floor. I know I've practiced that kind of thing, I don't do anything to this guy firstly he can shoot at my wife…they pulled my hands, you know so they could put the cables behind me. It hurt my shoulder after it finished, I still had some shoulder pain because they pulled my hand abit to-too much…"* -P2

> *"They took me to the spare room, switched on the iron and told me and placed it next to my face and told me, if you don't, if you move we will blow the iron up on your face and uh ya and then they robbed us…ya they actually tied me up more than anybody else because male figure…when they were leaving I pulled out my firearm, but my wife says no leave it don't shoot or else it's going to get worse and all"* -P4

> *"If you want move your head she's going to hit you there, you must just back to sleep, you sleeping or she's taking a cushion and she's putting on top of your head, you can't see anything"* -P8.

Some male participant's constructed themselves as potential threats to perpetrators, and agreed that physical violence was used as a means to intimidate, retrain and instil fear in them. In his account, P4 suggested that he was exposed to a more aggressive form of violence than his family, owing only to the fact that he was the '*male figure'*. Some male participants constructed the idea that in order to take control and dominate a risky situation such as residential robbery, perpetrators need to ensure that men are incapacitated and are not in a position to fight back, attack or resist in any way – "*they pulled my hands, you know so they could put the cables behind me*" (P2); "*they actually tied me up more than anybody else*" (P4).

In their accounts, P2 and P4 suggested that they could have retaliated using their strength or being armed. Being trained in martial arts, P2 recognised that he had both the strength and agility to "*disarm him and put him on the floor*" (P2). As a man and skilled martial artist P2 had the ability to overpower the perpetrators but considered against it fearing first for the safety of his wife. Through their accounts, both P2 and P4 constructed their performative patriarchal roles toward their families. They accounted for protection being a man's role and responsibility. They reported that although they would or should have retaliated, they didn't as they would have been endangering the lives of their family rather than protecting them.

In his account, P4 acknowledged that he owned a gun and could have shot at the perpetrators to protect his family; however, this could have resulted in the situation escalating further. Challenging or threatening the life of perpetrators could have resulted in P4's own death. In low income communities, P8 accounted for physical violence as men being hit on the head, told to '*sleep*' or blinded as perpetrators don't want to be identified in the community.

While discussing their residential robberies, some male participants went on to construct their roles as protectors. They had the following to say:

> *"I didn't think things through too far, all I knew that my daughter is in her room, my son is in that room and we gonna go in one room. I don't know what's happening at those places, I just knew that I wanted to see them, I must be able to see them. I don't mind if they gonna, If they gonna end up tying us up or whatever, I want to be all in the same room so I can see that's all"*-P2

> *"I've got girls at home, I've got a wife so, I'm the only man in the house so you-you all these things run through your mind"*-P3

In their accounts, male participants drew on gendered discourses to identify themselves as the protective figures in their families. Participants acknowledged that they could not think of anything other than ensuring the safety of their wives and children, often with little or no regard for their own personal safety. P2 constructed his role as a protective father through emphatically reporting. His need to be in control of seeing his children and having them close to him during the residential robbery. The lives of his children were considered as being more valuable, sacred and precious than his own – this implies a bio-political logic of the inherent value of family life over his own and the objects being stolen. He reflected on his responsibility of ensuring his children were not in danger without him being physically present to oversee, control and deescalate the situation.

In his account, P3 positioned himself as "*the only man in the house"*, constructing the idea that by being the male figure, he was solely responsible for the people within his household. For him, being male carries with it an instinctive sense of authority and protective behaviour. He also referred to having "*girls [daughters] at home, I've got a wife*", which enforces the gender construction of females being more vulnerable and needing male protection. It also enforces ideals of patriarchy. The house is constructed as a space of authority and the responsibility of the occupants living within it is managed and controlled by the male figure..

While talking about their residential robberies, participants accounted for the different emotional and physical reactions or vulnerabilities that occurred after the robbery:

> *"Well they [wife and daughters] actually had to get psychology uh help, psychological help and uh ya it, it deters them from going to shop or going to you know or going to malls"*-P4

> *"I'm not going anywhere because, I have a feeling like they out there waiting for me, uhm then secondly it made me to be cautious of myself and the fact that I need to defend myself all the time"*-P6

> *"I do definitely make sure that I'm, that I'm at home my doors are locked, that my alarms are set, that my beams outside and I don't think that's the way we want to live, it just doesn't feel safe"* -P7

Through the use of gender discourse, females were constructed by both themselves and male participants as being more likely to have negative side effects as a result of residential robberies. In his account, P4 constructed his wife and daughters as being more psychologically vulnerable than himself. He referred to their need to seek therapy to cope, whereas he did not. By making reference to "*it deters them*", he constructed the idea that the robbery created a sense of doubt or fear in them to engage in daily routines or behaviours that were previously considered 'normal'. A similarly gendered discourse was shared by other participants. Both P6 and P7 self-identified as being more vulnerable and at risk, being female. They constructed their vulnerability by describing the restrictive actions or behaviours they engaged in to avoid being re-victimised, for example: "*not going anywhere*" (P6), "*need to defend myself*" (P6), "*my doors are locked, that my alarms are set*" (P7). P6 and P7 both considered, however, that despite taking these steps they reported feeling psychologically trapped, violated or unsafe; "*I have a feeling like they out there waiting*" (P6), "*it just doesn't feel safe*" (P7).

In their accounts, female participants discussed the potential threats of violence they either feared or encountered during their respective residential robberies.

> *"First of all when they came, they were like who are we taking with us, who are we taking with us, so the first thought that came to my mind, that's these guys are kidnappers so maybe they trying to kidnap someone for a money ransom or something. So I started begging, I was like no please don't take anyone with you just do what you want to do and leave…we were all girls, we were not harmed, they could have easily raped us, killed us, shoot us, stab us there was a lot they could have done to us"*-P6

> *"The guy said that if I didn't cooperate they would rape me…I was thinking that's fine, if you do that away from my husband… I was also thinking do it and get it over and done with and get out of here so my girls don't have to be part of this"* -P7

Some female participants constructed gender as a risk factor for being exposed to particular forms of violence such as rape, kidnapping and murder during a residential robbery. Female participants identified themselves as being vulnerable and reported that they are easy targets due to their gender. In her account, P6 reported being fearful when thinking about and discussing the potential offences that could have happened. "*We were all girls we were not harmed so they could have easily raped us, killed us, shoot us, stab us*", she implied that the mere nature of being female placed her and her sisters at greater risk for encountering one or more forms of violence apart from the residential robbery. Despite not being harmed, she emphasised the word "*easily*", recognising that it could have been a likely outcome because of the fact that they were "*all girls*", making them more vulnerable.

In her account, P7 constructed the threat of rape being used as a means of intimidation to ensure her cooperation during the residential robbery. Through her construction of gender roles both as a mother and wife, P7 accounted for her need to protect her family from being affected by the threat of sexual violence both psychologically and physically. "*Do it and get it over and done with and get out of here so my girls don't have to be part of this*", she reported a sense of desperation and almost frustration. She emphasised her willingness to accept the act of sexual violence against herself if it guaranteed the normality of 'household relations' and the ability to maintain the integrity of her family – especially for her daughters, thereby placing family life over her individual life.

4.3.5 STATE FAILURE

In constructing residential robbery, participants drew on a discourse of responsibility. They constructed particular institutions within South Africa as being obligated to protect the people of the country; however, they are failing in their responsibilities. The main institutions discussed by participants included the government and the police force respectively. While a majority of participants discussed these failures, each constructed these differently.

> *"People say uh the government are working on it or the government are protecting us, the police are doing their job with the way they are working, it should have died down but it keeps increasing so that's why I see it's a big problem and I don't know if they ever going to curb it"*-P6

In her account, P6 constructed government failures in line with the general public opinion- in that if the government was indeed successful in their efforts, then there would be a decrease in the rate of residential robbery. According to P6, however, this is not the case as residential robbery continues to rise and even get worse.

P2 went on to construct a direct link between the government's failures and education when asked who is to blame for the problem of residential robbery.

> *"To me, it's [residential robbery] gonna lean back towards government. Why I say that, to me, to sort out the problem comes, to solve a problem like this, you can't solve it overnight you have to go to the level of education of people, because if people are educated right they are taught properly"*- P2

According to P2, failure stems from a lack of or poor education. Cycles of crime are perpetuated by inability of the government to ensure that its citizens are provided with quality education, even at a basic level. P2 positioned his view that education is the foundation which teaches people right from wrong. If people are properly educated, they have the means to sustain their lives in different ways rather than turning to residential robbery and other crimes. This is a problem that is deeply rooted within South African society and is therefore impossible to solve – *"overnight"* (P2).

For P4, failure results from the government's lack of effort or immediate concern to address the problem.

"I would say the government is not putting out enough force in-in uh in looking at the problem of robberies, they-they take it too lightly. I think the death sentence should be brought back, then people will probably be scared"-P4

With residential robberies being commonplace within communities, the government has become complacent in their approach to dealing with it. In his account, P4 shared his view that the government is not putting in every effort to find solutions to the problem. The gravity of the situation and its escalating nature is not taken seriously. The government is failing in their responsibility to ensure stricter laws or punishments against those who engage in residential robbery. P4 also drew on a discourse of power and lawlessness. The government is constructed as has having the power to impose death as a punishment – a means to deter or even stop the problem. However, due to complacency no strict action is enforced or considered. Accounting for this construction from a bio-political lens, power lies in the government to make decisions for its citizens. The government in modern society is a representation of the sovereign, who is failing in its political duties toward the people. Perpetrators violate the regulation and fostering of life or the movement toward 'make live'; therefore their lives should be accounted as meaningless and repressed through punishment or death. Due to their lawless actions, they should be stripped of rights as citizens and exposed to 'bare life' leaving them vulnerable and accountable for their actions.

The second institution discussed by a majority of participants was the police force. In their accounts, participants constructed the police as being responsible for protecting the public in their communities, creating crime-free and safe environments and ensuring that perpetrators are apprehended and punished for their actions. While the police operate under governmental laws and regulations, participants constructed the police as independent bodies that have the power to carry out their jobs effectively. A majority of participants, however, discussed the failure of the police to carry out their responsibilities.

"The security in this country is awful, I mean a guy can rob you tomorrow and he's coming out on bail again. I mean you committed a murder then you out on bail so you see"-P3

According to P3, state failure extends to all levels of authority from the police to the legal system. The legal system is constructed as the body responsible for ensuring that perpetrators are punished and the public is protected by placing perpetrators in jail. The legal system fails as perpetrators are not punished to the full extent of the law and are often let off lightly or

with monetary fines, despite committing serious or violent offenses. They escape the consequences of their actions, leaving the public vulnerable to more acts of residential robbery and other crimes. Life is not protected by state governments or judicial bodies – "*I mean you committed a murder then you out on bail*" (P3). Within the principles of bio-political power, life is considered a political object as something that is valuable and should be preserved and maintained. Perpetrators, however, are not being held responsible or punished for their behaviours and actions against these principles. They expose others to death with little to no repercussions.

Participants also accounted for the underlying failure of the police force to meet their responsibilities – linking it to process failures, a lack of resources and inadequate compensation.

> *"It has to be a process and proper plan and payment you need to pay people properly … the police those three areas should be areas where they put a lot of focus on. If you opening it up to bribery and corruption for the cops you see what's happening there"*- P2

> ***"****They should create opportunities or provide more patrol vehicles because this area is very quiet, we don't have police patrol around here so it's very easy for these guys to pick on us"*- P6

P2 constructed the police as underpaid workers who fall victim to process and management failures. In his account, P2 addressed that the failure to adequately pay workers is regarded as a reason as to why the police engage in illegal activities and corruption. The blame or responsibility is not directed at individual officers' actions but the broader institutions which they fall under. Furthermore, the occurrence of residential robbery was constructed as being a result of poor police presence in communities.

A majority of participants discussed their own role in preventing residential robbery. They acknowledged that they alone are accountable for their safety, protection and peace of mind. The prevention of residential robbery in communities was constructed as a responsibility of individuals themselves or the community as a whole as trust in the government, police, and other bodies continues to decline.

"It is affecting the community in a bad manner - in a way that they ended up forming up, as a community, to make patrols around that area of Diepsloot to prevent such things"-P1

P1 constructed the prevention of residential robbery as a communal responsibility. Due to a lack of or no access to security, all individuals within low income communities are viable targets. It is therefore necessary for the community as a whole to protect themselves and each other. Individuals engage in community patrols and 'policing' of their own areas to deter perpetrators as the police and other institutions fail in this regard. Due to the failure of multiple institutions within South Africa, the public are placing themselves at risk in an attempt to prevent increasing rates of residential robbery and other crimes.

"I've just become a bit more aware. In addition to that I'm also getting security. I've got a security company, like where in saying my car is here and I've a wall over here so I'm trying to see if I can get a alongside the wall is like a camera coming up here, but like a gooseleg coming into coming over out of my yard with a camera facing past my drive way and another one that way so and link it up to my phone"-P2

"I had put more burglar bars on a different alternative you know, to try getting in and eventually , I had to put up an electric fence and that's when it stopped…you just have to be as preventative as possible"- P5

Some participants discussed the privatisation of security and personalisation of safety against state failure. They referred to the measures they put in place to ensure they were not re-victimised and their homes or 'personal safe spaces' were not re-targeted. In order to create a safer, more crime free home environments they reported that it was necessary to rely on high end security to fortify their houses such as cameras, electric fences, security companies, burglar bars and other technology. Alongside security, they reported that it was necessary for individuals to be proactive in their personal capacities by becoming more vigilant and aware of their surroundings. P5 accounted for his need to be as innovative as possible with his security measures as he could not only rely on a single method of prevention. P2 accounted for his residential robbery making him more aware of where the faults in his private security were and more prepared to implement necessary changes and measures to prevent any further victimisation to himself and home space.

4.4 CORE MORAL DISCOURSES

The second section of analysis clusters around *'core moral discourses'.* Morality is linked to crime in professional accounts, with some theorists insisting that the most common sign of moral breakdown in society is crime – especially violent crime (Rauch, 2005). Durkheim explained that deviance from moral norms becomes significant when people are forced into different social and occupational roles (Hilbert, 1986). Due to inequality, rapidly changing socio-economic conditions and little access to jobs there is a breakdown in morality and an increase in criminal acts. Durkheim also related crime and a breakdown of morality to people's inability to satisfy their wants and needs and therefore may engage in property crime to obtain or maintain a certain standard of living (DiCristina, 2016). People coming from different social classes view and express their morality in a number of different ways. Also, how morality is valued to different people is based on the numerous circumstances they find themselves in.

Participants discussed morality in a number of different ways while using moral discourses to construct the criminal and their individual accounts of residential robbery. They had the following to say:

> *"It's your upbringing, if you're brought up in a way it teaches you, you know you don't need to steal or you don't need to rob, it would be a different story but I don't think that everybody is taught that way"*-P3

Some participants constructed morality as something which is learned or instilled during childhood. P3 constructed residential robbery as a crime which results from a lack of early moral development. The moral understanding for P3 is that if perpetrators are taught what is right from wrong from the very beginning, they would not be compelled to engage in robbery or other crimes. The blame for different kinds of moral judgement is shifted from the criminal themselves to the individuals who are responsible for their moral education during childhood.

Some participants went on to discuss morality in terms of socio economic circumstances. The inability to meet basic needs and the division between people places perpetrators in varying moral positions.

> "*They need to put food on the table and if it means stealing someone's TV to get R200 even though the TV costs R15000, for them the R200 is R200 they never had"*-P2

"They can sustain themselves, it's by taking people's stuff, stealing and funny enough when you take a TV worth R70000 they can only sell it for like R800 less than R1000 because they don't know the worth"-P6

In their accounts some participants do not construct perpetrators as being absolutely immoral individuals, but rather acknowledge that they operate within different scales and types of morality based on their circumstances. Both P2 and P6 echoed similar views that perpetrators pay little or no attention to the value of the 'things' they take, compared to the victims' who place significantly different meaning and value on their 'things'. Value is perceived differently by different people. "*You take a TV worth R70000 they can only sell it for like R800 less than R1000 because they don't know the worth*" (P6) – perpetrators don't know the true 'monetary' value of 'things' as they are unfamiliar to a particular class and wealth experience.

On the other hand, morality was constructed as a choice. Each individual regardless of circumstances is faced with the choice of doing something right or wrong and therefore should always be accountable for their own actions.

"I wouldn't say they don't have or they don't know about moral, I would rather say they lost it, they lost it somewhere. I believe every child or every human being born into this world you should know the difference between good and bad, you should know so it is your choice to do what good, it's your choice to do what bad so I believe they lost it somewhere they lost the morals somewhere"-P6

"I need to tell you the truth if someone she's doing things, she's know, she's know you can't do things you don't know, she's know, she's know. She's know this thing is wrong, this thing is right she's know but she's do it"-P8

Participants engaged with a discourse of lost morality. In their accounts, they essentialised a universal morality, which is transgressed by robbers. In his account, P8 emphasised the fact that perpetrators are consciously aware of their actions, but still choose to act against the moral "norm". Perpetrators have a sense of what is right and what is wrong but still carry out their actions based on what they 'feel is right'. They hold a significantly different value of morality based on their life situations.P6 constructed morality as something that is shared by all humans from birth. Morality is constructed as being an innate characteristic. People are born into particular classes in society that already have their own set of moral codes by which individuals are expected to abide by and follow.

P6 does not construct perpetrators as amoral but rather immoral individuals. They have moral values and the ability to determine right from wrong, but choose to act in a manner which is beneficial to their interest rather than the interests of society.

While reflecting on the topic of morality and values, some participants constructed perpetrators as being completely without morals due to their nature and actions.

> *"These guys got no morals, absolutely no morals… I don't think they feel bad, because they-they stealing is part of their life, they finish one and then go to the next and to the next, so if they had any uh, feeling or anything for anybody they wouldn't go from one person to the next to the next, so they don't feel bad about it"*-P4

> *"I'm not sure if they have any concept of values and morality and think that uh, they couldn't care who they hurt and how they hurt you. I think it's a question if we want and we'll take and if you stand in our way you'll, we'll get rid of you… I think overall morals are so low that-that especially on-on their side, on the less privileged people's side, I think morals have no value at all"*-P7

Participants P4 and P7 constructed perpetrators as amoral, emotionless individuals who commit residential robbery. They drew on a discourse of sacred humanity and humanness to emphasise that perpetrators have no regret for their actions as they continuously move from one target to another. There is no interconnected social value, meaning or relationship that exists between perpetrators and the rest of society. There is no empathy for others or regard for societal moral codes. The respect for morals and values has been replaced by the want for 'things' and an apathetic attitude towards the sacredness of life. Perpetrators are constructed as a representation of Agamben's 'bare life', they are not human – as to be human one has to value life and its sacredness.

P4 constructed stealing as being a part of a perpetrator's life. Some perpetrators from particular class brackets are accustomed to a certain lifestyle where societal moral norms, integrity and the value and respect for life have no place. This is not true for all perpetrators, however, as they operate from different moral economies. 'A failure to recognize differing moral economies and orders of morality may hamstring our ability to understand violence as we often depart from the assumption that human life is equally understood as worthy of preservation, when in fact large sectors of the population may consider the life of the human subject to be no more or less valuable than the objects in our social worlds' (Bowman et al, 2015, p.245). According to P4, if perpetrators had any moral feeling they would not rob

continuously engage in crime and rob people one after another. "*These guys got no morals, absolutely no morals because they, they even rob pensioners they rob pension'. I mean pensioners get 1500 bucks and they rob them so where's the morals in that, there is nothing*" (P4). P4 also constructed perpetrators as amoral in that they do not even spare old, vulnerable or weaker individuals from their devious actions. According to his account, perpetrators take anything they can find, whether it holds significant value or not.

In her account, P7 constructed underprivileged classes of people as having no value for particular types of morality. For P7, in a society where morality is low or non- existent – criminal behaviour and acts of residential robbery will continue. Perpetrators are constructed as having no remorse for their actions. According to P7, they are focused on their goal of 'getting' and are apathetic towards how they get it or who they hurt, so much so they would even kill for it. There is no moral value for human life. Life has become expendable and it is no longer considered sacred or valuable in the eyes of perpetrators. *"If you stand in our way you'll, we'll get rid of you*" (P7), perpetrators will kill anyone who gets in their way of accumulating 'wealth'. They are indifferent to the loss of innocent life.

Shifting the focus from criminal's morality; participants began constructing their own personal values and moral beliefs. They identified and constructed themselves as moral members of society by virtue of their actions toward poor and underprivileged people.

> *"I give my little donations to where people go for different things and I'm still doing it and I will still continue to do it as long as I've got a job. There are people with less that uh, that uh have more needs than me and not as fortunate, so I would still contribute even though my incident had happened it's not like I hate all these people"*-P2

> *"I usually give to the, to people with babies because I feel like I'm not doing it for them, I'm doing it for the baby; that child is innocent – that child knows nothing so – I'm obligated to give to the child"*-P6

> *"I think I feel obligated because, I-I want to help people but I, from the fact that I have is much uhm and that is obligation to say that, I feel sorry for them and I would like to help him. I've always helped people, many people and it's just people that come across my path that I think I want to help"*-P7

Participants constructed their own moral behaviour by drawing on a discourse of moral obligation. They defined their moral nature by their thinking and actions towards others and

by constructing their class experience in relation to others. In his account, P2 discussed his moral responsibility to give back to charity and make donations due to his stable socioeconomic position. Being a victim of residential robbery did not, he reported - alter his moral attitude or drive him to categorise all underprivileged people as perpetrators. On the other hand, P6 constructed her moral nature as conditional and emphasised that not all people in need deserve help. According to her account, her moral obligation was only toward the most vulnerable and innocent of individuals, which are children. P7 reported a sense of obligation to give to disadvantaged social classes owing to her having more than them. Being moral according to P7 is maintained through acknowledging the condition of others and making a concerted effort to change or improve their circumstances.

4.5 EXISTENTIAL AND POWER DISCOURSES

The last part of the analysis brings together '*existential and power discourses'* – within the context of this research they coexist and occur together. Within '*existential and power discourses'* lies participants' constructions of the importance of *life and the value of 'things'*, the dynamics of power, vulnerability and fear and finally the politics of death in which life is influenced by the threat of violence.

4.5.1 LIFE VERSUS THINGS

Values are differentiated socially, and how we relate that value to our lives and our 'things' are constituted discursively and materially. In their accounts, some participants were more inclined to choose their life and the lives of the people around them over their value of material 'things'.

> *"I can buy them tomorrow, it can be replaced. You got insurance to cover that why, same with the vehicle I got insurance for it, insurance was gonna pay out for it so why you want to hold onto something, you paying monthly for it, let it go, you can replace it, but life unfortunately you can't replace that it's the best"*- P3

> *"Material things are not important you can always replace jewellery but you can't replace your wife and your children. The first thing that comes into your mind is let them take everything and not hurt the family, your wife and children come first, the materialistic things are- are the last things in your mind"* –P4

In their accounts, participants engaged with an important discourse surrounding privilege. They constructed their choice for life based on the ideal that material possessions held no

sentimental or emotional value. In their accounts, P3 and P4 acknowledged that 'things' can be substituted or easily 'replaced' with something that's just like it, however, human life and family life is unique, one of a kind and cannot be substituted in the same way as 'things' can be.

In his account, P3 positioned his choice to let his possessions go owing to the fact that he knew he had the financial support of his insurance. He had the ability as well as the affordability to replace those items with ease at any time. *"Life unfortunately you can't replace"* (P3) – for P3 human life is regarded as scared, it is something that cannot be replaced through insurance or by financial means, therefore its value and importance outweighs all possessions. P4 positioned his choice based on the importance of his family life – his wife and children. In his account, P4 reported that there was a strong emotional connection that motivated his decision to let his possessions go. The value of 'things' are often disregarded when there is a potential threat to human life or family life. In some participants accounts, socioeconomic stability, affordability and family were all factors taken into consideration when evaluating the importance between life and 'things'.

P2 shared a similar view to P3 and P4 in that his possessions were not of sentimental value. In his account, however, he constructed the positive opportunities that come from the loss of material possessions.

> *"I'm not a sentimental person…now I can get a smart TV, at that time I didn't have a smart TV. So that how I look at it, I try to look may-maybe it's-it's to try and make myself feel better or something I look at the upside in this thing. I'm gonna get new stuff"*-P2

P2 viewed the loss of his possessions as an opportunity to indulge in something more exclusive and buy an item of higher value than what he previously owned. "*I'm gonna get new stuff*" (P2), P2's conspicuous accumulation of goods is a reflection of his 'want' to have material possessions. It is not a need or something that would ensure his survival; it is just a desire to have more. By being in a favourable socioeconomic position, he had the financial affordability to replace what was taken and even get something more extravagant. Despite positioning himself as non-sentimental, he did acknowledge that replacing his possessions would make him *'feel better or something'*.

While some participants accounted for material possessions holding little to no importance, P5 on the other hand constructed his view that material possessions should be valued.

> *"I mean you still paying off that car but it's- it's gone in an instant so it's more emotional disappointment as much as it's a material thing we're always told these are just material things but material things are important so that's why"*-P5

In his account, P5 reported an emotional aspect to the loss of his material possessions rather than just sentimental value. In his account, P5 constructed societal norms as being a common dictator for how people react to the loss of their possessions, *'these are just material things'* in comparison to other significant things that could be lost, such as life. Material 'things' and life have relative value; life cannot be lived without 'things' and 'things' are necessary to have a 'life' – we have to acknowledge that 'things do have their place in life and are necessary.

P5 constructed the idea that possessions are important as they reflect what a person has gained over time and therefore a person has the right to be emotionally attached to their items. P5 also draws on a discourse of accountability, in spite of the loss of possessions people are still held liable for them. The fact that possessions can be replaced is not always satisfying, as there is always the potential for the items to be taken again at another point in time.

In her account, P6 conveyed a view similar to P5. She reported the emotional disappointment of having to passively allow her possessions to be taken.

> *"I'm just letting them take stuff that I worked for, and I'm just letting them take stuff that doesn't belong to them"*-P6

Despite being in a good socioeconomic position, P6 was not as open to replacing her 'things' as other participants. She reported having emotional value attached to her possessions based on the effort and hard work she had to put in to obtain them in the first place. She emphasised that she just *'let them take'* offering no protest against it, possibly due the potential consequences that come with resistance which could have resulted in the harm of her life or her body. In her account, P6 constructed perpetrators as having no respect or value for others possessions. If they did, they would not readily take something that did not belong to them. They don't know the value behind it because they have not worked to obtain it themselves.

While the general consensus amongst participants placed the value of human life above material possessions, there was one participant who engaged with a different perspective altogether. Coming from a low income community and being a part time employee, P8 placed the value of his possessions over his life.

> *"I'm ready to fight. I work hard, I'm working hard. I'm here [in] this country I think 17 years. I'm working; I didn't steal anything [from] somebody. I'm working that's why I say to him just kill me because I'm working hard to find the stuff"* –P8

P8 accounted for his position '*to fight*' and justified it by reporting that he was not born in the country, and came to South Africa to ensure he could secure a better life out of poverty and unemployment. He also engaged with a discourse surrounding privilege. Despite finding himself in disadvantaged circumstances in terms of his socioeconomic opportunities, he worked hard and did not resort to criminal or illegal means to sustain his life. He showed no fear in fighting for material possessions that he equated as more valuable to him than his own life. In his account, the distinction made between the value of life and the value of 'things' becomes one. They are valued in the same way and one without the other is inconceivable to P8. Sovereign powers (perpetrators) have the authority and power to reduce victims' into the realm of 'bare life'. They expose victims' to death and violence in order to validate their own existence and power; which are taken away from them when they become excluded 'non-citizens' of society due to their behaviours and actions that violate bio-political principles. Bio-power looks to foster life and preserve it; however, perpetrators act against this principle by imposing potential violence and death on their victims' during residential robberies. In this instance, however, P8 exposed himself to potential death by excluding his life from the realm of being sacred and valuable. The possibility of being subjected to poorer conditions by his 'things' being taken, was regarded by P8 as a form of death – a 'living death', a fate worse than the loss of life.

> *"This thing is like a baby, it's like your child. This thing it's like my child, if you taking my child [it's the] same like taking my TV, because I work hard to find this thing. Even [for] the child you work hard through growing up but if someone coming to take so easy it's painful, it's painful, it's painful that's why I say to him just kill me"* –P8

In his construction, P8 used the words '*baby'* and '*child'* when referring to his 'things', giving his possessions a human parallel. He described the hardship of obtaining his possessions and compared that to the rearing of a child. It took time, effort and hard work to

accumulate what he had, and he reiterated how painful it was when it was taken from him so easily. 'Things' are his life, it's what he works hard towards accumulating and it allows him to participate in conspicuous consumption. His ability to show status and value through his 'things' was more significant than his life itself. The loss of his life was welcomed without a moment of consideration when the threat and fear of the loss of his possessions was presented to him in a flight or fight situation. The value of life was reduced and cheapened, while the value of material possessions was elevated and made exclusive- "*the computer is so expensive and TV is so expensive that's why I say no it's my time to dead"* (P8).

4.5.2 POWER, VULNERABILITY AND FEAR

Participants drew on discourses of power, vulnerability and fear in order to account for residential robbery. They reflected on and acknowledged that they had no control over the situation or its eventual outcome. They constructed themselves as powerless in comparison to perpetrators. Fear of re-victimisation or potential exposure to other crimes were constructed as being the result of their residential robberies..

> *"It's like they do it for fun, because they have that power, they can do it and all that"*-P1

> *"They had the power, they could call all the shots and they would do whatever they wanted us"*-P7

> *"They've for power because of you sleeping, you find someone is inside your house you, you still sleeping you can't carry anything. That one's got power because she is carrying something if you try to wake up to fight, he's gonna hate you, that why I say these guys they've got power"*-P8

Participants engaged with a discourse of power and control. They constructed residential robbery as an act of power dominance in which perpetrators control the sequence of events and the actions of both themselves and their victims. In modern society, sovereign power lies at the hands of perpetrators. They exercise control and validate their power through dominance, appropriating victims' 'things' and their ability to make decisions in taking victims' lives or letting them live. They do not align with bio-political principles of valuing life and fostering its continuation.

In her account, P1 constructed the act of power dominance as something carried out for no particular purpose or reason other than that of fun or as a mere distraction. "*They have that*

power, they can do it" (P1), "*they had the power, they could call all the shots*" (P7) – perpetrators are constructed as having the power over situations and the people they choose to rob. Victims are reduced to a state of 'bare life' by perpetrators as their rights as citizens and humans are stripped. Life is reduced to something that exists for the purpose of entertainment; it holds no sacredness or meaning in the face of sovereign power. By having the ability to 'call the shots', perpetrators gain a sense of authority over their victims. The power dynamic shifts and victims lose control over themselves and their environment.

P8 drew on a discourse of power and vulnerability. Perpetrators are constructed as opportunists who look for vulnerable moments to engage in acts of power dominance. P8 accounted for his vulnerability in two ways; the first resulted from being asleep and not having the power to defend himself – which accounted for a state of failed patriarchy in that men are supposed to be protectors and defenders. The second resulted from the knowledge that the perpetrators were armed. "*If you try to wake up to fight, he's gonna hate you*", the power or ability to retaliate or defend oneself is eliminated during the act of power dominance in fear of being harmed in the process. The autonomy over one's body, 'things' and life is challenged. Life can be easily taken in defence of ones 'things' and harm can be inflicted on the body; therefore an important decision has to be made as to which holds more value and which is more pertinent to protect. By referring to the word "*hate*", P8 constructed the idea that any actions outside a perpetrators expectations would result in first-strike violence, as their power is challenged

While some participants constructed residential robbery by drawing on a discourse of power, others went on to discuss and engage with discourses of vulnerability and helplessness. In their accounts, participants reported the emotional and physical vulnerability they encountered during their residential robberies.

> *"It wasn't a good feeling, because you are just following in line with what they say so you are at their mercy now"*-P2

> *"I felt vulnerable, like I really did have that feeling that someone could actually tie me up and there's nothing I could do like, I'm just very compliant. I'm just letting them take stuff that I worked for, I'm just letting them take stuff that doesn't belong to them. So I felt helpless at that time with the fact that they…they were armed and we were not"*-P6

In his account, P2 constructed two important ideas, he referred to feeling like he was just "*following in line with what they say*" and ultimately being "*at their mercy*". Through his account, P2 constructed himself as being under the control and influence of another person. His actions and reactions were dictated for him as he was merely required to follow the behaviour that was expected of him in the situation. Without doing so, he would have become susceptible to the actions of the people around him and was unable to defend himself from being harmed or affected. Perpetrators (sovereign power) look to establish control and validate themselves though violence, coercion and dominance over victims' and their lives. Any attempt to act outside what is expected or challenge the power in any way results in violence or death. It's a cycle of power.

In her account, P6 constructed the physical vulnerability she encountered. She reported experiencing a sense of vulnerability through having to be compliant when she was physically restrained, "*there's nothing I could do*". She acknowledged that she was not in control of her body or environment. She also had no say in her possessions being taken, emphasising that she was "*just letting them take stuff*", against her will. P6 also constructed her vulnerability as a response to being confronted with weapons during the residential robbery. "*They were armed and we were not*", for P6, having no protection or defence intensified her helplessness.

One participant on the other hand went on to discuss and construct his vulnerability in terms of his residential security.

> *"I tried this and it didn't work these guys found another way that was a sense of helplessness. Uh, where it seemed like, I couldn't prevent them from coming in over and over until, eventually I had to put up an electric fence. Uh, the helplessness was there, it's almost like they had right of way into the house and it was the arrogance on their side that they could just come in a do what they could in terms of taking away stuff almost…It's almost like a slap in your face"*-P5

P5 indicated that he made multiple attempts to secure and protect his house, but was unsuccessful a majority of the time. His sense of vulnerability and helplessness was evoked by his inability to secure his personal space and deter perpetrators from entering on numerous occasions. He referred to a discourse of entitlement when constructing his account. By referring to perpetrators having a "*right of way"* – he accounted for their self-proclaimed right or privilege onto his property. P5's account reflected an underlying distinction between

neoliberal rights to property and life. The underlying idea put forward in his account is that individuals within middle-higher income communities have access to private land and rights to engage in ownership while those in low income communities have no control over land. This stems from a historical political disempowerment of poorer people. Property deprivation affects the lives of poorer people in that they are continuously excluded. Gaining access to his property, perpetrators take control and power over land they see as 'rightfully' theirs, something which was taken from them and they are continuously excluded from. 'Having property and using violence are powerful nodes in hegemonic masculinity, and at least in the case of residential robbery, the home and its meanings surely activate the conditions for both to come into play –in this sense, violence and (acquisition and defence of) property are both correlates of manhood and the frame of the home provides a perfect theatre for their entanglements' (Bowman, Stevens, Eagle & Matzopoulos, 2015, p.289). For P5, perpetrators developed a sense of entitlement to his house because they managed to get past his different security measures. This left him feeling frustrated and helpless. He constructed the actions of perpetrators as an insult to himself referring to it as a *"slap in the face"*. The perpetrators had access to his private space and portrayed a sense of arrogance by showing P5 they could constantly break into his house, despite his attempts to deter them.

Participants went on to construct fear as an outcome of residential robbery. They constructed their fear toward their environment, their homes and their personal overall safety.

> *"It brings fear, fear of whose watching you know, it brings fear. Now, you have to be more vigilant"*-P3

> *"The fear, the fear is just there, you live your life in fear even if the area is safe. The fear of these people might just come, might just come it's there and uh eish it's tough, it's really tough, so I don't know how else to explain it, but it's not a good feeling – it's not"*-P6

Fear was constructed as an outcome of residential robbery. In their accounts, both P3 and P6 drew on a discourse of fear surrounding the unknown. As residential robbery is an unpredictable event, life after its occurrence also becomes uncertain. P3 constructed his fear around visibility and being watched. He made reference to the idea that *"now, you have to be more vigilant",* which engages with the notion that vigilance is a forced action, one that becomes more necessary and something that is required in order to be less fearful. P6 constructed her fear of re-victimisation. Despite living in a seemingly safe environment, the

possibility of having the robbery reoccur fuels the fear. *"The fear is just there, you live your life in fear"* – fear becomes a part of every aspect of life and has the ability to influences a person's mind and perceptions of safety. Fear is not easily forgotten or replaced. Through their accounts, participants constructed their safest places (their homes) as being unsafe and accounted for a continuous cycle of imminent danger being a result of their residential robberies.

While a discourse surrounding imminent danger and fear was used by most participants to construct residential robbery, one participant drew on an opposing discourse of bravery.

> *"It makes you uhm, fearful but also brave. Uhm, it's makes you uh, you want to take them on and every time you see someone that's uh a potential robber, you want to kind of kill them but uh ,with the laws of South Africa you're not allowed to do those kind of things"*-P4

In his account, P4 acknowledged that while the situation made him fearful, it also encouraged him to want to retaliate and not merely fall into a victim category. He constructed fear as an empowering and motivating force that drove him to want to take action against potential perpetrators. He also drew on a discourse of power. Based on his residential robbery, he developed a sense of wanting to *"kind of kill them".* For P4, by ridding the community of potential perpetrators, victims would be able to take back their control and power over their environment. In his account, P4 reported that in South Africa, victims are the ones that are criminalised for defending themselves or relating against perpetrators. *"You're not allowed to do those kind of things*", as the law prevents ordinary citizens from taking safety and security into their own hands.

Some participants constructed perpetrators as being either equally as fearful, or more so during residential robberies.

> *"They're as, more fearful than what we are, cause now they invading someone else's privacy and taking from them what doesn't belong to them"*-P3

> *"They actually also are scared when they in your house because, they don't know what you gonna do or what somebody else is gonna do, so they wanna steal and get away as quick as possible"*-P4

In their accounts, both P3 and P4 constructed perpetrators as being unaware of how victims could react, how volatile or violent the robbery could become and ultimately whether or not

their robbery would be successful. In their accounts, participants made the following references *"more fearful than what we are"* (P3), "*they actually also are scared"* (P4). These references represented an interesting notion, as they constructed perpetrators with human qualities of fear and being scared. In a sense, perpetrators have more to lose, especially because they place themselves in the private spaces of others and take what does not belong to them, all of which has its own particular consequences (prison, death etc.). Both P3 and P4 also drew on a discourse of understanding and acknowledged that fear of crime is not limited to victims or society. It extends and includes the individuals who commit these criminal acts.

4.5.3 THE POLITICS OF DEATH

Participants responded directly to questions regarding their willingness to cooperate with perpetrators during their residential robberies and the factors that influenced their decisions. They constructed their own actions as being influential in terms of the consequences they either faced or had the potential to face. They went on to construct life as something meaningless to perpetrators. Life in modern society has become so undervalued and can easily be taken away without a second thought. The power and ability to make decisions over life and death not only lies in the hands of sovereigns, governments or judicial systems but also with perpetrators who consider it an expendable commodity with little value.

Participants constructed the risk factors they took into consideration when making the decision to cooperate during their residential robberies.

> *"They had guns and they were pointing at my wife asking her to jump out so it was already 3 guys and I saw, I saw at least 2 guns so the plan had not changed, even if I considered doing anything to now co-operate because there's too many guns you can't do anything"*- P2

> *"They hit me with a gun and you know what I told them you can take everything I gave everything to them…the best thing is that you don't look at them the worst is to look at them because they'll shoot you instantly uh you corporate you give them what they want and you-you look down*"- P3

> *"Four guys that just rushed into the house and on my way back out of the house which was within 5 minutes. They were inside the house and they just had guns with them…they just said be quiet or else we'll kill you… they pointed the gun at me"* -P4

All participants reported being confronted with at least one weapon ranging from guns to knives during their residential robberies. Some participant's referred to the use of weapons, the number of perpetrators and the presence of their family members as serving crucial roles in their decision to cooperate. Participants constructed themselves as compliant and cooperative individuals as they made attempts to not provoke perpetrators and remain unharmed. P3 specially described his attempt to not look at the perpetrators faces, fearing being killed. He emphasises the idea that along with cooperation, remaining unaware or oblivious to the criminal's actions by 'looking down' is less provoking. "*They'll shoot you instantly*", he constructed perpetrators as thoughtless, unforgiving and willing to kill without hesitation or delay. Life has become the commodity; it can be given or taken without consideration.

Perpetrators use of weapons was constructed in two ways, the first was as a means to demand authority, and threaten or scare victims into cooperation "*they had guns and they were pointing at my wife*" (P2), "*they just said be quiet or else we'll kill you… they pointed the gun at me*" (P4). Guns serve an important role in the dynamic between life and death.

The second was as a means to carry out more violent actions in an attempt to overpower, control or force victims in to a more compliant attitude, "*they hit me with a gun and you know what I told them you can take everything*" (P3). In his account, P2 considered being non-cooperative momentarily, however, changed his mind when he saw the number of weapons "*even if I considered doing anything to now co-operate because there's too many guns*". P6 was the only participant to construct the act of cooperation as being an action unwarranted and unwanted by perpetrators during a residential robbery.

> *"All we had to do was to pretend that they were not here we just pretended like they were not here we just put our head down to the floor… they didn't like the fact that we were cooperating with them and maybe they felt like we could also mislead them so they didn't want our cooperation"* -P6

In her account, P6 constructed residential robbery as a performance, an act in which perpetrators want to go unnoticed or 'unseen'. Each person involved in this act has a particular role to play. "*All we had to do was to pretend that they were not here*", for P6, her role was to deliberately ignore the behaviour and activities of the perpetrators and make no attempt to intervene or stop them. "*We just put our head down to the floor*", they pretended that the perpetrators were not there. She emphasised her position by reporting that perpetrators

could feel misled or deceived when victims show willing cooperation, therefore it becomes a risk factor in its own right. The ability to perceive perpetrators as invisible and not acknowledge the act of residential robbery was discussed by P6 as being a more positive reaction than that of cooperation.

In their accounts, participants went on to draw on discourses of power, death and the value of human life.

> *"If they going to shoot you they going to shoot you right, if they don't well it's your lucky day, that-that was my uh my view, my thinking at the time*"-P2

> *"If you look at these days robberies, they kill the people they don't give them a second chance"*-P3

Participants engaged with discourses surrounding death and chance. They acknowledged that the chance of being killed during a residential robbery is quite high. "*If they don't well it's your lucky day*" (P2), "*don't give them a second chance*" (P3), in their accounts, both P2 and P3 shared a desensitisation to the idea of death. Everyone is at risk of being killed and no one has surety of survival, which is an example of Agamben's bio-political theory of the homo sacer. If we recognise all citizens as homo sacri, then everyone is unconditionally exposed to being killed – even perpetrators. If perpetrators are already stripped of their rights and exposed to 'bare life' by the established powers, then they have no fear or objection in ensuring that all people are exposed to the threat of death like themselves. "*Your life is really worth nothing at that moment and if you get, if you aggravate them they could easily just take your life*" (P7), during residential robberies, the lives of victims' become as meaningless and invaluable as the lives of the perpetrators'. If perpetrators live as if they are already going to die, then victims' lives become just as expendable.

Participants engaged with a discourse of 'us' versus 'them', "*they going to shoot you right*" (P2), "*they kill the people*" (P3), "*they will just shoot you"* (P7),. They constructed perpetrators as the 'them', those that devalue life and easily engage in the killing of others without consideration or thought. They externalise and distance themselves from that mentality and behaviour, thereby creating the 'us', being the people who respect life, hold it in high regard and try to foster its longevity. Bio-power fosters life for the collective wellbeing of the population and individuals who resist the regulation are excluded or repressed through exile, punishment or death (Srinivasan, 2016). If perpetrators are defined within this exclusion, then

they do not serve the purpose of Foucault's 'make live' within society. They are free to engage in violent actions and behaviours.

> *"They will just shoot you for…for, you often hear of people being shot for a simple amount, nothing significant they will shoot you to get your TV where I'm sure that person would have gladly said take my TV uhm but they-they are killing people for no reason, for little reason… and I also think life means very little to these people"*-P7

"*Being shot for a simple amount, nothing significant*" (P7), life is cheapened and reduced to a commodity, something expendable and easily taken in exchange for 'insignificant' objects or material gain. In her account, P7 constructed an important point that there is no logical or rational reasoning behind the choice to kill, just a need to gain. While killing during a residential robbery is regarded as a senseless action, it's an opportunity for perpetrators to exercise a need to display their power. If perpetrators are excluded and are regarded as 'non citizens', they have the opportunity to use residential robbery and violence as a way to display power and validate themselves within a society that has disregarded them. It serves as a way for them to regain their lost control and at the same time gain material 'things'.

4.6 CONCLUSION

This chapter provided a detailed analysis of this study. It focused on three main sections based on the discourses that emerged from the data. It includes foundational discourses in which the initial discourses used by victims' to construct residential robbery were analysed. The analysis then focused on core moral discourses in which it considered various constructions of morality, moral attitudes and the link between morality and residential robbery. Lastly the analysis focused on existential and power discourses , analysing victims constructions of power, the relationship between life and 'things' and the occurrence of death. Having analysed the data in detail, the next chapter gives a comprehensive outline of the findings, highlights the limitations, provides future research recommendations and offers a final conclusion to this research study.

CHAPTER 5

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter offers a comprehensive summary of the analysis section. It also includes an explanation of the limitations of the research study and how I tried to mitigate the challenges I faced. It provides future research recommendations and ends with a section on my final concluding statements about the research as a whole.

5.2 SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

This research provided an opportunity to explore how victims' constructed residential robbery and the use of violence in its enactment. Its objective was to answer two main questions, firstly how do victims' construct residential robbery and secondly how do victims' construct the use of violence during residential robberies? The analyses of the findings were divided into three broad sections which included foundational discourses, core moral discourses and existential and power discourses. The main findings of each category will be discussed.

Firstly within foundational discourses, participants discussed the role of poverty and unemployment. Some constructed residential robbery as an act of desperation – something done by disadvantaged social classes to fulfil a need within a failing social system. Others constructed residential robbery as an easy alternative to hard work. People choose to either stay in poverty or rise above it and make an honest living. For some, "the poor" and unemployed were regarded as 'lazy' individuals who have become complacent in a lifestyle of stealing from others. The growing 'want' to live a particular lifestyle outweighs the need and therefore to participate in that, residential robbery becomes a means to achieve it. A discourse of accountability was also discussed for the victim's themselves. The idea is that, victims need to be aware of their own role in residential robberies. By showing material wealth to those that don't have, victims create that desirability for perpetrators to steal.

Participants went on to discuss the role of race. They constructed the idea that racial agendas exist during residential robbery. Perpetrators have an expectation of who they want to rob and target specific groups as a means to control and instil fear. Residential robbery may not only be about stealing but also about exerting power through these acts. In their accounts, some participants acknowledged that they did not consider race as being an influencing factor in

residential robberies but rather that everyone is at risk and has the potential to become a victim.

Participants also discussed the role of accessibility. In low income communities there is a lack of access to security and other basic needs which makes residential robbery within this community easier. Foreigners were constructed as the main perpetrators of residential robbery and other crimes. They are considered as 'outsiders' who engage in crime due to failed unemployment. Local involvement in crime is often overlooked as the blame is shifted onto foreign occupants.

Residential robbery was also constructed as an act of opportunity. If there is something of value and the opportunity presents itself, it will be taken. Perpetrators look for moments of weakness or favourable accessibility to target their victims. In their accounts, victims' reported having a sense of responsibility for not ensuring their own safety and protection. Responsibility was shifted from the criminal to the victims own actions. For some, the responsibility was directed both at the victim themselves and situation. While opportunity is regarded as a driving force, perpetrators have an underlying motivation or reason for their actions. Participants also engaged with a re-victimisation discourse. Re-victimisation occurs either because a criminal finds individuals or places attractive or the opportunity to retarget victims is easy.

Gender discourses were used by participants to account for the use of violence during residential robbery. Male participants were exposed to forms of physical violence which were used as a means to subdue or overpower them to ensure they did not fight back. Within middle to higher income communities men were hit or tied up, while in low income communities they were blinded (with pillows) as perpetrators did not want to be identified. Male participants constructed their role as protective authoritative figures, feeling responsible for the safety of their families. Female participants were constructed as being more vulnerable. Gender was constructed by female participants as a risk factor to being exposed to sexual and emotional forms of violence. The female participants reported being threatened with violence such as rape to ensure their cooperation during their individual robberies. Violence was a means for perpetrators to exert power over their victims. In the accounts of these female participants this led to negative psychological effects which forced them to take restrictive actions in their daily lives to avoid re-victimisation.

Participants engaged with a discussion on state-failure. They expressed that institutions like the government and the police were obligated to ensuring the safety of citizens. Residential robbery is a reflection of the failure of these institutions to carry out their roles. The government has reportedly failed to provide a quality education and has also become complacent in their approach to crime and finding solutions. The government was constructed as having the power to impose death and punishment for crime, however, it is not considered. The legal system also fails citizens as perpetrators are often not punished to the full extent of the law. The failures of the police were constructed in three ways. The first is that they are limited in their actions and power as they fall under the government's control. Secondly, that they lack proper resources to carry out their duties and be present in communities, while some are not adequately compensated for their work. Participants drew on a discourse of privatisation of security and personalisation of safety. They acknowledged that they had to ensure their own protection rather than rely on the government and other institutions.

Within core moral discourses, morality was constructed as a value which is learned in childhood. In their accounts, some participants constructed moral education as being important for children to learn right from wrong. They further suggest that a differentiation in moral judgment in perpetrators is considered the responsibility or negligence of their caregivers. In some cases, participants drew on a discourse of desperation in which they constructed differing moral positions that exist among perpetrators who try to fulfil their basic needs. Socioeconomic circumstances drive perpetrators to actions that they may not necessarily want to do, but are involuntarily forced to do. For others, morality is considered a choice.

Participants also engaged with a discourse of lost morality. In this, perpetrators are constructed as not being without morals, but actively choose to ignore them or go against the moral norms of society. For some, perpetrators were constructed as being immoral and emotionless. Morality holds different meanings and values for perpetrators and circumstances play a role in how and when morality is expressed.

Participants also considered their own moral positions. By drawing on a discourse of moral obligation some constructed their need to help all people from underprivileged social classes despite being victims of residential robbery. For others, moral obligation was constructed as being conditional and should only be reserved for the most innocent of individuals such as

children, not people who use circumstances as an excuse for a continued cycle of low moral value. Moral obligation is strengthened when people feel they have more than others. By giving back their moral attitudes and thinking sets them apart from perpetrators within society.

Within the last section of existential and power discourses, participants discussed three topics. Firstly life versus 'things', in which they constructed the value we attach to our material wealth and our lives. Some participants placed more value on life than 'things'. By drawing on a discourse of privilege they considered that socioeconomic background, affordability or financial support through insurance and family played an important role in how value is placed. 'Things' were constructed as having no sentimental value in comparison to life. Others regarded the loss of their possessions as an opportunity to indulge in more expensive or exclusive items than they previously owned. In other instances, despite having the means to replace possessions, there is still a reported underlying emotional disappointment. Possessions are a reflection of a person's hard work and effort. In low income communities, however, the value of 'things' was placed over life. Coming from a disadvantaged socioeconomic background, losing possessions was considered painful. Without hesitation, one participant was willing to give up his life as he acknowledged that trying to replace what he lost would be almost impossible.

Participants went on to draw on discourses of power, vulnerability and fear to construct residential robbery. Residential robbery was constructed as an act of power dominance which perpetrators use as a means to either exercise authority or in some instances as a fun distraction. Participants reported physical and emotional vulnerability as an outcome. They were physically retrained, threatened with weapons and their actions and behaviours were dictated to them by perpetrators. Some participants reported feeling helpless and defenceless with ultimately no control over themselves or their environment. Vulnerability occurred due to the failure of securing residential spaces. By engaging with a discourse of entitlement, perpetrators were constructed as being arrogant and showing a sense of entitlement to victim's properties multiple times despite attempts made to deter them. They further engaged with a discourse of fear as an outcome of their robberies. They feared the unknown that comes with residential robbery and the idea of re-victimisation to the point of it affecting their overall perception of safety. While a discourse of fear was shared by most participants, others drew on a discourse of bravery. Their robberies encouraged them to want to retaliate against perpetrators and not fall into a victim category. Fear was constructed as a motivating

powerful force that allows victims to take back control of their environment. Fear is not an emotion only shared by victims but also perpetrators themselves. By communicating within a discourse on the fear of crime, participants considered perpetrators as also having human qualities, being scared as they are unaware of how victims may react or what the outcome of the situation will be.

Lastly they focused on the meaning life has in modern society. Participants discussed the risk factors associated with residential robbery and their willingness to cooperate. The risk factors associated with the choice to cooperate involved the number of weapons being used, the amount of perpetrators and the presence of family members. Some participants constructed themselves as being willingly compliant and cooperative, however, in some cases cooperation was seen as misleading and unwanted by perpetrators. When accounting for the violence encountered, all participants made reference to the use of weapons such as knives and guns. Weapons were used in two ways, to threaten victims into cooperation and to carry out more violent actions against victims.

Participants went on to construct life in two ways – as something that is highly valued and sacred and secondly something that has become undervalued, dispensable and easy to take without consideration or thought by particular groups of perpetrators. Some participants engaged with a discourse of death and chance – during a residential robbery there's a high chance for victims to be killed. The idea of death has become common place and getting a second chance at life is considered 'lucky'. They also drew on a discourse of 'us' versus 'them'. Perpetrators were considered the 'them', those that undervalue life and kill others while the 'us' includes victims and likeminded people who foster and try to protect life. There is often no logic or rationally behind the choice to kill but a mere opportunity to exercise power in a volatile situation. To conclude, victims' drew on a plethora of discourses to construct residential robbery and the use of violence in its enactment. As the researcher, I tried to convey the victims' accounts as transparently as possible. However, I also remained cognisant that all research has its potential limitations. This brings me to my next section on research limitations, future recommendations and my final conclusion.

5.3 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

Limitations according to Theofandis and Fountouki (2018) are any potential weaknesses in the research that lie outside the control of the researcher and are often associated with the research design, methods or other factors. Limitations have the ability to affect the research

results and conclusion and should be discussed (Theofandis & Fountouki, 2018). This section aimed to provide an understanding of the limitations and challenges faced during the research process as well as how they were mitigated or addressed.

Initially, to obtain to my sample I approached the South African Police Services (SAPS) to request access to closed docket cases (older than 6 months) of residential robbery victims. I was referred to their research department and was asked to fill out documents outlining my request. After an extensive procedure, I was denied access to these records. I therefore had to broaden my initial method of purposive intensity sampling to include a more flexible approach of snowball sampling. Snowball sampling is limited as it's open to forms of selection bias and it has a high risk of becoming distorted with one group or particular criteria being over represented (Patton, 2014). It's also reliant on participant's willingness to contribute to the sample and refer others to the research process; therefore it's important for the researcher to build a relationship with participants' as they have the ability to affect the research process positively and negatively (Patton, 2014). Through the use of snowball sampling, I was able to gather my required number of participants; however, the sample was different from what I had initially proposed. It included more Indian participants and the ratio of males to females was higher. While this may be regarded as a limitation, snowball sampling is employed in qualitative research where generalisation of results to wider communities and validity is not the main concern (Parker et al, 2019). The aim of this study was to represent victim's individual accounts and social constructions as well as gain a better understanding of residential robbery. It was not to generalise results to all communities that have dealt with residential robbery.

Access to participants from low income communities also posed a challenge. Some participants from within these communities were unwilling to discuss their experiences, while others refused to share information without receiving a benefit or compensation for their time. Some feared that they would be retargeted if they spoke out against perpetrators and criminal activity within their communities. I tried to assure participants that their information would remain anonymous and addressed any concerns they had with the research. Despite this, I was only able to gain access to a limited number of participants from low income communities, however, their individual experiences added new insight and value. The use of snowball sampling allowed me to access a hard to reach community through a method of networking. According to Noy (2008), snowball sampling is a method that allows researchers to reach potentially unobtainable populations. Through this process, researchers can gain

social knowledge and a quality interaction (Noy, 2008). This opens a potential opportunity for further research into victim's accounts from low income communities. It's a possibility to gain a better understanding of residential robbery and how it's constructed within this hard to reach community. Another recommendation for future research is to use the same bio-political lens utilised in this study to understand residential robbery from the perpetrators themselves. It would offer a different view and dynamic to how morality and life are constructed. In order to gain a holistic understanding of residential robbery, it's essential to consider both the victims and perpetrators perspectives.

The next limitation was experienced during the actual interview process. During one interview, the recording device being used stopped working mid-way through and the rich information initially gained was lost. While the participant allowed the interview to be redone, the initial depth of information was not present. To ensure this did not occur in future interviews, I ensured that I had a backup device recording after ensuring that participants were comfortable and aware of this. Another challenge I faced during the interviewing process was a language barrier. One participant was not fluent in English and was prepared to do the interview in her home language, Zulu. In order to conduct the interview I asked for the assistance from a police officer who was in the same vicinity in which the interview was taking place. He translated the questions I asked into Zulu and gave a general overview of her responses. This interview went for transcription to gain a holistic understanding of everything the participant conveyed. I realised that having a police officer present changed the researcher - participant dynamic. It was not a space that was comfortable or open. There was a shift in power relations having an 'authoritative figure' present. The participant may have felt intimidated and her responses regarding topics relating to how she constructed the police, government etc. may have been influenced by the officer's presence in the research process. I also felt that my power and role as the researcher was limited as I could not engage with the participant and build rapport with her from the beginning. I was reliant on the officer who may have changed the meaning of the questions when he translated it or gave feedback.

In qualitative research, using in-depth interviews as a data collection method also has its set of limitations. Firstly the participants have the ability to construct a particular social phenomenon in their own way (Morris, 2015). With in-depth interviews there is no way to verify the information presented by participants and the researcher's presence may lead to unavoidable bias in participants responses (Anderson, 2010). For example, in some instances participants were careful when discussing particular topics like race and gender.

Lastly, while the report provides an extensive theoretical foundation, the aim of this research was to focus on the discourses and constructions that were generated through the data. The link in some areas between findings and theory may therefore to some extent be limited. To conclude, while there were a number of limitations and challenges experienced during the research procedure, I tried to mitigate as much of them as possible. Limitations and challenges allow us to improve the gaps and give us the opportunity to address them in future research.

5.3 FINAL CONCLUSION

To conclude, residential robbery pervades and affects the lives of all South Africans; therefore it is essential to understand and study it through multiple lenses. Residential robbery is considered to be a performative act in which vital decisions between 'life and 'things' are made. This study has shown that there is an underlying relationship that exists between morality, power, violence and the enactment of residential robbery. Residential robbery provides the platform and space for the other constructs to play out. In the participants account, perpetrators use residential robbery as a way to gain their lost control and power, which they lose through conditions such as poverty, unemployment and being excluded for their unlawful behaviour and actions in society. Perpetrators operate within different levels of morality which pertain to the circumstances in which they find themselves. In most instances morality often becomes a secondary construct within this performative act of residential robbery. In their accounts, victims' constructed morality on multiple levels. Some constructed morality as something that is shared by all humans, however, it is not fixed – it adapts and changes and how it is expressed or valued differs among people from different social classes.

By using a bio-political framework, I was able to look at residential robbery from a novel lens. Within this framework, some victims' accounts reflected two different expressions of power in relation to life. The first was bio-power, in which life was constructed as being sacred, valuable, meaningful and more important than material wealth. This lens also provided an alternative construction to the inherent value of life. Victims' accounted for being at the mercy of their perpetrators bringing about the second form of power expressed which was sovereign or disciplinary. Life was constructed as being contingent upon people who can control it and take it. Life is dispensable, a commodity and its value or sacredness holds no weight in the accumulation of 'things'. Possessions and 'things' are considered to be

more meaningful to some individuals from particular social classes who are excluded from a certain wealth experience.

These differential constructions of life reflect a significant battle that exists between how life and 'things' are positioned and valued to people from different social classes. In their accounts, some victims' constructed the preservation of life as being crucial and advocated for doing whatever necessary to ensure its protection and continuation – especially family life. Others, however, constructed life in relation to 'things'; one cannot exist without the other. A life without possessions was constructed as being worse than death itself. Ultimately what this research has shown is that all of these constructs together play their own crucial role in how residential robbery is enacted as well as constructed. By utilising victims' accounts and through multiple lenses we thus have the ability to acquire a more holistic picture on residential robbery and violence in the future.

CHAPTER 6

6.1 REFERENCE LIST

Abrahams, D. (2010). A synopsis of urban violence in South Africa. *International review of the Red Cross, 92*(878), 495-520.

Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford University Press.

Alshenqeeti, H. (2014). Interviewing as a Data Collection Method: A Critical Review. *English Linguistics Research, 3*(1), 39.

Alvi, M. (2016). A manual for selecting sampling techniques in research.
Retrieved from https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/70218/1/MPRA_paper_70218.pdf on 21 November 2021 at 10.08am.

Anderson, C. (2010). Presenting and evaluating qualitative research. *American journal of pharmaceutical education, 74*(8).

Ayala, F. (2010). The difference of being human: Morality. *Proceedings Of The National Academy Of Sciences, 107*(Supplement_2), 9015-9022.

Biggerstaff, D. (2012). *Qualitative research methods in psychology*. In: Rossi, Gina, (ed.) Psychology: selected papers. Rijeka, Croatia: Intech, 175-206.

Bowman, B., Stevens, G., Eagle, G., & Matzopoulos, R. (2015). Bridging risk and enactment: The role of psychology in leading psychosocial research to augment the public health approach to violence in *South Africa. South African Journal of Psychology, 45(3),* 279–293.

Bowman, B., Stevens, G., Eagle, G., Langa, M., Kramer, S., Kiguwa, P., & Nduna, M. (2015). The second wave of violence scholarship: South African synergies with a global research agenda. *Social Science & Medicine, 146,* 243-248.

Bowman, B., Kramer, S., Salau, S., Kotze, E., & Matzopoulos, R. (2018). Linking criminal contexts to injury outcomes: findings and lessons from a national study of robbery in South Africa. *International journal of Public Health, 63*(8), 977-985.

Bowman, B., Kramer, S., Salau, S., & Matzopoulos, R. (2022). Trends, Correlates, and Contexts of Robbery-Homicide in South Africa. *Homicide Studies.*

Brankovic, J. (2019). *What Drives Violence in South Africa?*. Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.

Bruce, D. (2006). Racism, self-esteem and violence in SA: gaps in the NCPS' explanation? *SA Crime Quarterly*, *2006*(17), 31-36.

Bruce, D. (2010) 'The ones in the pile were the ones going down': The reliability of violent crime statistics, *South African Crime Quarterly* 31, Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies.

Burr, V., & Dick, P. (2017). Social constructionism. In *The Palgrave handbook of critical social psychology* (pp. 59-80). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation. (2007). The violent nature of crime-a concept paper for the Justice, Crime Prevention and Security Cluster.
Retrieved from https://www.csvr.org.za/docs/crime/compatibility_mode.pdf on 10 May 2018 at 17.52pm.

Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation. (2010). "Why South Africa is so violent and what should we be doing about it?"
Retrieved from https://www.csvr.org.za/docs/study/CSVRstatement091110.pdf on 6 April 2017 at 14.34pm.

Corral, H. R. (2015). Bio politics and Homo Sacer in a Torture Centre in Chile. *Revista Direito GV*, *11*(1), 257-276.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. Sage publications.

Da Silva, A., & Sagvaag, H. (2008). The relationship between social constructionism and qualitative research.
Retrieved from
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311650502_The_relationship_between_social_constructivism_and_qualitative_method_on 19 December 2021 at 12.34pm.

Dean, M. (2004). Four theses on the powers of life and death. *Contretemps*, *5*(1), 16-29.

De Kock, C., Kriegler, A., & Shaw, M. (2015). A citizen's guide to SAPS crime statistics: 1994 to 2015. *Centre of Criminology, University of Cape Town*.

DiCristina, B. (2016). Durkheim's theory of anomie and crime: A clarification and elaboration. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, *49*(3), 311-331.

Doolan, K., Ehrlich, R., & Myer, L. (2007). Experience of violence and socioeconomic position in South Africa: a national study. *Plos One*, *2*(12), e1290.

Edwards, R., & Holland, J. (2013). *What is qualitative interviewing?*. A&C Black.

Felson, M., & Clarke, R. V. (1998). Opportunity makes the thief. *Police research series, paper*, *98*(1-36), 10.

Flick, U. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research*. Sage.

Fossey, E., Harvey, C., McDermott, F., & Davidson, L. (2002). Understanding and evaluating qualitative research. *Australian and New Zealand journal of psychiatry*, *36*(6), 717-732.

Foucault (1972) as cited in Hoffman, M. (2013) Foucault and Power: *The Influence of Political Engagement on Theories of Power* . London: Bloomsbury.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality: An Introduction*, Volume 1. New York: Pantheon Books.

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of peace research*, 6(3), 167-191.

Hadi, M. A., & José Closs, S. (2016). Ensuring rigour and trustworthiness of qualitative research in clinical pharmacy. *International journal of clinical pharmacy*, *38*(3), 641-646.

Harris, B. (2001). *A Foreign Experience: Violence, crime and xenophobia during South Africa's transition* (Vol. 5). Johannesburg: CSVR.

Hall, L. A. (2007). *Death, Power, and the Body: A Bio-political Analysis of Death and Dying* (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University).

Hamlin, J. (2009). The Normality of Crime: Durkheim and Erikson. *Department of Sociology and Anthropology UMD*, 1-2.

Hamby, S. (2017). On defining violence, and why it matters. *Psychology Of Violence*, *7*(2).

Haynes, K. (2012). Reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative organizational research: Core methods and current challenges*, 72-89.

Heathwood, C. (2012). Could morality have a source?. *Journal of Ethics and Social Philosophy, 6(2)*.

Hilbert, R. A. (1986). Anomie and the moral regulation of reality: The Durkheimian tradition in modern relief. *Sociological Theory*, *4*(1), 1-19.

Hill, R.A. (2012).*A Guideline to Discourse Analysis*: With Personal Construct Psychology Undertones; Second Edition. ReConstrue Publications.

Hossain, D. M. (2011). Qualitative research process. *Postmodern Openings*, *2*(7), 143-156.

Kaus, W. (2013). Conspicuous consumption and "race": Evidence from South Africa. *Journal of Development Economics*, *100*(1), 63-73.

Kynoch, G. (2013). Reassessing transition violence: Voices from South Africa's township wars, 1990–4. *African Affairs*, *112*(447), 283-303.

Lamb, G., & Warton, G. (2016). Why is crime in South Africa so violent?. *Updated Rapid Evidence Assessment on Violent Crime in South Africa. Cape Town: Safety and Violence Initiative*.

Legard, R., Keegan, J., & Ward, K. (2003). In-depth interviews. *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*, 138-169.

Loria, F. & Kumagai, S. (2020). *Building Trust in Government through Citizen Engagement.* World Bank Group.

Louw, A., & Shaw, M. (1997). *Stolen opportunities: The impact of crime on South Africa's poor* (No. 14). Halfway House: Institute for Security Studies.

Luthango, M., van Donk, M., & Wegner, E. (2018). Promoting safety and violence prevention through informal settlement upgrading.
Retrieved from https://www.saferspaces.org.za/resources/entry/promoting-safety-and-violence-prevention-through-informal-settlement-upgradpdf on 17 January 2022 at 19.38pm.

Lynch, M. (2000). Against reflexivity as an academic virtue and source of privileged knowledge. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *17*(3), 26-54.

Marks, S. R. (1974). Durkheim's theory of anomie. *American Journal of Sociology*, *80*(2), 329-363.

Mantzaris, E. A., & Pillay, P. (2017). Corruption and the erosion of citizen trust in Brazil and South Africa. *African Journal of Public Affairs*, *9*(8), 63-77.

Mbembé, J. A. (2003). Necropolitics. *Public culture*, *15*(1), 11-40.

Meiring, T., Kannemeyer, C., & Potgieter, E. (2018). The gap between rich and poor: South African society's biggest divide depends on where you think you fit in. Cape Town: *SALDRU, UCT*.

Morris, A. (2015). *A practical introduction to in-depth interviewing*. Sage.

Mohajan, H. K. (2018). Qualitative research methodology in social sciences and related subjects. *Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People*, *7*(1), 23-48.

Ndlela, Q. (2020). Crime in South Africa. *Crime, Law And Social Changes In South Africa, 1*(1).

Nkwede, J. O., Obona, E. E., & Joseph, N. (2019). Xenophobic violence and economic development in South Africa. *International Journal of Innovative Legal & Political Studies, 7 (3): 20, 28*.

Noy, C. (2008). Sampling knowledge: The hermeneutics of snowball sampling in qualitative research. *International Journal of social research methodology*, *11*(4), 327-344.

Ojakangas, M. (2007). Impossible dialogue on bio-power: Agamben and Foucault. *Foucault studies*, (2), 5-28.

Oksala, J. (2010). Violence and the Biopolitics of Modernity. *Foucault Studies*, (10), 23-43.

Olutola, A. A., & Bello, P. O. (2016). An exploration of the factors associated with public trust in the South African Police Service. *International Journal of economics and finance studies*, *8*(2), 219-236.

Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, *42*(5), 533-544.

Palmary, I. (2015). Reflections on social cohesion in contemporary South Africa. *Psychology in Society*, (49), 62-69.

Parker, I. (1992). *Discourse Dynamics: Critical Analysis for Social and Individual Psychology*. London: Routledge.

Parker (1992) as cited in Augoustinos, M., Walker, I., & Donaghue, N. (2014). *Social cognition: An integrated introduction*. Sage.

Parker (1992) as cited in Talja, S. (1999). Analyzing qualitative interview data: The discourse analytic method. *Library & information science research*, *21*(4), 459-477.

Parker, C., Scott, S., & Geddes, A. (2019). Snowball sampling. *SAGE research methods foundations*.

Parveen, R., Hussain, M., Majeed, I., Afzal, M., & Gilani, S. A. (2018). Influence of Poverty on Moral Development in Rural Community Lahore. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management*, *5*(3), 113-124.

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*. Sage publications.

Pretorius, R. (2008). Armed robbery, violent assault and perceptions of personal insecurity and society as a risk. *Acta Criminologica: Southern African Journal of Criminology*, *21*(2), 81-91.

Prinz, J. (2008). Is morality innate. *Moral psychology*, *1*, 367-406.

Rabinow, P., & Rose, N. (2006). Biopower today. *BioSocieties*, *1*(2), 195-217.

Rauch, J. (2005) "Linking Crime and Morality, Reviewing the Moral Regeneration Movement". *Crime Quarterly* No 11.

Retrieved from https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/118311/114FULL.pdf on 13 March 2017 at 13.22 pm.

Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., Nicholls, C. M., & Ormston, R. (Eds.). (2013). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. Sage.

Schiller, J., Black, W., & Murphy, P. V. (2012). Crime and Criminality.
Retrieved from http://www.des.ucdavis.edu/faculty/Richerson/BooksOnline/He16-95.pdf on 10 May 2021 at 14.42pm.

Schinkel, W. (2004). The will to violence. *Theoretical Criminology*, *8*(1), 5-31.

Schonteich, M., & Louw, A. (2001). Crime in South Africa: A country and cities profile. Institute for Security Studies.

Shaw, S. E., & Bailey, J. (2009). Discourse analysis: what is it and why is it relevant to family practice?. *Family practice*, *26*(5), 413-419.

Silber, G., & Geffen, N. (2009). Race, class and violent crime in South Africa: dispelling the'Huntley thesis'. *SA Crime Quarterly*, *2009*(30), 35-43.

Singer, P. (1972). Famine, affluence, and morality. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 229-243.

Solomon, H., & Kosaka, H. (2013). Xenophobia in South Africa: Reflections, narratives and recommendations. *Southern African peace and security studies*, *2*(2), 5-30.

South African Institute of Race Relations. (2016). Winning the War on Crime in South Africa: A new Approach Community Policing.
Retrieved from http://irr.org.za/reports-and-publications/media-releases/winning-the-war-on-crime/viewon on 6 April 2017 at 13.22pm.

South African Police Services (2012), Crime Definitions to be utilized by police officials for purposes of the opening of case dockets and the registration thereof on the Crime Administration System, V.001, *Issued by Consolidation Notice* 2/2012, Pretoria.
Retrieved from https://issafrica.s3.amazonaws.com/site/uploads/factsheet-sa-crime-stats-definitions.pdf on 10 January 2022 at 09.22am.

South African Police Services. (2017). Annual Crime Report. Retrieved from https://www.saps.gov.za/about/stratframework/annual_report/2016_2017/gpw_crime_stats_2017.pdf on 19 August 2021 at 19.30pm.

South African Police Services. (2019). Annual Crime Report. Retrieved from https://www.saps.gov.za/about/stratframework/annual_report/2018_2019/annual_crime_report2020.pdf on 19 August 2021 at 10.22am.

South African Police Services. (2020). Annual Crime Report. Retrieved from https://www.saps.gov.za/about/stratframework/annual_report/2019_2020/annual_crime_report_2019_2020.pdf on 18 August 2021 at 16.03pm.

Srinivasan, K. (2016). Biopower. In *The International Encyclopedia of Geography: People, the Earth, Environment, and Technology*. Malden: Wiley.

Statistics South Africa. (2019). Governance, Public Safety and Justice: Victims of Crime Survey.
Retrieved from http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0341/P03412018.pdf on 11 July 2021 at 12.02pm.
Statistics South Africa. (2020). Governance, Public Safety and Justice: Victims of Crime Survey.
Retrieved from http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0341/P03412019.pdf on 15 August 2021 at 9.15am.

Steinberg, J. (2018). Xenophobia and Collective Violence in South Africa: a note of skepticism about the scapegoat. *African Studies Review, 61*(3), 119-134.

Suri, H. (2011). Purposeful sampling in qualitative research synthesis. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *11*(2), 63-75.

Theofanidis, D., & Fountouki, A. (2018). Limitations and delimitations in the research process. *Perioperative nursing*, *7*(3), 155-163.

Uzoigwe, A. M. (2013). Towards Inculcating Morality among the Youths in Nigeria: The Holy Family Youth Village Example. *UJAH: Unizik Journal of Arts and Humanities*, *14*(1), 161-184.

Van der Merwe, H. (2013). Violence as a form of communication: Making sense of violence in South Africa. *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, *13*(3), 65-84.

van Raalte, D. (2013). *Explaining Residential Robberies: A study into the characteristics of victims, residences and locations of residential robberies.* (Masters). University of Twente.

White, R., & Perrone, S. (2010). *Crime, criminality and criminal justice* (1st ed.). Oxford University Press.

Willman, A., Gould, C., Newham, G. & Gomez, M. (2019). *Crime, Violence and Exclusion in South Africa Society: Overcoming the Legacy of Exclusion in South Africa*. World Bank Group.

World Health Organisation (2002). *World report on violence and health*: *summary*. World Health Organisation: Geneva.

Zinn, R. (2010). Inside information: Sourcing crime intelligence from incarcerated house robbers. *SA Crime Quarterly*, *2010*(32), 27-35.

Zinn, R. (2010). *Home Invasion: Robbers Disclose What You Should Know*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.

6.2 APPENDICES

6.2.1 APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

- What are your overall feelings or thoughts surrounding residential robbery in South Africa?
- Having been exposed to residential robbery, can you tell in detail what happened during the robbery?
- Who are the perpetrators of residential robbery?
- Who is at risk of residential robbery and why?
- Do you think residential robbery is a problem in South Africa (why/why not) and who do you think is to blame for the problem?
- What factors do you think lead to the problem of residential robbery?
- Do you believe experiences of residential robbery differ amongst different income communities? How so?
- What items were taken during the robbery and how valuable were those items to you?
- Were you co-operative or resilient toward the perpetrator (s) during the robbery? Why did you react in this way? What consequences/outcomes did your reaction have on the situation?
- Were perpetrators armed, if so how did they use the weapon?, if not did they use other means (i.e. verbal threats etc.)?
- Did the perpetrator (s) attempt to physically harm or restrain you during the robbery? (why/why not)
- Was there an escalation of the robbery into other crimes? If so how did it escalate to that point and if not was there a potential for it to escalate into something more?

6.2.2 APPENDIX B: PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Dear Participant

My name is Tashmika Sewsunker. I am currently a Masters in Social and Psychological Research student at the University of the Witwatersrand. My purpose for conducting this research is to obtain my Master's degree. My research aims to explore -Victims' social constructions of residential robbery and the use of violence in South Africa. I would kindly like to invite you to be a participant in my research study. By participating in this research you will have a face to face interview conducted by me. Interviews will be approximately between 45 minutes to 1 hour. Interviews will also be audio voice recorded for the purpose of transcription and analysis. All transcripts and audio files will be stored on a computer that is password protected and only my supervisor (Prof Brett Bowman) and I will have access to these recordings and transcripts. Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary.

I will ensure that your anonymity and partial confidentiality is maintained. To do this, I will not disclose or include personal information (name, address, workplace etc.). I may use direct quotations from your interview in the research report; however, I will assign you a pseudonym (Participant A or Respondent B) which will be referred to in the results of the report. You have the right to withdraw your responses and/or participation from the research at any time prior to the completion of my write up. You may also choose not to answer questions should you not feel comfortable. There are no benefits to being a participant in this research study. Upon request, a 1 to 2 page summary of the research and its results can be provided to you. You may email my supervisor (Prof Brett Bowman) or me if you would like to receive this summary. Our contact details appear below. The summary will be available only after the written report is submitted and marked.

Before I conduct the interviews, you are required to read and sign each consent form acknowledging the terms of the research and confirming that you are aware and accepting of everything that has been mentioned.

Yours sincerely

Researcher: Tashmika Sewsunker (tashmikasewsunker@yahoo.com)

Supervisor: Prof Brett Bowman (brett.bowman@wits.ac.za)

6.2.3 APPENDIX C: CONSENT FORMS FOR PARTICIPANTS

Interview consent form

I_____ hereby consent to being interviewed by Tashmika Sewsunker for her research study titled – Victims' social constructions of residential robbery and the use of violence in South Africa. I acknowledge the following:

- My participation in this research is entirely voluntary.

- I may choose not to answer questions.

- I have the right to withdraw my responses and/or participation from the research at any time prior to the completion of Tashmika's (the researcher's) write up.

- I may be directly quoted in the research report under a pseudonym (Participant A, Respondent B etc.).

- The research report will not include my personal information (name, address, workplace etc.).

- I am aware that this research is being done for the partial completion of Tashmika's (the researcher's) degree – Masters in Social and Psychological Research and that the findings of her research will be reported in the form of a research report.

-The research may later be published in a book chapter or journal and may also be presented and local/international conferences.

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Researcher signature:_____

6.2.4 APPENDIX D: CONSENT FORMS FOR PARTICIPANTS

Recording Consent Form

I, _____ hereby consent to being audio recorded by Tashmika Sewsunker during my interview for the purpose of her study. I acknowledge the following:

- The transcripts and audio files will only be seen and heard by Tashmika (the researcher) and her supervisor.
- The transcripts and audio files will be stored on a computer that is password protected.
- In the transcripts and research report, no personal information will be used (name, address, workplace etc.).
- In the research report, direct quotations from my interview may be used; however, Tashmika (the researcher) will refer to me by using a pseudonym (Participant A, Respondent B etc.).

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Researcher signature: _____

6.2.5 APPENDIX E: ETHICS CLEARANCE NUMBER

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, JOHANNESBURG

HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE (SCHOOL OF HUMAN & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE	**PROTOCOL NUMBER: MASPR/17/007 IH**
PROJECT TITLE:	Moral discourses in the social constructions of residential robbery in South Africa
INVESTIGATORS	Sewsunker Tashmika
DEPARTMENT	Psychology
DATE CONSIDERED	28/06/17
DECISION OF COMMITTEE*	Approved

This ethical clearance is valid for 2 years and may be renewed upon application

DATE: 28 June 2017

CHAIRPERSON _____
(Prof. Gillian Finchilescu)

cc Supervisor: Prof. Brett Bowman
Psychology

DECLARATION OF INVESTIGATOR (S)

To be completed in duplicate and **one copy** returned to the Secretary, Room 100015, 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 be contemplated from the research procedure, as approved, I/we undertake to submit a revised protocol to the Committee.

This ethical clearance will expire on 31 December 2019

PLEASE QUOTE THE PROTOCOL NUMBER IN ALL ENQUIRIES