

https://dspace.org/

Constructions of masculinity in perpetrators' accounts of violent crime encounters in South Africa

Rowles, Kyle Glen

2016-07-28
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/20744

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

CONSTRUCTIONS OF MASCULINITY IN PERPETRATORS' ACCOUNTS OF VIOLENT CRIME ENCOUNTERS IN SOUTH AFRICA

STUDENT NAME: KYLE GLEN ROWLES
STUDENT NUMBER: 466977
SUPERVISOR: PROF. BRETT BOWMAN

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

DECLARATION:

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

Signed: **KYLE ROWLES**

Date: March 2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to the following people, without whom this research report would not have been possible:

- My research supervisor, Prof. Brett Bowman. Thank you for having the patience to work with me and for your unfaltering commitment. I have gained a lot of knowledge through working with you and for that I will be forever grateful.

- My parents, Glen and Sandy, for always supporting me in my quest for knowledge and for providing me with an education.

- The Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation for allowing access to their data, without which this study would not have been possible.

CONTENTS:

CHAPTER 1.....6

INTRODUCTION, AIMS, AND RATIONALE.....6

1.1. INTRODUCTION.....6

1.2. AIMS.....7

1.3. RATIONALE.....7

1.4.STRUCTURE AND OUTLINE OF RESEARCH REPORT.....8

CHAPTER 2.....9

LITERATURE REVIEW.....9

2.1. STRUCTURAL FACTORS IMPLICATED IN VIOLENCE.....10

2.1.1. Gun culture.....13

2.1.2. Patriarchy.....15

2.2. INEQUALITY.....16

2.2.1. Consumerism.....17

2.3. SUBSTANCE USE/ABUSE.....19

2.4. MALENESS, MANHOOD AND MASCULINITY.....21

2.4.1. Hegemonic Masculinity.....21

2.5. MOVING BEYOND BROAD BRUSHSTROKES.....24

2.6. CONCLUSION.....26

CHAPTER 3.....27

METHODS.....27

3.1. DESIGN AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....27

3.1.1. SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONISM.....27

3.1.2. SECONDARY DATA ANALYSIS.....29

3.2. DATASET.....30

3.3. PROCEDURE.....31

3.3.1. Sampling.....31

3.3.2. Analysis.....32

3.4. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....33

CHAPTER 4.....**34**
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....**34**
4.1. RATIONALIZING STRATEGIES.....**34**
4.1.1. Alcohol and Substance Abuse.....**35**
4.1.2. He brought it upon Himself.....**37**
4.2. HETEROPATRIARCHY.....**37**
4.2.1. Peer Approval and Men as Strong Individuals.....**38**
4.2.2. Weapon Use.....**41**
4.2.3. Authority Figures and Being in Control.....**44**
4.3 CONSUMER-CAPITALISM.....**47**
4.3.1. Material Possessions.....**47**

CHAPTER 5.....**49**
LIMITATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION.....**49**
5.1. STUDY LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS.....**49**
5.2. CONCLUSION.....**50**

APPENDICES.....**52**
APPENDIX 1: CONSENT FORMS.....**52**
APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE.....**56**
APPENDIX 3: LETTER OF PERMISSION.....**57**

REFERENCE LIST.....**58**

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION, RATIONALE, AND AIMS

1.1. Introduction:

Violence is a serious social issue worldwide and South Africa has one of the highest murder rates in the world and experiences more cases of violence than most other countries (CSVR, 2009). According to the South African Police Services (SAPS), in the year 2013, 17 068 cases of murder took place in South Africa. This translates into a homicide rate of 32.2 people per 100 000 of the population (SAPS, 2013). This rate is much higher than the global average of 6.2 per 100 000 population (UNODC, 2013). In South Africa, violence is considered a contact crime which is committed against the individual and involves physical contact between the victim and the perpetrator. Furthermore, this contact is usually of a violent nature and includes common assault, sexual offences, common robbery, assault with the intent to cause grievous bodily harm, robbery with aggravated circumstances, attempted murder, and murder (SAPS, 2013). According to the SAPS Annual Report for 2013/14, contact crime was the largest contributor to the total number of reported crimes and accounted for 34% of all reported crimes (SAPS, 2014).

A rapidly growing body of research on violence has increasingly shown that violence is the result of a complex causal pathway that includes multiple interactions between certain risk factors such as alcohol abuse (Capraro, 2000; de Visser & Smith, 2007; Mullen, Watson, Swift & Black, 2007), inequality (Demombynes & Ozler, 2005; Langa, 2008), the normalisation of violence (Guerra, Huesmann & Spindler, 2003, Widom & Maxfield, 2001), and masculinity (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Courtenay, 2000; de Viggiani, 2012).

Masculinity is a complex concept and is not easily defined. Discourses on masculinity frequently refer to hegemonic masculine ideals which state that men should be powerful, practice predatory heterosexuality, and provide for his family (Jewkes, Flood & Lang, 2014; de Visser & Smith, 2007). Research on violence has focused on how certain risk factors (such as alcohol and drug abuse) perpetuates a life of violent crime, however, research on how perpetrators of violent crime construct their masculinity during the violent encounter itself is limited. Furthermore, the risk factors referenced above highlight the tenets of hegemonic

masculinity and, thus, an investigation into how male perpetrators of violent crime construct masculinity will be beneficial in the field of violence research.

1.2. Research Aims:

The aim of this study was to explore constructions of masculinity within narratives of violent encounters solicited through interviews with incarcerated perpetrators of contact crime. This was achieved by making use of secondary interview data which was subjected to a discourse analysis.

1.3. Research Rationale:

The epidemiology of violence has been widely studied (see for example, Blumstein, 1995; Cantillon, Ransford & Slutkin, 2014; and Widom & Maxfield, 2001) in order to answer the broad questions such as who are perpetrators of violent crime and what factors may perpetuate a life of violence? Furthermore, other studies focus on what types of violence occur most frequently and where (i.e. rural vs. urban settlements; Cape Town vs. Johannesburg etc.) they occur (for a South African profile see: NIMSS, 2002). While much epidemiological data has shown that being a male is associated with significant risk for being both a perpetrator and victim of violence and, a large body of work has focused on men and health – masculinity studies have not yet provided an exhaustive analysis on precisely how masculinity is constructed, during retrospective reports of violent encounters, by perpetrators of violence, especially in middle-income countries such as South Africa.

Furthermore, the fact that males are disproportionately both the victims and perpetrators of violence has lead several theorists to suggest that the social meanings and roles commonly attached to being a man, or masculinity, is implicated in the complex causal pathways of violence (Hong, 2000; Kimmel & Mahler, 2003; Kimmel & Messner, 2001). Although gender is routinely included in epidemiological studies of violence, the precise mechanisms that tie masculinity to its enactments are understudied. This is important because research has found that men not only perceive violence to be masculine, but may use such perceived masculine acts when their masculinity is in doubt in order to prove or exaggerate their masculinity (Messerschmidt, 2000). Jewkes et al. (2014) state that masculinity and gender-related social norms are implicated in violence as men's practices and experiences of violence are supported by commonly held versions of manhood. The prevalence and patterns

of violence, however, vary noticeably worldwide, and individual differences may exist between men in any particular context. Thus, the connection between masculinity and violence lies in gender; "that is, the social values, behaviours, roles, and attributes thought to be appropriate and expected for men" (Jewkes et al., 2014, p. 2). These behaviours and ideas that constitute gender are determined, as well as defined, by societies and their subgroups. However, these beliefs are embodied in the actions of people and materialised in social institutions. Therefore, ideas and attitudes related to gender influence how men view themselves as men within social relationships (Jewkes et al., 2014).

The remainder of this research report constitutes four further chapters which will review the literature, outline the research design and method, present the results, and draw conclusions.

1.4. Structure and Outline of the Research Report:

Chapter 2 reviews the literature in order to locate the study within the context of gendered social constructions. The literature review provides a comprehensive outline of risk factors for violence which include Structural factors implicated in violence, inequality, substance use/abuse, and masculinity.

Chapter 3 outlines the research design and method utilised in order to develop the study. How the dataset was obtained, the sampling techniques, and data analysis approach are described. Ethical considerations are also considered and discussed.

Chapter 4 presents the results of the analysis. This chapter locates the various discourses arising from the texts in light of the arguments put forward in the literature review. The chapter begins with a broad overview of results (presented in table 1) which is followed by an analysis of the perpetrators' discourse which included rationalizing strategies, heteropatriarchy, and consumer-capitalism.

Chapter 5 concludes the research report with a summary of the findings. Recommendations for future research are made whilst recognizing the various strengths and limitations of the study.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Relative to those countries that report violent crime to the United Nations (UN), South Africa has a high prevalence of both fatal and non-fatal violence. Although the homicide rate, which is considered by many to be the most reliable indicator of violence, more than halved for the first eighteen years after democracy (Bowman, Eagle & Stevens, 2013), it has steadily increased in recent years (Institute for Security Studies (ISS), 2015) and South Africa continues to have one of the highest homicide rates in the world. Furthermore, it also has amongst the highest violent crime rates in the world (Demombynes & Ozler, 2005). The World Health Organization (WHO) defines violence as:

> 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 (World Health Organization (WHO), 2002, p. 5).

In South Africa, violence is considered a contact crime (SAPS, 2013). Contact crime is committed against the person and involves physical contact between the victim and the perpetrator. Therefore, given both these definitions, violent crime is an act which involves force or threat of force.

Felson (2009), however, notes that violent crime involves both crime and violence and, therefore, an understanding of violent crime requires an understanding of both deviance and aggression. He insists that violence and crime are overlapping domains as some acts of violence are not criminal nor deviant; such as violence in self-defence, and violence in war. On the other hand, Felson (2009) highlights that illicit drug use is an example of a crime that does not involve violence. Therefore, if one is interested in violent crime, one should try to explain why people do not mind harming others, as well as why they are willing to break the law (Felson, 2009). Felson's views highlight that violent crime researchers need to not only focus on the contact aspect of violent crime (which is highlighted by both the SAPS' (2013) and the WHO's (2002) definitions), but also on the deviance and the willingness of a perpetrator to break the law. Furthermore, Bowman, Stevens, Eagle and Matzopolous (2015) highlight that the current WHO definition links intentionality with the outcomes of death,

injury, maldevelopment, psychological harm, and/or deprivation, but what is not presently included in definitions of violence is the process that links intention to injury outcome.

Much of the literature on violent crime has focused on the risk factors for violence and the related autobiographical backgrounds of violent perpetrators (Blumstein, 1995; Widom & Maxfield, 2001), leading Barolsky et al. (2008) to argue that research about violent perpetrators has not gone beyond outlining a general typology of offenders. Many researchers have found that perpetrators (and victims) of contact crimes are usually young males (Blumstein, 1995; Butchart & Engstrom, 2002; Smith, 1995; Widom & Maxfield, 2001). This holds true for South Africa where, in 2000, the highest homicide victimisation rates were identified in men aged between 15-29 years old - 184 per 100 000 (Seedat, Van Niekerk, Jewkes, Suffla & Ratele, 2009).

The following sections will summarise some of the most researched risk-factors for violence (including social norms that support violence, inequality, substance use, and firearms) by making reference to past literature and will then focus on masculinity (and constructs of masculinity) and how this concept ties in with violence in order to better situate the current study with a focus on motivating for a secondary analysis of data collected by Barolsky et al. (2008).

2.1 *Structural Factors Implicated in Violence*

It is widespread belief, according to Widom and Maxfield (2001), that violence begets violence. The cycle of violence is one of the most researched factors for violence and can be understood in terms of the abused becoming abusers/delinquent, as Widom and Maxfield (2001) state: “One of the most pervasive claims that appears in both academic and popular writings refers to the cycle of violence: abused children become abusers and victims of violence become violent offenders (p. 160).” Early childhood victimization has been found to have long-term consequences for adult criminality, delinquency, and violent criminal behaviour (Widom & Maxfield, 2001).

Many argue that South Africa is a special case due to the legacy of apartheid which was quintessentially violent in all its forms (CSVR, 2009). For example, Kynoch (2006) states that:

> We have to take account of state policies that exposed millions of boys and men to humiliating police harassment and a violent prison system. Finally, state sponsorship of township violence further undermined the rule of law. These conditions, unique to South Africa, nurtured a culture of violence that has reproduced itself ever since (p. 32).

Seedat et al. (2009) state that the structural factors implicated in violence in South Africa include widespread poverty and income inequality. Furthermore, they insist that apartheid laws continue to have profound effects on lives of South Africans as they state that apartheid policies were used to achieve considerable wealth for a small racial elite which resulted in abject poverty for most of the population; which can still be seen today in the growth of income inequality (CSVR, 2009). Furthermore, not only did political violence flourish under apartheid (Kynoch, 2006), interpersonal violence was common as there was a lack of common-law policing in townships (Seedat et al., 2009).

Barolsky et al. (2008) found that in South Africa, escalating patterns of offending occurred, which started in adolescence as petty crimes (stealing from a local shop) but "steadily escalated to more serious activities such as housebreaking, hijacking, armed robbery, and murder as these men became more deeply involved in a criminal lifestyle" (p. 8). The CSVR (2009) highlight that men who become persistent offenders are usually exposed to negative family environments in childhood. Furthermore, many children who are plagued by problems such as violence grow up in single-parent families and poorer sections of South African society (CSVR, 2009). What is even more noticeable in their data is a reported failure to recognize violence as violence. This indicates how violence has become normative for these participants (Barolsky et al., 2008). In apartheid South Africa, the criminal justice system primarily focused on protecting white South Africans against crime and investments in addressing crime in townships was low. This resulted in criminal groups and criminal culture entrenching itself in township areas (CSVR, 2009).

Barolsky et al. (2008) also argue that very few of the sample were aware of alternative choices at the time of the perpetration of violence. This could be due to many factors such as a lack of education (since many of the perpetrators in their study left school early due to a number of reasons). However, it could also be argued that this could be due to the culture of violence, and the normative nature of violence in South Africa, as forms of environmental determinism such as parental role-models and delinquent peer groups play an important part

in influencing and exposing a child to violence (Orpinas, Murray & Kelder, 1999; Stevens, 2008).

Orpinas et al. (1999) observed an inverse relationship between "aggression scores, fighting, injuries due to fighting, and weapon carrying and the family variables: parental monitoring, a positive relationship with parents, and the lack of parental support for fighting" (p. 774). Furthermore, students were less likely to report aggression if they lived with both parents than those in other living arrangements (Orpinas et al., 1999). Stevens (2008) found a similar trend in his study as his participants deployed registers of inadequate parental involvement and made "references to the observation and learning of violence from the social context (p. 272)." One participant, for example, explained how he saw his father beat his mother and he, in turned, beat his girlfriend. Another participant described learning violence from elders: "so that's why most of us tend to be violent at times. Because we've seen most elders solve their problems violently, so we think that's the kind of way. That's how we need to solve our problems as well" (Stevens, 2008, p. 273). Stevens' (2008) participants also described their peers as a source of their violent behaviour and Barolsky et al. (2008) found that an influence of a delinquent peer group was expressed very strongly by the perpetrators. In both studies the participants reported that the perceived need to meet others' expectations of masculinity is directly related to acts of violence and that violence is often committed in a context where peer approval is sought (Barolsky et al., 2008). Seedat et al. (2009), along with income inequality and widespread poverty, also highlight patriarchal notions of masculinity that valourise toughness, defence of honour, and risk-taking as a factor that supports violence in South Africa. Furthermore, Jewkes et al. (2014) state that men's use of violence is upheld by commonly adhered versions of manhood and, therefore, reproducing hegemonic masculine ideals is a social norm and, in turn, a structural factor which is implicated in violence. Hegemonic masculine ideals include men being an economic provider, strong, tough, and able to stand up for himself (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Jewkes et al. (2014) also highlight that frequently associated manly attributes may lead to violent competition between men in the form of fights for honour and territory, when they feel the need to express their masculinity or meet others' expectations of masculinity. This is evident in a number of studies in which participants made references to gangsterism, honour and proving to peers that they are able to look after themselves (Barolsky et al., 2008; Stevens, 2008).

Another factor that supports violence is exposure to abuse in childhood (Seedat et al., 2009). Barolsky et al. (2008) reported that many of their interviewees perceived being victims of violence themselves or that they knew somebody who was a victim of violence. Exposure to violence or abuse in early childhood leads boys to being prone to impulsivity, disdain and a lack of remorse, and aggression, and are more likely to perpetuate violence (Jewkes et al., 2014). However, Widom (1989) also raises the crucial point that it is important to acknowledge the problem of directionality in the causality of the events (i.e. delinquency and being abused/a victim of violence) since it may be that the delinquency could lead to the abuse. Furthermore, Widom (1989) also points out that not every abused child becomes an abuser themselves and not every victim of violence becomes a violent perpetrator.

Thus, the literature on social norms and structural factors implicates the seeming cyclicality of violence through familial and peer group influences. However, the disproportionate number of men as both victims and perpetrators of violence suggests these influences are gendered. Therefore it is important to gain an understanding of how structural factors influence constructions of masculinity such that the mechanisms that underlie gender as expressed through social norms that support violence can be understood.

Therefore, according to Seedat et al. (2009), the structural factors that implement violence include inequality, widespread poverty, patriarchal conceptions of masculinity, and exposure to abuse in childhood. Another important risk factor for violence is access to firearms (Seedat et al., 2009) and Kramer and Ratele (2012) report that the likelihood of mortality in an altercation is massively increased by the presence of a firearm and that firearms are central to interpersonal violence.

2.1.1 *Gun Culture*

"*South Africa's violent history has resulted in an entrenched gun culture* (Seedat et al., 2009)."

Much research has focused on the risk factor of gun ownership. This research, however, has focused more broadly on the rate of reported firearm deaths (Lamb, 2008), the relationship between firearm ownership and violent criminal perpetration (Monuteaux, Lee, Hemenway, Mannix, and Fleegler, 2015), and who is most at risk for firearm mortality and when this risk

is highest (Kramer & Ratele, 2012). Given that gun ownership is mostly a male phenomenon, and that young males are most at risk for firearm mortality, it is important to understand how gun ownership, and use, is related to masculinity and, furthermore, how firearms are used as tools for constructing masculinity.

According to Kramer and Ratele (2012) the second leading cause for mortality, in the USA, across the age groups of 10 to 34 is firearms. A US-based study found that "higher levels of firearm ownership were associated with higher levels of firearm assault and firearm robbery" (Monuteaux et al., 2015, p. 1). They also reported a direct relationship between firearm ownership and firearm homicide (Monuteaux et al., 2015). This is echoed by South African data as Norman, Matzopoulos, Groenewald, and Bradshaw (2007) found that, in the year 2000, 54% of all homicides in South Africa were firearm related. Similarly, in 2007, close to half of the approximately 20 000 murder victims in South Africa died as a result of firearms (Lamb, 2008). Seedat et al. (2009) highlight that a third of female homicides and 39% of male homicides, in South Africa, are attributable to firearms. Furthermore, Abrahams, Jewkes and Mathews (2010) report that South Africa has the third-highest (after Colombia and Venezuela) annual rate of firearm deaths in the world (26.8/100 000). Thus, firearm homicide is a very prominent cause for concern in South Africa.

Lamb (2008) reports that most firearm homicides are committed with firearms which have been stolen or lost. These include thefts from or losses by state armouries, licensed civilian owners, and state personnel. The transfer of legal to potentially illegal firearms is thought to be significant. For example in 2006/2007 some 3865 firearms were reported lost by the police in South Africa (Abrahams et al., 2010).

Gun ownership is mostly a male phenomenon and is seen as a means to demonstrate manhood, particularly among young men. "Whilst men are the predominating victims of gun violence, women are most vulnerable behind closed doors, where guns are used to intimidate, control, hurt, and kill intimate partners" (Abrahams et al., 2010, p. 586). This highlights how men may use firearms in order to subordinate women and reproduce patriarchy. Furthermore, Seedat et al. (2009) insist that men are highly competitive about power, respect, and status and that carrying of weapons leads to fights over power which results in serious injuries or death. Thus, it is evident, then, that gun ownership is tied to masculinity as it grants power to its owner and that one of the main tenets of masculinity is that men are powerful (Capraro,

2000). In South Africa, many township boys identified with a militarized masculinity during the fight against apartheid which led to violence and weapons use as an acceptable means for gaining power (Langa, 2012). This relationship to masculinity is however complex. A study by Stroud (2012) explored how men drew on discourses of masculinity to explain their possession of firearms and found that they accounted for gun ownership through a desire to protect their family, and to defend themselves against people and places they believed to be dangerous. Therefore, it is important to explore how men construct masculinity in relation to firearms as it may provide insight into gender-relations and power.

2.1.2 *Patriarchy*

Patriarchy can be defined as the subordination of women by men. Masculinity has been defined as a composition of practices that have the effect of controlling women (Almasi, 2005; Schrok & Schwalbe, 2009). Thus, it can be said that hegemonic masculinity is geared towards the dominance of men over women. Furthermore, current sociological theory suggests that gender is not a characteristic of individuals, but rather "the name we give to cultural practices that construct women and men as different and that advantage men at the expense of women" (Schrok & Schwalbe, 2009, p. 278).

Most families, prior to the nineteenth century, were organised according to patriarchal tradition where the head of the house oversaw the means of production whilst their wives and children were compelled to administer the unpaid labour needed to preserve family enterprises (Ruggles, 2015). Thus, the largely unidimensional and universal definition of manhood; which states that men are economic providers and the heads of the family, stems from this history (Hunter & Davis, 1994). However, this history is not shared by all South Africans as the effect of apartheid can be understood as being an assault of black men's masculinity (Langa, 2012). As a result of apartheid, the white Afrikaner masculinity was understood as being hegemonic in relation to black masculinity (Langa, 2012) as many black men were forced to move away from their families in order to work in mines where they were subjugated to white power (Morrell, 2001). Furthermore, males, as the masters of the household, had a legal right to command the acquiescence of their wives, children, and slaves, and to use corporal punishment to correct disobedience (Ruggles, 2015; Siegel, 1996). Therefore, black males were emasculated by this as their masculinity was set up in opposition to that of the hegemonic white Afrikaner masculinity (Langa, 2012). Despite the fact that this is no longer the case, interpersonal violence against women is still very prominent globally

and in South Africa. The World Health Organisation undertook a large multi-country study in ten countries making use of more than 24 000 women as their sample and found that between 15% and 71% of 15-49 year old women had been a victim of physical and/or sexual violence by an intimate partner in their lifetime, with average prevalence rates between 30% and 60% (Pallitto, Garcia-Moreno, Jansen, Heise, Ellsberg & Watts, 2012). South Africa is said to have one of the highest rates of gender-based violence in the world which includes rape and abuse/domestic violence (Seedat et al., 2009). Furthermore, in a study conducted by Abrahams, Mathews, Martin, Lombard, and Jewkes (2013), which made use of a retrospective national survey of a random sample of 38 mortuaries, found that, in 2009, female homicide in South Africa had decreased since 1999, however, intimate partner femicide rates were not statistically different. Furthermore, they state that men who believe being able to exhibit power over women as imperative to their self assessment as men are much more likely to be violent (Abrahams et al., 2013). This further highlights the link between men, masculinity, and power. Thus, it has been seen that masculinity is geared toward subordinating women and reproducing male power and that gun ownership is a means to gaining power.

Therefore, it is important to gain an understanding as to how masculinity is constructed in relation to patriarchy in order to gain insight into how masculinity is constructed around the subordination of women.

2.2 *Inequality*

Another well-researched risk factor for criminality and violent criminality is that of inequality. Many studies have found that high inequality consistently coincides with high homicide rates (Butchart & Engstrom, 2002; Messner, 1989). Due to the fact that perpetrators and victims of violent crime are most commonly young people, Butchart and Engstrom (2002) state that it is important to examine whether the rate at which 0-24 year old males and females are murdered is effected by economic factors. They found that potential for committing violent acts that bring about gains through criminal means is increased by economic deprivation and inequality which, in turn, increases individuals' anger, frustrations, and perceived needs (Butchart & Engstrom, 2002). Jewkes et al. (2014) highlight that one of the associated roles of masculinity is that of being a provider and that this concept is embraced from childhood and, even if these roles cannot be fulfilled by some men (such as failure of being an economic provider due to poverty or unemployment), is aspired to by most

men. Furthermore, Butchart and Engstrom (2002) also found that low-to-middle income countries (such as those in Latin America, Eastern Europe, and ex-Soviet Countries) experienced high levels of violence among 0-24 year olds. In South Africa, one can see affluence side-by-side with destitution, hunger, and overcrowding and is, thus, a country of stark contrasts (Woolard, 2002). Seekings and Nattrass (2002) question why the dissolution of apartheid, and the onset of democracy, has not been accompanied by a decline in inequality. In their 2010 paper, they argue that the persistence of poverty is due to the extremely unequal distribution of the benefits of growth (Nattrass & Seekings 2010). In fact, due to the benefits being distributed unequally, income inequality had actually worsened (since 1994), whilst poverty in 2008 had only slightly decreased since 1994 (Nattrass & Seekings, 2010). Unemployment is a major determinant of poverty and inequality (Seekings & Nattrass, 2002) and Nattrass and Seekings (2010) highlight that "poverty in South Africa is rooted in a combination of very high unemployment, landlessness, and the decline of subsidence agriculture" (p. 5). Such prominent inequality in South Africa rests on past policies of segregation and discrimination (since poverty, in South Africa, is concentrated on in the Black African population (Woolard, 2002)) as well as low economic growth in more recent decades (Nattrass & Seekings, 2010). Following this, a study conducted by Demombynes and Ozler (2005) explored the effects of local inequality on property and violent crime in South Africa. They state that both economic and sociological theory links the distribution of welfare to criminal activity and that "the expected level of crime will be greater in a community with higher inequality" (Demombynes & Ozler, 2005, p. 267). Thus, as South Africa has been pointed out to be one of the most unequal countries in the world (Woolard, 2002), it can be expected that level of crime and violence is high. Demombynes and colleagues' (2005) results confirmed this as they found a positive relationship between inequality and four categories of crime (namely, residential burglary, vehicle theft, serious assault, and rape).

2.2.1 *Consumerism*

While there is clear evidence for the association between inequality and violence, the mechanisms by which inequality is translated into violence remains unclear. According to Ger and Belk (1996), however, non-consumption of widely available consumer items is experienced as exclusion which, in turn, perpetuates poverty and creates withdrawal:

> Especially with raised consumer expectations that cannot be satisfied for the masses, these growing polarisations fuel alienation, frustration, and deprivation which in turn may nurture social strife and crime (p. 283).

However, Mullen, Watson, Swift and Black (2007) found that a sample of young British men believed that wearing fashionable clothing and caring about one's image is not masculine. Langa (2008), however, insists that post-1994 a 'lost generation' or a 'Y generation' of young black males who had lost interest in politics were more concerned with material possessions. "The obsessive embrace of all things American by South African youth (Langa, 2008, pg, 7)" including fashion, has also been documented. Furthermore, Stevens (1994) states that what is increasingly apparent in post-Apartheid South Africa "is the emergence of what could be referred to as a 'Coca-Cola' culture – an embracing of American individualism, competition, individualistic aspirations and general worldview" (p. 8). This 'Coca-Cola' culture is, according to Stevens (1994), a result of many black adolescents being expected to perform in roles that are consistent with a capitalistic framework, despite, often, being unattainable due to the racist legacy of South African society. Furthermore, Stevens (1994) states:

> What needs to be understood is that these shifts among black adolescents (from political activists to 'Coca-Cola kids') are not merely determined by the new socio-historical contexts, but that many black adolescents are actively embracing this 'Coca-Cola' culture as a means of maintaining their material and psychological integrity (p. 8).

Thus, as being an economic provider is a main tenet of hegemonic masculinity, exploring whether the perpetrators interviewed for this study share the belief of the young British men or whether or not the fact of poverty and (a lock of) wealth plays a more important role in the acquisition of fashion labels will highlight how poverty, inequality and a lack of wealth aid in the construction of masculinity.

Evidence for this driver of violence was presented by Barolsky et al. (2008) and suggests that the desire for consumer goods and popular fashion labels featured as a significant motive and as a motivation for crime in the narratives of their sample. However, this does little to shed light on the relationship between access to consumer goods, masculinity, and the use of violence to acquire them. Thus, in the current study the emphases will be on using situational accounts of violence to better understand how the participants construct masculinity in violently acquiring consumer goods.

2.3 *Substance Use/Abuse*

Substance (mis)use/abuse is a very common justification for perpetrators of violent crime. In their London-based study de Visser and Smith (2007) found that young men report that they would not have engaged in violence if they were not intoxicated. Furthermore, Rehm, Mathers, Popova, Thavorncharoensap, Teerawattanon and Patra (2009, p. 1) state that "alcohol contributes substantially to the global burden of disease (4% of total mortality and between 4% and 5% of disability-adjusted life-years [in 2004])." Furthermore, of this, intentional injuries accounted for 11.4% of this for males and 9.0% for females. Furthermore, they state that in South Africa, of all mortality attributable to alcohol, unintentional and intentional injuries accounted for 31% of deaths for males and 12% for females (Rehm et al., 2009).

In South Africa, Barolsky et al. (2008) found that many of the perpetrators they interviewed blamed alcohol for their actions since split-second decisions made by offenders were usually explained to be driven by drugs, alcohol or machismo. Alcohol has costly effects not only on the individual but also on the state. After unsafe sex/sexually transmitted diseases and interpersonal violence (which are both influenced by alcohol and exerts a substantial economic burden on the state), alcohol is the third largest contributor to death and disability (Matzopoulos, Truen, Bowman & Corrigall, 2014). In 2000, the estimated burden of disease attributable to alcohol use was 7.1% of all deaths in South Africa (Peltzer, Davids & Njuho, 2011). However, the relationship between alcohol consumption and violence seems to be related again to broader drinking trends that are unmistakably gendered and international.

Studies in America (Capraro, 2000), England (de Visser & Smith, 2007; Harnett, Thom, Herring & Kelly, 2000), and Scotland (Mullen et al., 2007) all indicate that men are, firstly, more likely to drink to get drunk than women and secondly, drink in excess of the recommended daily limit. Mullen at al. (2007) state that in Scotland men between the ages of 16 – 24 are most likely to eclipse recommended weekly limits. Furthermore, Capraro (2000) found that men outnumber women in every category of drinking behaviour such as frequency of drinking and intoxication, prevalence, consumption, incidence of problem and heavy drinking, alcohol abuse and dependence, and alcoholism. Similarly, Mullen et al. (2007) found that more than two thirds of alcohol related deaths in the UK are among men. Why is it that more men than women participate in alcohol-related activities? De Visser and colleagues' (2007) sample believed that alcohol consumption is an insigne of masculinity

and, thus, behaved accordingly. Similarly, Capraro (2000) states that drinking is a 'male domain' and that drinking is an indication of masculinity and that men may drink to be considered manly. De Visser and Smith (2007) state that: "despite the fact that many different discourses of masculinity exist, many men endorse and aspire to hegemonic masculinity which characterises toughness (both physical and emotional), risk taking and predatory heterosexuality (p. 597)." Capraro (2000) states that men in our society are supposed to be powerful; however, not all men are powerful and, thus, they may compensate for this powerlessness by drinking since drinking will stimulate social power thoughts. Thus, men who are insecure about their masculinity may benefit from alcohol consumption in demonstrating masculine competence (de Visser & Smith, 2007) and feelings of confidence (Mullen et al., 2007).

The consumption of beer with fellow males, according to Mullen et al. (2007), seems to be a way in which men perform the standard hegemonic masculine identity. Furthermore, de Visser and Smith (2007) make reference to 'lad culture' in Britain where men get together at the local pub to have a pint and watch the football. Barolsky et al. (2008) state that many black South African citizens (especially men and those in urban settlements) view the tavern as an important site of leisure. Thus, this is very similar to the 'lad culture' of Britain. Barolsky et al. (2008) go on to state that alcohol consumption and violence have an intimate relationship in South Africa. Similarly, Mullen et al. (2007) state that participants mentioned witnessing occasions of violence in pubs, however, their view was that alcohol-related violence predominantly took place on the streets and in the house. For example, one participant from the study conducted by de Visser and Smith (2007) stated that he and his friends used to beat random people on the street for fun. This was always attributed to being intoxicated since getting drunk can lead to impulsive behaviour and not considering the negative outcomes of actions (de Visser & Smith, 2007; Mullen et al., 2007).

Thus, the use of alcohol and a license to drink to intoxication are deeply rooted in how society expects men to behave (Mullen et al., 2007). Furthermore, understanding the link between violence and alcohol consumption could lie in the construction of masculinity since drinking can be viewed as a social activity (Barolsky et al., 2008; de Visser & Smith, 2007; Mullen et al., 2007; Harnett et al., 2000) and that men perform certain masculinities in order to meet others' perceived expectations of it (Barolsky et al., 2008).

The above risk factors for violence have all been related to being male, however, it is only relatively recently that gender studies have attempted to understand what performing masculinity means for the enactment of violence. Thus, the final section will attempt to sketch what is known about masculinity and its relationship to social norms, inequality, and substance abuse as these intersections relate to the enactment of violence.

2.4 *Maleness, Manhood, and Masculinity*

While gender has been routinely included as a variable for study in the social sciences, the concept of masculinity, however, is not very easily defined as the history of the concept amply shows.

In the 1980's research on men started focusing on how men enact differing and diverse masculinities as opposed to the previously researched singularity surrounding the male sex role and masculinity (Schrok & Schwalbe, 2009). Furthermore, Schrok and Schwalbe (2009) state that the category of 'males' is not equal to that of 'men' as "men are biological males claiming rights and privileges attendant to membership in the dominant gender group (p. 279)." and, therefore, in order to enjoy these privileges and benefits attributed to this gender group, one must accord himself with a certain kind of social being: a man (Schrok & Schwalbe, 2009). According to Schwalbe (2005), to be accepted as a man, then, what one must do is perform manhood acts with conviction. This includes mastering and understanding a set of conventional identifying practices through which the identity 'man' is entrenched and, more importantly, upheld in interaction. Therefore, this mastery of conventional identifying practices enables men to re-enact the tenets of hegemonic masculinity as hegemonic masculinity has been defined as the currently most recognized way of being a man (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005).

2.4.1 *Hegemonic Masculinity*

The concept of hegemonic masculinity, which was developed approximately two decades ago, has greatly informed recent thinking about men and gender (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). This form of masculinity is understood as a system of beliefs and practices that allows men's ascendency over women to continue (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Furthermore, the meaning of manhood has largely been treated as unidimensional and universal, which states that men are the economic providers and the head of the family (Hunter & Davis, 1994). Hegemonic masculinity, according to Connell and Messerschmidt (2005), however,

"was not assumed to be normal in the statistical sense; only a minority of men might enact it. But it was certainly normative. It embodied the currently most honoured way of being a man" (p. 832) and helped express widespread ideals, fantasies, and desires. The concept of masculinity, however, is blurred and ambiguous in its meaning as well as flawed "because it essentializes the character of men or imposes a false unity on a fluid and contradictory reality" (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 836). Furthermore, this concept fails to specify what hegemonic masculine behaviour looks like in practice (Wetherell & Edley, 1999). Thus, Morgan (1992) (along with many other researchers) argues that several versions of masculinity coexist simultaneously and, thus, brought about the idea of masculinities as opposed to masculinity. Thus, this school of thought believes that one's masculinity is constructed around particular factors which are unique to them. This argument lends itself to the idea of intersectionality. The intersectionality perspective (which gained prominence in feminist literature) acknowledges that one's experiences and beliefs about gender are greatly affected by the individual's social identities (Shields, 2008). Furthermore, this approach underlines the differences among differing intersectional positions. For example, Shields (2008) states that the definition of manhood may differ when applied to one's own racial group as opposed to that of another group. A number of recent research (Gear, 2007; de Viggiani, 2012) has focused on 'prison masculinities.' In his study in the UK, de Viggiani (2012) found that incarcerated males conform to prison masculinities in order to mask perceived weakness or vulnerability and as a means of survival. However, these recent studies have not focused on the way incarcerated perpetrators of violent crime construct masculinity more generally. This may have very important implications for understanding how the construct of masculinity plays a role in violence and why male perpetrators may feel the need to protect their sense of masculinity through acts of violence which Stevens (2008) describes as being a means of sustaining male dominance over females and exclusion and asserting masculinity in group struggles. Barolsky et al. (2008) also claim that violence is essentially aimed at the goal of control and taking command of a situation. Furthermore, Barolsky et al. (2008) state that violent masculinity (i.e. violence as a result of masculinity) can be seen as an intersectional performance because they found it to be mediated by racial divisions, geographical location, socioeconomic status, and other social markers, especially within the South African climate. This indicates that depending on where one is from, what racial group one belongs to, and one's socioeconomic status (along with other possible factors that may become visible in the narratives of the perpetrators that this study will analyse) might have an impact on how one views and constructs masculinity and,

furthermore, what masculinity means to the individual. This implies that masculinity as a social construction is contingent on contextual features including race, gender, class and often sexuality (Cole, 2009). Thus, it is important to understand how these social markers may play a role in the construction of masculinity in an enactment of violence.

Race is an important factor to consider as it plays a big role in the construction of masculinity. Hunter and Davis (1994) state that the status and privilege of White males is used as a measuring tool for determining what Black men are, and what they should be. Similarly, Langa (2012) states that in a white-supremacist context, black masculinity is the most marginalized form of masculinity. South Africa is no longer a white-supremacist state, however, Langa (2012) highlights that black men in South Africa were historically subjected to oppression in defining their own masculinities. Langa (2012) takes this further by stating that it could be argued that along with other forms of masculinity, 'black' masculinity remains marginalized globally and, thus, is still marginalized in relation to hegemonic masculinity. Therefore, according to Langa (2012), it is apparent that hegemonic masculinity can only be sustained at the cost of the marginalization and subordination of some men and their masculinities.

Furthermore, one's masculinity may come under direct threat or, at least, under perceived threat and offenders may feel the need to protect their sense of masculinity. This highlights the importance of focusing on the situational enactment of violence as it will indicate how, through protecting his sense of masculinity, one constructs it. Barolsky et al. (2008) indicate that this may very well be due to the fact that a male offender is under pressure from his social group to perform in particular ways under certain conditions. For example, one of the interviewees in their study claimed to have shot a man at a bar for accusing him (the offender) of looking at him (the victim) in a manner which did not please him only because his friends questioned whether or not he would allow this man to make a fool of him and question him in front of the whole bar. This perpetrator's reported behaviour can be linked to the idea that men feel the need to prove to their social group that they are manly and can handle certain situations themselves (Mullen et al., 2007). Furthermore, Barolsky et al. (2008) go on to state that control of one's masculine identity as well as having control over others appears to be intrinsically linked and this may be a very important influence in men's use of violence. Thus, it is clear that violent poly-perpetration is an important factor to consider in how one constructs his masculinity as it will influence whether or not the

perpetrator feels the need to prove himself (and his masculinity) to his peers or his fellow perpetrators. In South Africa, violence often involves poly-perpetration and poly-victimization and is, thus, often polymorphic (Bowman et al., 2015). Therefore, this highlights the need to understand the contextual determinants that dynamically outline enactments of violence (Bowman et al., 2015).

Therefore, it is evident that while masculinity, as a social norm, has been shown to be related to violence and has been extensively researched, there has been relatively scant research on its constructed role in the perpetration of violent crime. Therefore, due to the fact that this research is focusing on the situational performance or 'use' of masculinity, namely: during an act of violence it made use of the second interview conducted by Barolsky et al. (2008) as this focused on the perpetrator's involvement in violence. Gaining an understanding into how it is constructed could help researchers gain invaluable knowledge into the relationship between violence and masculinity which could enrich current theoretical perspectives and even future interventions in order to prevent violent criminality. This requires a move beyond what has been researched in the past (i.e. outlining a broad typology of offender) in order to understand the intersectional relationship between the risk factors for violence.

2.5 *Moving beyond Broad Brushstrokes: The need for in-depth accounts of violence*

Barolsky et al. (2008) conducted a qualitative study that aimed to understand: how individuals become involved in violence, the severity of violence used in individual incidents including instrumental and expressive factors in violence, and to engage in questions concerned with possible interventions that could aid in preventing violence. Operationalised through three staggered in-depth interviews with twenty incarcerated violent offenders they explored three primary thematic concerns; namely: the life history of the participants, their involvement in violence, and their experience of incarceration with the goal of unpacking and individualising the category of male offender. These three concerns were chosen in order to present as comprehensive a picture as possible of each offender's life, from childhood through to their present experience of incarceration (Barolsky et al, 2008). By locating the acts of violence of these perpetrators within a broader context of the overall trajectory of their lives, Barolsky et al. (2008) "hoped to develop a more complex understanding of these offenders, than that currently portrayed in the popular imagination, where the violent acts in which offenders are involved often appear largely dissociated from the history of the individual and, perhaps most significantly, the history of their involvement in violence" (p.

12). Thus, the study was conceptualised to better understand the mechanisms that underlie epidemiologically established risk factors for violence.

They did this by exploring the narratives and motivations for violence in a corpus of transcriptions of 60 semi-structured interviews with a purposive sample of 20 incarcerated perpetrators of violent crime. However, given the scope of the analysis, focused interrogations of the various sub-themes was difficult. While masculinity was highlighted as a theme in the analysis it was not the focus point of the second interview (i.e. their involvement in crime) but, rather, a general theme which appeared in all three interviews. Despite highlighting this theme as cross-cutting and important, the more generalist demands of the project meant that a depth analysis of each theme was not provided and so the authors called for further more focused studies of each. Given that the field of masculinity studies has isolated performances of violence as an important component of performing masculinity, the transcripts provide a useful site for exploring just how these performances are constructed in accounts of the enactment of, rather than as a background factor, to the violent crime. Furthermore, according to Schrok and Schwalbe (2009), the field of masculinity studies can be seen as a confusing one, which stems from unclear definitions of important concepts, inconsistent use of important concepts, or both. Similarly, Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) state that "the concept of masculinity is blurred and uncertain in its meaning as well as flawed because it essentializes the character of men" (p. 836). Furthermore, this concept fails to specify what conformity to a certain masculinity looks like in practice (Wetherell & Edley, 1999) and, therefore, many researchers argue that several versions of masculinity coexist simultaneously (Morgan, 1992).

Realising that such performances cannot be isolated from other identities and the material conditions in which they are birthed and sustained, Barolsky et al. (2008) call for such an account to focus on the ways that masculinity is mediated by racial divisions, geographical location, socioeconomic status, and other social markers within the South African climate. In short such a call requires that such identities be considered as intersecting and inextricably linked to other identities and the broader socio-political context.

Thus, it is important to understand not interpretations but constructions of masculinity in violent encounters as it will help gain valuable insight into how masculinity plays a role in violent crime.

2.6 *Conclusion*

It is evident that the epidemiology of violence has been widely studied in order to gain insight into the risk factors for violence. Barolsky and colleagues' (2008) study examined these risk factors and the epidemiology of violence in a South African content. However, due to the fact that all the above mentioned risk factors can and have been related to masculinity, it is also evident that the situational performance of masculinity (and how this concept is constructed in relation to other risk factors) is required. Masculinity, for Barolsky et al (2008), was not the focus point of the second interview (i.e. their involvement in crime) but, rather, a general theme which appeared in all three interviews. Thus, expanding on Barolsky and colleagues' (2008) work is required to explore accounts of the role of masculinity in shaping the situation of the violent event, rather than just as a background factor.

CHAPTER 3:

METHODS:

Given the paucity of research exploring constructions of masculinity during enactments of violent crime, this study was guided by a single research question:

1. How is masculinity constructed in incarcerated perpetrators' accounts of violent crime?

Selected extracts from the interviews were analysed individually first using Parker's (1992) guidelines for discourse analysis in order to attempt to highlight how the perpetrators constructed masculinity and what discourses were drawn on in order to do so. Once this stage of analysis was complete, the researcher then compared and contrasted the extracts to each other in order to gain an understanding of how the constructed masculinities were similar, were different, and where power was presumed to lie within these narratives. The following sections will highlight why discourse analysis was chosen as the method of analysis as well as why Parker's (1992) guidelines for this analysis were drawn on.

3.1 *Design and Theoretical Framework:*

3.1.1 *Social Constructionism*

As masculinity has shifted over time and, so, is made meaningful in social contexts, the project is embedded in a social constructionist framework. Social constructionism highlights the 'turn to language' which had a profound effect on study in the social world in psychology (Edley, 2001). This 'turn to language' makes it possible to suggest that phenomena are socially constructed and accomplished in ordinary, everyday interaction (Edley, 2001). Similarly, DeLamater and Hyde (1998) state that reality is socially constructed. What this means is that social interaction and the social context in which people construct their reality, play very important roles in how one makes sense of the world (Silverman, 2004; Firth & Kitzinger, 1998). Language, then, is a very important factor in this theory since it is the means by which we classify events and persons and it provides the grounds on which we attempt to understand the world (DeLamater & Hyde, 1998). Linked to language is the fact that reality of everyday life is shared. According to DeLamater and Hyde (1998) language facilitates the sharing of experiences and make these experiences available to others. It is

important to note, however, that shared experiences and typifications of reality become institutionalized which leads to habitualization (DeLamater & Hyde, 1998). Thus, language enables habitualization which makes the behaviour of others predictable and once a typification becomes inveterated, others come to expect it, and methods of social control are created to maintain it. Therefore - through language - behaviour, ideas, or beliefs (such as that of hegemonic masculinity) may become institutionalized, habitualized, and re-enacted.

Social constructionists see gender not as an attribute of the individual but rather as a "process external to the individual. Gender is defined by interactions between people, by language, and by the discourse of a culture" (DeLamater & Hyde, 1998, p. 16).

The literature surrounding masculinity and violence has highlighted the important role that social context plays on how one views gender and masculinity (see, for example Langa, 2012). Furthermore, it is evident that gender is a social construct and, therefore, various (and varying) masculinities may be constructed in any one context (Schrok & Schwalbe, 2009; Shields, 2008). According to Shields (2008), any investigation of gender has to place the individual's social context at the forefront. Furthermore, she insists that "gender must be understood in the context of power relations embedded in social identities" (Shields, 2008, p. 301). She elaborates on this by stating that social identities which organize features of social relations are mutually constituted, reinforced and naturalized by one another (Shields, 2008). This means that a category of gender is meaningful in relation to another category of gender. This is important to understand as the literature has highlighted that many masculinities are possible and, thus, each masculine identity becomes meaningful in relation to another, differing, masculine identity. Schrok and Schwalbe (2009) state that in order for an individual male to be credited as a man he needs to put on a conclusive manhood act which "requires mastering a set of conventional signifying practices through which the identity 'man' is established and upheld in interaction" (p. 279). Thus, it is clear that masculinity is embedded in social relations, which makes language, as a social instrument, the means by which to decode in what ways it is constructed. Willig (2008) highlights that discourse studies, by definition, are committed to the ontological position that language constructs, as opposed to represents, social reality. Thus, discourse analysis is geared towards using language as the focus of analysis in order to decode what has been constructed and, therefore, the current study's data will be subject to a discourse analysis.

It is also evident that power is an important marker of hegemonic masculinity as the hegemonic man is believed to be strong, powerful and dominant (Capraro, 2000). Parker (2005) suggests: "The 'supposition' of knowledge by the speakers of characters in a piece of text will indicate, for example, where authority and power are presumed to lie" (p. 172). Therefore, this paper seeks to make use of Ian Parker's take on the social and power as a guideline for analysis. Thus, by making use of Parker's take on power within social constructionism (which defines gender by interaction), this research aims to explore how constructions of masculinity make reference to power and authority in enactments of violence.

3.1.2 *Secondary Data Analysis*

Since this research made use of pre-collected data, it represents a secondary data analysis which is not frequently conducted in qualitative designs. The aim of secondary data analysis is to answer new research questions that vary from the questions asked in the initial research (Long-Sutehall, Sque & Addington-Hall, 2010). One of the main critiques of secondary analysis is that the secondary researcher has not been involved in data collection and, thus, has no data on interaction or how the participants behaved during the data collection (Long-Sutehall et al, 2010).

Furthermore, researchers have raised questions pertaining to ethical dilemmas in secondary analysis. Kuula (2010) argues that researchers are concerned with the confidential nature of interviews and if qualitative data is archived, for the purpose of being available for secondary analysis, one can argue that confidentiality is at risk of being compromised. However, this study made use of transcripts with all identifying information removed (discussed further in 'ethical considerations'). One of the most valuable benefits of this analysis is that it allows researchers access to participants who may be elusive (Fielding, 2004). This is vital for the current study since gaining accesses to incarcerated perpetrators of violent crime is exceedingly difficult within the confines of a master's by coursework and research report.

Given that this is a secondary analysis, and that the main critique of these analyses is that the researcher was not involved with data collection (Long-Sutehall et al., 2010), it is especially important to understand how the data came to be data for this study.

3.2 *Dataset*

It is important to clearly describe the history, constitution and process involved in the compilation and analysis of the dataset which was used in this study.

Barolsky et al. (2008), through liaison with the Department of Correctional Services (DCS), approached 20 male inmates to volunteer for their study. Once this sample of twenty had been decided upon, an initial interview (or screening interview) took place in order to describe the nature of the study, the extent of the commitment involved, as well as to obtain informed consent (see Appendix 1 for original consent forms). These initial interviews were conducted "by an experienced interviewer who had had some clinical training in order to ensure that any potential participant suffering from a serious mental disorder or disability was immediately excluded" (Barolsky et al., 2008, p. 17).

The sample, therefore, consisted of twenty males who have been "incarcerated for violent offences that are defined in South African criminal law as murder, attempted murder, aggravated robbery, and assault with intent to do grievous bodily harm (Barolsky et al., 2008, p. 7)." Furthermore, many of the participants were involved in, or accused of being involved in, sexual offences against women. Ten participants were recruited from Johannesburg Prison (Gauteng) and a further ten from Pollsmoor Prison (Western Cape). The ages of the participants ranged from 23 to 34. Furthermore, many of the participants had been arrested at least once before as they were all involved in criminal activities prior to their current incarceration (Barolsky et al., 2008).

Once the initial interviews had taken place and the sample chosen, the three remaining interviews were conducted. These interviews focused on the life history of the participants, their involvement in crime, and their experiences of incarceration. Recalling and narrating acts of violence was recognized by Barolsky et al. (2008) as a potentially traumatic experience not only for the participants, but the interviewers too and, thus, their study made use of accomplished interviewers with at least some clinical training. In Gauteng, two interviewers conducted the interviews; one of which was a trained counsellor and the other a psychologist, who were subcontracted from the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (CSVR). The interviews were conducted over a protracted period of several months. In the Western Cape, a psychologist from the Centre for Victims of Violence and Torture conducted the initial selection interviews whilst a group of ten trained field

interviewers from Providence Holdings Ltd. conducted the remaining three interviews (Barolsky et al., 2008).

During the above mentioned selection process (the initial interviews) permission to record interviews was received from potential interviewees (Barolsky et al., 2008). Barolsky et al. (2008) translated the interview schedule (see appendix 2) into the language of the participant and conducted the interviews in the language (or languages) participants were most comfortable with. Therefore, after the interviews had been conducted, the recordings were transcribed verbatim (i.e. in the language in which they were conducted) and then translated into English. This, as one can imagine, revealed methodological complexities. Due to the nature of translation, it is possible that some important implications in the language of interviewees were lost (Barolsky et al., 2008). Translation and transcription companies were contracted to conduct this aspect of the research and they internally checked the translations/transcriptions to determine accuracy.

This dataset was obtained for this study from the Principle Investigator on the original study (see appendix 3 for letter of permission).

3.3 *Procedure*

Long-Sutehall et al. (2010) assert that when doing a secondary analysis, the quality of the dataset available must be assessed (i.e. the data needs to be rich in information regarding the topic in order to answer the questions of the secondary analysis) and, thus, many secondary researchers sort through the original dataset in order to identify a sub-sample in order for analysis to be selectively limited to specific themes or topics.

3.3.1 *Sampling*

The researcher therefore carefully examined the full corpus of transcripts and decided on a smaller sub-sample (of seven interviews) based on what he believed to be information rich and interesting cases – i.e. cases which contained data pertaining to masculinity and masculine ideology as well as cases which presented opposing discourses and differing ideologies. Patton (2014) states that purposeful sampling methods includes "selecting information-rich cases to study, cases that by their nature will illuminate the enquiry question being investigated (p. 264)." He highlights that the main strength of purposeful sampling in qualitative study is that "one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the

inquiry. Studying information-rich cases yields insight and in-depth understanding rather than empirical understandings (Patton, 2014, p. 264).” This study, therefore, made use of purposive sampling methods in selecting information-rich cases and attaining the sample (Ritchie, Lewis & Elam, 2003) which consisted of seven South African male violent offenders. Therefore, this research selected the transcribed interviews with participants who made use of discourse which focused on their, and their exposure to, violence and contact crimes. Furthermore, this study aimed to investigate masculinity, and thus, discourse which focused on the enactment of violence and highlighted masculine ideals was focused on.

3.3.2 *Analysis*

Given that the project is focused on understanding constructions of masculinity and is embedded in social constructionism the selected transcripts were subjected to a discourse analysis derived from Parker’s (1992) guidelines for conducting discourse analysis. This method was chosen by the researcher since it operationalises many of the tenets of social constructionism. Language is a very important factor in this theory since it is the means by which we classify events and persons and it provides the grounds on which we gain an understanding of the world (DeLamater & Hyde, 1998). It is easy to link this to Parker’s (1992) guidelines since he states that researchers need to treat the objects of study as text. Social constructionism also highlights the importance of institutionalisation (DeLamater & Hyde, 1998), and Parker (1992) suggests that discourse analysts need to take these into consideration when analysing data. Furthermore, according to Parker (1992), discourse analysts should talk about the conversation as if it were an object, specify what types of people are talked about in the discourse, set contrasting ways of speaking against each other and identify where these different discourses may overlap, look at how and where the discourses emerge, describe any changes in the discourse and how these changes tell a story, highlight how a particular discourse relates to other discourses which sanction oppression and how the discourse allows dominant groups to tell their story about the past in order to justify the present. Discourse studies by definition are committed to the ontological position that constructs, as opposed to represents, social reality (Willig, 2008). Therefore, this research does not intend to generalise its findings to the population of incarcerated violent criminals but, rather, to gain an understanding of how masculinity is constructed in the narratives of a smaller sample of incarcerated perpetrators of violent crime.

3.4 *Ethical Consideration*

Due to the fact that this research made use of pre-collected data, permission to make use of the original dataset was required (see appendix 3). Prior to receiving the interview transcripts, the original researchers removed any identifying information about the participants and, thus, confidentiality was guaranteed. Furthermore, the researcher of this study did not have any access to, or be in contact with, any of the participants and, thus, anonymity was also guaranteed. For original consent forms, see appendix 1. The original dataset is not in the public domain and further studies will therefore require permission from the original research team in order to access it. Due to the fact that this research made use of pre-collected data, it will most likely be preserved, protected, and stored after usage. Measures will be taken to ensure its security – i.e. rigorous password protection and careful storage.

CHAPTER 4:

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

The remainder of the report discusses how masculinity is constructed through gendered and sexualised discursive practices. It further examines how discourse on gender, violence, substance use, criminality, and possessions shape the constructions of masculinity of incarcerated perpetrators of violent crime during their accounts of enactments of violent crime. Table 1 provides a summary of the overarching discourses (arranged thematically) yielded by the analysis of this study.

Overarching Discursive Themes	Subthemes
Rationalizing strategies	Alcohol and Substance Use
	He brought it upon himself
Heteropatriarchy	Peer Approval and Men as Strong Individuals
	Weapon Use
	Authority Figures and Being in Control
Consumer-capitalism	Material Possessions

Table 1: Summary of Results

4.1 *Rationalizing Strategies*

Participants drew on discursive strategies that either shifted the blame from themselves or justified their behaviour (or both). In general, these participants tended to draw on these 'resources' for rationalization which included alcohol consumption, peer influences, as well as a denial of the consequences of their actions in order to distance themselves from the acts of violence. These risk factors, often highlighted by researchers and the media, therefore were constructed as causes for violence by the perpetrators. In effect, treating risk factors as discursive resources enables the locus of the responsibility to be shifted from the perpetrator. The construction of 'peer-pressure and bad influences' was dominant throughout most of the interviews. Many studies (Barolsky et al., 2008; De Visser & Smith, 2007; Mullen et al., 2007) have found that substance use/abuse is a very common justification for perpetrators of violent crime as they have found that young men report that they would not have engaged in acts of violence if they were not intoxicated. The use of alcohol as justification is also tied to

masculinity in the interviews. P4, for example, when waiting for his victim to return home stated: “So I said to [name] you know what if this person is not back at this time it might be he is drinking wherever he is.” This highlights the social construction that drinking is entrenched in the way men behave and is, thus, a manhood (or masculine) act (Schrok, 2005). Furthermore, six of the seven interviewees stated that the incident which led to their incarceration either took place at a tavern or whilst drinking somewhere. Thus, drinking and alcohol use became a resource for blame and justification across all of the transcripts.

4.1.1 *Alcohol and Substance Use*

Substance use and abuse is very commonly linked with violent crime and is often seen as a risk factor for it. Across most of the interviews, the participants constructed the cause of the offenses as being driven by someone, or something, else and all of the participants mentioned alcohol, drinking, or being in a place where alcohol is consumed (such as a tavern or a shebeen) when talking about the violent crime they were involved in. Furthermore, P6 was the only participant who did not mention either being drunk or having drunk alcohol himself.

In the extract below, the way that alcohol is elided with hegemonic masculinity is clear. P1 not only blames alcohol for the reason he and his nephew fought, but he also blames his nephew: “The reason we had that fight is that he was drunk.” Here P1 states that him and his nephew only fought because his nephew was drunk, despite the fact that he, too, had been drinking. Thus, from this, it is evident that P1 is drawing on blaming discourse which refers to alcohol as well as his nephew as the reasons behind his violent behaviour and, thus, distancing himself from any blame. Furthermore, P1 states that the alcohol made his nephew feel like a man as he stated:

P1: *He sat drinking the whole night and the alcohol made him “strong” that night. He did not want to be told. I called him and told him his mom was in the Wendy House and that she had said to me she doesn’t want him in the house after 12. He must stay out if he is going to come home later. He told me not to tell him and said he was a grown up.*

This supports the link between alcohol and masculinity as it reproduces the hegemonic masculine ideal of men as being tough and powerful. This ties in with de Visser and Smith’s (2007) London-based study which found that their participants claimed that they would not

have engaged in violent acts if they were not under the influence of alcohol. Furthermore, Capraro (2000) and de Visser and Smith (2007) both report that men believe alcohol consumption to be a male domain and a marker of masculinity. Capraro (2000) states that men, in our society, are expected to be powerful and that they may compensate for any powerlessness by drinking since this provides them with social power. The fact that he relays that alcohol consumption allowed his nephew to feel "strong" demonstrates how easily the discursive resources that elide alcohol and hegemonic masculinity with violence are mobilised. P4 further highlights this as he states that before he and his cousin went ahead with their plan of armed robbery, they went out drinking for the entire day. This suggests that drinking allowed this participant (like P1's nephew) to feel "strong" and that it gave him the courage to go through with his premeditated plan:

P4: "*So I and* [name] *I went out to drink for the whole day, so when we returned around nine o'clock that white man was still not back yet. So I said to* [name] *you know what if this person is not back at this time it might be he is drinking wherever he is*."

P4, here, concludes, without having any knowledge on the actual whereabouts of his victim that he is out drinking. This highlights how normative drinking is to this participant. "If this person is not back at this time it might be he is drinking wherever he is" points to evidence that P4 has no knowledge on where the victim is and the words "might be" highlight that he assumes the man is out drinking. It is interesting that P4 also claims that his accomplice was reconsidering taking part in this plan: "but [name] was getting cold feet, so I tried to motivate him." The phrase "cold feet" indicates nervousness and worry and, thus, it is interesting that these two men reportedly went drinking for the day. This, again, links to Capraro's (2000) comment that alcohol consumption allows men to feel powerful and helps to stimulate social power thoughts, as well as feelings of confidence (Mullen et al., 2007). Thus, like in the case of P1's cousin, alcohol, here, allows the participant to construct himself as powerful and confident.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note the use of the words "white man" in P4's narrative. The use of this phrase indicates that P4 refers to his victim as different from himself. Furthermore, Hunter and Davis (1994) state that Black men are measured against the status and privilege of White males. By using these words, and in relation to the rest of the extract, P4 draws on

discourse of power to construct a masculinity that is different to that of the 'privileged white male' and which highlights (through alcohol consumption) toughness and bravery. Therefore, it is clear that accounts that attribute violence to alcohol are simultaneously tied to normative assumptions about masculinity and violence.

4.1.2 *He brought it Upon Himself*

> *He brought it upon himself as he came back to stab me with a knife* (P1).

Many of the participants offered varying justificatory discourses with the most common being that of self-defence and peer pressure. P1 justifies his behaviour (and as will be seen later, his use of a firearm) by blaming his nephew's own use of a weapon: "he brought it upon himself as he came back to stab me with a knife." "He brought it upon himself" is the key phrase in this extract as it highlights that P1 draws on blaming discourse in order to justify his use of a firearm and his use of violence. This constructs a reality in which men turn to violence when their masculinity is under direct or perceived threat.

Similarly, P7's victim 'brought it upon himself' by not giving him his money back which insulted him. Furthermore, his violence is constructed as retaliation which indicates that the victim is to blame: "*He hit me. So I hit him back with a bottle over his head."* Thus, P7, like P1, justifies his behaviour by shifting the blame onto his victim. "So I hit him back" highlights that P7's use of violence is retaliatory and, thus, constructed as self-defence. However, this extract, like P1's, constructs weapons as powerful and that this power will be attributed to the wielder. Thus, these two participants, through the use of weapons, construct a masculinity that entails power and control.

4.2 *Heteropatriarchy*

Many of the participants drew on gendered discourse which focused on patriarchy, heterosexuality, and men as strong and brave.

Kandiyoti (1988) states that patriarchy is social system in which men control the power and that women are largely ostracized from it. This aligns with hegemonic masculine ideals as this concept, according to Connell and Messerschmidt (2005), is understood as the pattern of practice that allowed men's subordination of women to endure. In line with this, hegemonic

masculinity also highlights heterosexuality as an important factor for being masculine. Many of the participants mentioned being with women during their violent crime encounters. P5 also makes mention to violence against women:

P5: *He liked hitting girls, he is my co-accused in this case. So girls always liked shouting for me; you know? I would give them attention. After I pay some attention to them and the guys are waiting for me…"Dude we want to go", you know that kind of thing. I'd say "just hold on guys, we'll go just now". So he'd get angry and hit the girl.*

Here, P5's friend is constructed as someone who views violence against women as normative as he hits the "girl" when angry and impatient with his friend as opposed to the friend himself. This constructs women as easier/weaker targets for men. The use of the word "girl" is also interesting as the participant does not grant these women, 'woman-status' but rather refers to them as girls. This highlights patriarchy as the male participant constructs a masculinity here where females (especially talking to and interacting with them) are an important part. However, this masculinity is also constructed around women being viewed as girls and, thus, not as women.

Another common discourse drawn on by the participants is that of men being brave and tough. Most of the participants highlighted the importance of men being able to stand up for themselves and be able to control a situation.

4.2.1 *Peer Approval and Men as Strong Individuals*

In the original study, Barolsky et al. (2008) found that the perceived need to meet others' expectations of masculinity is an important determinant in violence and that delinquent acts are often committed in a context where peer approval is desired. This is very evident in the narratives of P2 and P3:

P2: *So Saturday afternoon we were drinking and he came at around 18:30 he was accompanying his girlfriend. He approached me directly with his hands in the pockets he was talking many things and I knew that if I could have left him the guys were going to think that I am afraid of him and that I am not sure of myself.*

P3: *There was a guy we were at the tavern and me and that guy had met before and he asked why I looked at him that way. So I asked him how do I look at him and he said you look at me like shit, and I was armed at that time and he knew me, but he I didn't know him. So I told the people I was with that eish here is this guy he say so and so. So those people wanted us to fight but some said we should fight outside if we wanted to fight. So we went outside, so when we got there that guy said I must do what I wanted to do and the guys I was with were pressurising me to do something. They said this guy is insulting you, are you going to leave him like that, I got angry and I shot him.*

In the above extract, P2, makes direct reference to meeting his peers' expectations as he states: "If I could have left him the guys were going to think that I am afraid of him and that I am not sure of myself." Hegemonic masculinity has been defined as men being tough and powerful (Capraro et al., 2000), thus, P2 draws on hegemonic masculine ideals as he says that his peers will think he is afraid if he does not stand up for himself against this man who is threatening him. Furthermore, the only evidence of his peers' expectations of P2 is when he states: "the guys were going to think that I am afraid of him" and, thus, there is no evidence of his peers actually telling him to fight or making it known to him that if he doesn't fight, they will think he is afraid. The use of the word "think" is important to highlight as it indicates the perceived need to meet others' expectations of masculinity. P3, on the other hand, refers directly to his peers expectations when he states: "the guys I was with were pressurising me to do something. They said this guy is insulting you, are you going to leave him like that, I got angry and I shot him." This extract not only highlights the reported pressure his peers were putting on him to act violently, but is also supports the construction of men turning to violence when their masculinity is under direct or perceived threat. The phrase "I got angry and I shot him" constructs a situation where P3's masculinity was under direct threat not only by his victim, but by his peers too, which led to him getting angry and turning to violence. Similar to P2, P3's narrative highlights the importance of proving that one can protect and stand up for oneself: "...this guy is insulting you, are you going to leave him like that." Further evidence of P3's peers pressuring him to act in a violent manner comes when he states: "So I told the people I was with that eish here is this guy he say so and so. So those people wanted us to fight". Thus, P3 is only put under pressure by his peers once he has told them about the situation and this extract, therefore, constructs violence as being directly related to the need to meet others' expectations of masculinity. These two

participants, then, justify their behaviour by drawing on patriarchal discourses that state that men are supposed to be powerful and that men can handle themselves in adverse situations or when their masculinity is in doubt and being questioned. Therefore, like P2, P3 reproduces hegemonic masculine ideals as his construction of masculinity, through the need to meet others' expectations of masculinity, highlights toughness and being able to handle a 'tough' situation.

Similarly, P5 makes draws on a similar discourse to these two participants, however, he makes use of the word "moffie" (a derogatory, slang word used in South Africa to describe a homosexual person) when justifying his behaviour. The interviewer asked P5 if he helped his friends search their victims after they drew a gun and he replied: "Yes, I had to search them; you don't want to be called a 'moffie.'" De Visser, Smith and McDonnell (2009) state that "elements of hegemonic masculinity are set up in binary opposition to their alternatives: anything other than the orthodox form is deemed non-masculine or feminine" (p. 1048). Therefore, by making use of the term "moffie", this participant constructs a masculinity which is in line with the hegemonic masculine ideal of heterosexuality as it exists in opposition to homosexuality. Furthermore, the participant constructs a masculinity which not only excludes homosexuals but portrays them as being non-masculine or feminine. This speaks to Langa's (2012) statement that hegemonic masculinity can only be sustained through the marginalization and subordination of some men (in P3's account, homosexuals).

P6 also makes reference to the idea that men are supposed to be tough and powerful as, during the altercation with his victim, he states:

P6: "*...he had a knife on me and he stood up and he took out his knife and he grabbed the chain and then I asked him, "why do you grab me in this way?" and I was afraid and said to him, "you can't do this and what are you supposed to do now with me? Show me that you are man enough". He cooled down a bit.*"

Here P6 offers paradoxical views on how men should feel in a violent altercation. On the one hand he says: "and I was afraid", however, he follows this up by telling his attacker to "show me that you are man enough." This is a very important sentence as it directly highlights that P6's construction of masculinity contains, both, men as being able to show fear as well as men being violent and capable of stabbing another person. Furthermore, this sentence spoken

by P6 is a direct challenge to his attacker and, thus, P6's attacker's masculinity is under direct threat. Interestingly, however, P6 claims that his attacker "cooled down a bit." This response is opposite to that of both P2 and P3's responses when their masculinity was under perceived threat by their peers. P2 and P3 retaliated violently whilst P3's attacker "cooled down." Thus, this highlights that differing constructions of masculinity are possible in similar situations.

An important set of characteristics of a man who identifies with the hegemonic masculine ideals is that he is powerful, strong and in control (Capraro, 2000). Furthermore, this masculinity is viewed as the most powerful and, depending on the social context, the hegemonic man may wield power economically, politically, intellectually, physically, or all simultaneously (Marano, 2015). Social context is a very important aspect to consider when one attempts to understand constructions of masculinity as a male in an economically deprived social context will not be able to construct his masculinity around the hegemonic ideal of economic power and being a provider. These men, however, may still make a claim to the gendered position of power and will, therefore, seek power through other means (Marano, 2015). Violent crime, thus, may provide a way of 'doing masculinity' to boys of whom other resources (such as wealth) appear unattainable. Weapon use has been the focus of much research on violent crime and it has, unsurprisingly, been found that carrying a weapon such as a firearm leads to a higher chance of a violent encounter resulting in mortality (Kramer & Ratele, 2012). It has also been noted that weapon use is a very common way to highlight or exaggerate one's power (Stroud, 2012). This was evident in the interviews for this study as many of the participants referred to firearms or knifes when talking about violent crime.

4.2.2 *Weapon Use*

According to Marano (2015), a young man may achieve his masculine identity by showing what he is not and, thus, by engaging in aggressive performances designed to distance him from anything understood as feminine. This is evident in the earlier extract from P5 where he states: "Yes, I had to search them, you don't want to be called a moffie." This extract was discussed above, however, it is an example of how a male may achieve his masculine identity by engaging in an activity that seperates him from the non-masculine (in P5's narrative, the "moffie").

Furthermore, many of the participants made reference to weapons when describing their violent crime encounters and many of these narratives highlight how weapons are seen as a sign of power and can be used to increase one's own power. P1 is an example of this:

P1: *He ran into the Wendy House where his friends were sitting. He went into the house to get a knife to stab me. When this was happening my friend gave me the gun to hold. I then thought if he comes for me I will hold up the gun and fire off warning shots to scare him off.*

By stating "I will hold up the gun and fire off warning shots to scare him off", P1, here makes reference to the power of the firearm as it will be used to scare his attacker (his nephew) off. This extract also highlights how weapons signify power to their wielders as the attacker retreats from the confrontation in order to get a knife. However, this extract also constructs the firearm as more powerful than the knife (and, in turn, P1 as more powerful over his attacker) as he states that he will fire off warning shots if his attacker attempts to stab him with the knife which will "scare him off". Furthermore, it is important to highlight that, prior to this incident, P1 and his attacker engaged in a power struggle as P1 was lecturing his attacker on how to behave, but the attacker was not listening as he viewed himself as an adult:

P1: *He did not want to be told. I called him and told him his mom was in the Wendy House and that she had said to me she doesn't want him in the house after 12. He must stay out if he is going to come home later. He told me not to tell him and said he was a grown up.*

Thus, P1 turned to violence in order to emphasise his authority and power over his nephew. Furthermore, weapon use, in the above extract, can clearly be seen as a means to exaggerating or emphasising one's power over another individual (Stroud, 2012) and, as such, as a way of constructing a masculinity which entails power and authority.

Similarly, P2 highlights the power a firearm gives its wielder as he decided not to fight with someone during a confrontation due to the lack of a firearm:

P2: *... So I confronted him and he wanted to fight but I didn't fight because then I didn't have the gun. When we met again I shot him for that reason.*

This extract not only highlights the power P2 attributes to firearms but is also evidence as to why many researchers have found that gun ownership leads to a higher chance of a confrontation resulting in mortality (Kramer & Ratele, 2012). Furthermore, it is important to highlight that this confrontation resulted in response to P2's victim reportedly stealing, and then selling, his gun as he states that his friend (the victim) asked him if he can borrow it and then claimed that it had been lost. The sentence "I didn't fight because then I didn't have the gun" is very important as it highlights that not only did P2's victim steal his gun, but he took his power with it. Thus, by saying "when we met again I shot him for that reason" is P2's attempt at regaining his power, through violence. Therefore, like P1, P2 highlights how weapons, especially firearms, are seen as power-attaining devices which are used to emphasise their masculinity.

P6's account directly links weapon use and masculinity as during the encounter with his attackers he challenges one of them to prove their masculinity:

P6: *... he stood up and he took out his knife and he grabbed the chain and then I asked him, "why do you grab me in this way?" and I was afraid and said to him, "you can't do this and what are you supposed to do now with me? Show me that you are man enough".*

The fact that P6's attacker had a knife made him "afraid" and this highlights that, as well as guns (as seen above), knives are associated with power. Furthermore, P6 links this use of a knife directly to being a man and masculine as he states "show me that you are man enough." Therefore, P6, here, constructs a masculinity that not only focuses on power, but also allows for men to make use of this power attached to weapons in order to act violently as he challenges his attacker to prove his masculinity. It is also interesting to note that P6 says "and what are you supposed to do now with me?" This indicates that P6 has succumbed to his attacker's authority and states that the attacker is in control and has the power in the current situation. This is further highlighted when, later in the interview, P6 states: "Because I know that I can't screw up now, I don't have a chance now." This clearly highlights that, according to P6, his attacker has all the power in this confrontation due to the use of the knife.

P4, further highlights this link between weapon use and power as he and his accomplice planned to attack their victim with a steel rod in order to "convince him to show us where the money was." Therefore, P4's narrative highlights the power of a weapon as P4 stated that this will convince the victim to show them where the money is. This narrative (and other narratives – as we saw above in P6's narrative), therefore, make use of a discourse that focuses on being in control and being an authority figure and that weapon use is a means to this end.

4.2.3 *Authority Figures and Being in Control*

It is clear that in most of the interviews that in an act of violence, the men report that they need to control the situation and, sometimes, the victim.

This is clear in P1's narrative as his nephew defies two authority figures in his mother and his uncle (P1). The fact that P1's nephew does not want to listen to his mother highlights patriarchal ideals. Patriarchy is a system of society which states that men control the power and that women are largely barred from it (Kandiyoti, 1988). P1's nephew, however, although defying his mother's wishes, is not directly in contact with her and, thus, he is defying his uncle's (P1) authority more directly. This results in a power struggle between uncle and nephew which is highlighted in the following extract:

P1: *I told him to pull up his socks as he cannot behave this way, as I am his uncle. I told him to lock up outside and not come inside as that is what his mom wanted. He kept on telling me not to tell him [what to do] so I smacked him.*

This extract highlights the power struggle between uncle and nephew and that P1 states that the nephew should listen to and obey his uncle. This is highlighted when P1 states: "*... he cannot behave this way, as I am his uncle.*" However, the nephew, under the influence of alcohol, challenges this power-claim as P1 reports that his nephew viewed himself as a "grown-up": "*He told me not to tell him and said he was a grown up*." The transition of boy-child to adult man is also a prevalent form of justificatory discourse through the corpus. 'Being' an adult man implies a host of positions within the discourses of blame that account for violence amongst the perpetrators. These include unquestioned respect and female subordination – two defining elements of patriarchy. This power challenge by the nephew

leads P1 to act violently: "*He kept on telling me not to tell him* [what to do] *so I smacked him.*" P1 here, has not only taken on the role of the disciplinarian, but has been given this role by his nephew's mother as she asks him to talk to the nephew and tell him what to do: "*I called him and told him his mom was in the Wendy House and that she had said to me she doesn't want him in the house after 12*." Therefore, there is no contact between the mother and her son (P1's nephew). This disciplinarian role attributed to P1 highlights how society views men as being stronger and more authoritative than women. Furthermore, this highlights that violence is seen as an acceptable means of punishment and that it is normative for this participant. It also supports the claim that men turn to violence when their masculinity is being questioned or is under any real, or perceived, threat. By drawing on patriarchal discourse, P1 constructs a masculinity that entails discipline, power, and respecting authority figures and, thus, when his authority is challenged and questioned by his nephew, he resorts to violence. Thus, P1 constructs a masculinity that allows one to make use of violence in order to retain authority and control over another individual. This can be linked back to patriarchy as Hunter and Davis (1994) state that in a patriarchal society, men were legally permitted to use corporal punishment to correct disobedient behaviour of anyone under their authority.

Furthermore, this was also evident in P2 and P3's narratives with regards to peer approval as both these participants' narratives highlighted the need to meet others' perceived expectations on masculinity. In both these cases, P2 and P3 both needed to control the situation in order to meet these perceived expectations as P2 states: "I knew that if I could have left him the guys were going to think that I am afraid of him and that I am not sure of myself." This highlights the importance that this participant places on being in control of a situation in order to prove his masculinity. P3 constructs a similar masculinity to that of both P1 and P2 as he states that he shot someone due to his peers pressurising him to take action against someone who was insulting him and who was, thus, questioning his masculinity. Therefore, these three participants all construct a masculinity which aligns with hegemonic masculinity, as it focuses on power and being in control.

Furthermore, P4's narrative is important to consider in trying to understand this concept of power and being in control:

P4: *I asked him where the money was, when I asked him that he was just asking what is it he was done? And repeating that question, so I kept on asking him where the money was, and hitting him again and again until he couldn't speak anymore.*

This extract highlights how P4 reacted when his authority or control was being ignored by his victim. The fact that his victim ignored his questioning about the whereabouts of the money and, instead asked his own questions, highlights that P4's control of the situation was in doubt and that he never had full control over the victim. This leads to the violent behaviour of P4. The phrase "and repeating that question" highlights the fact that his victim was ignoring him and asking his own questions, thus, putting his authority in doubt. Furthermore, the use of the word "so" is important as this word is used by the participant to counter the victim's questioning of his power and attempt to regain the power in the confrontation. This is evident by the fact that "so" is followed up by the participant stating that he repeated his own questions about the whereabouts of the money (ignoring the victim's questions) and that he continually hit him in such a violent manner that the victim could no longer speak. This enactment of violence highlights the importance placed on being in control of a situation and having control over the victim.

P7's narrative offers a similar discourse to those above as he states:

P7: *It was at a tavern, we were drinking. So I gave this guy money to go drinks* [sic], *but he did not come back to drink with me or give me my change, I got angry and felt insulted. So we fought over that."*

Hegemonic masculinity demands that men characterize power through many means, one of which is wealth and being a provider (Capraro, 2000). Thus, the fact that the participant gave his friend money to go buy drinks can be seen, through a hegemonic lens, that he controlled the power in this relationship. However, his friend questions this power and dismisses this idea by not returning the money or drinks. This insulted the participant and, thus, he got angry and turned to violence in order to regain the power and authority over his friend.

Therefore, it is evident that being in control of a situation is seen as very important for these participants and they, therefore, all reproduce hegemonic masculinity ideals when constructing their own masculinity.

4.3 *Consumer-capitalism*

Many of the narratives of these participants highlight the importance of material possessions and making use of violence as a means to gain access to such possessions. As was seen in the review of the literature, inequality is a prominent risk factor for violent crime (Butchart & Engstrom, 2002). Furthermore, it has also been highlighted that hegemonic masculinity holds that men are supposed to be providers and, thus, access to wealth is an important marker for masculinity (Jewkes et al., 2014). Furthermore, Marano (2015) found, in a sample of adolescent boys who were asked to describe what they believe they should be as emerging men, that providing as opposed to being provided for was an important and consistent theme.

4.3.1 *Material Possessions*

In the narratives of these perpetrators, money and other possessions were the main reason cited for committing violence and violent crime. P4, for example, was motivated to act violently by thinking that he would be able to get money as a result: "so I kept on asking him where the money was, and hitting him again and again until he couldn't speak anymore." It is evident that this participant constructed a reality which, by making use of violence, he would gain access to money and wealth. This led the participant to violence and, in turn, led to him attempting to control the participant and the situation. Furthermore, later in the interview P4 states: "I had this imagine in my head that my life is going to get better because I will be having [sic] lots of money." Therefore, the desire to have and attain "lots of money" was used as a resource to account for the act of violence, as money helps males achieve hegemonic masculine status by being able to provide for others and themselves. It is also important to remember, here, that this participant made reference to the fact that his victim was white and that Hunter and Davis (1994) state that black men, and who they are and who they should be, is measured against the privileged white man. Langa (2012) also states that, 'black' masculinity remains marginalized globally and, thus, is still marginalized in relation to hegemonic masculinity. Therefore, this participant attempts to close the gap on his own, black, masculinity and hegemonic masculinity as his discourse makes reference to the wealth of the white man and that he wants access to this as it leads to a better life.

P7's narrative further highlights how arguments over possessions and money can lead to violence. By stating "but he did not come back to drink with me or give me my change, I got angry and felt insulted. So we fought over that" this participant highlights how valuable money is to him. Furthermore, as was discussed above, if one considers hegemonic

masculinity, that P7 controlled the power in this relationship. Therefore, by stealing money from him, P7's victim not only took away some of his wealth, but, in turn, threatened his masculinity and his power.

Therefore, material possessions were important markers of masculinity in the narratives of these participants as they are linked to power.

CHAPTER 5

LIMITATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS:

5.1 *Study Limitations and Future Recommendations:*

This study made use of pre-collected data and, thus, represents a secondary data analysis. The aim of secondary data analysis is to explore new research questions that vary from the questions asked in the original research (Long-Sutehall, Sque & Addington-Hall, 2010). However, one of the main critiques of secondary analysis is that the secondary researcher has not been involved in data collection and, thus, the primary researchers may not have focused on the topic of interest of the secondary researcher. However, by making use of purposive sampling, this research extracted information-rich cases which illuminated the enquiry question (Patton, 2014).

A further critique of secondary data analysis is that of transcription (Long-Sutehall et al., 2010). The secondary researcher, in this case, had no involvement in the transcription of the interviews and, thus, had to use what was received. Some of the transcripts, however, seemed to be incomplete as they either ended with no concluding remarks from the interviewer or started with the participant answering a question where no question was visible. This raises the question of the integrity of these transcripts. Barolsky et al. (2008) however, outline exactly how they collected data and how the interviews were transcribed and, thus, due to the fact that the secondary researcher knows where they came from and how they were constructed, they can be said to be reliable. In addition, these interviews were set up in order to explore the act of violence that lead to perpetration. However, these interviews were semi-structured and, thus, the interviewers drew on psychological discourse which led the interview to focus around the childhood and the background of the participant. Despite it being interesting from a discursive point of view, this limited the amount of information gained surrounding the act of violence. Therefore, it is recommended that future research sets up more structured interviews which will allow for more information on situational acts of violence.

The sample of this study was drawn from a sample of eighteen perpetrators used in the primary research (Barolsky et al., 2008) and consisted of seven incarcerated perpetrators of violent crime. South Africa, however, has one of the highest murder rates in the world and

experiences more cases of violence than most other countries (CSVR, 2009). Thus, this sample could be considered small. However, the aims of this research were not to generalise how incarcerated perpetrators of violent crime construct masculinity but, rather, to explore how this sub-sample of violent perpetrators construct masculine identities when talking about violent crime.

5.2 *Conclusion:*

This research examined how male perpetrators of violent crime construct masculine identities through talking about violence and the violent crime that led to their incarceration. An analysis of the way masculinity is established, produced, and regulated was conducted through broader discursive practices which come to speak through the male perpetrators of violent crime.

These participants relied on institutionalised discourses such as those which focused on hegemonic masculinity, alcohol use, as well as peer pressure. Their discourse included rationalising strategies, patriarchal discourse, substance abuse, being in control, and consumer-capitalism. Most of these discursive patterns both reproduce and replicate broader social discursive practices that imply that men should be powerful beings, should be in control of situations, and be able to handle themselves when they are challenged. Therefore, these participants reproduced discursive practices discussed in the literature review.

It was found that most of these perpetrators drew on hegemonic masculine discourse as many of their narratives aligned with characteristics which define this masculine identity. This was most commonly seen through alcohol consumption and proving one's toughness as well as one's ability to control a situation. Drinking as leisure amongst peer groups is deeply rooted in how society expects men to behave (Mullen et al., 2007) and these participants all made mention to this. Alcohol, however, was not only used as a social tool as some of the participants admitted to consuming alcohol either before or after committing an act of violence. Furthermore, as we saw in the narrative of P4, alcohol consumption did not lead to the act of violence (as it did in the narratives of some of the other participants), as the violent attack was planned before they went drinking. In this case, alcohol consumption was used by the participant in order to control his accomplice. Discourse surrounding control and power was very prominent throughout the corpus. All of the participants constructed masculinities that emphasised power and allowed men to make use of this power in order to act violently.

Furthermore, weapons were constructed as an important marker of power and, in turn, of masculinity. Firearms were the most common weapon discussed by these participants and it was clear that they all attributed power to these weapons which, in turn, allowed them to portray themselves to be more powerful than their victims and gain control of a situation. One participant (P2) even stated that he did not fight with someone when confronted due to the fact that he did not have a gun. However, once he had a gun, he shot the man who he had an altercation with. This highlights the power P2 places on the weapon as not having a gun changed the way he acted. Furthermore, P4 made a direct link to weapon use and masculinity as he challenged his attacker to prove his manliness and show him that he was "man enough" (to follow through with an attack). This highlights the power attributed to guns and weapons as these participants' constructions of masculinity reproduced the hegemonic masculine ideal of being powerful and tough.

Furthermore, these participants not only reproduced hegemonic masculine ideals themselves, but were often pressured into doing so by their peers. As has already been stated, one of the definitions of hegemonic masculinity is that it is the presently most distinguished way of being a man (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005) and this is evident in the discourse offered by the participants which state that they were pressured to act a certain way by their peers. This highlights how these participants view masculinity and is evidence for the idea that there are more honoured ways of being a man. Furthermore, not only is hegemonic masculinity seen as the most honoured way of being a man, but is set up in binary opposition to alternatives (de Visser et al., 2009). P3 highlights this when he states that if he does not help his peers search their victims he will be labelled a "moffie." Thus, this participant constructs a hegemonic masculinity which exists in opposition to homosexuality and, therefore, this constructed masculinity not only excludes homosexuals, but portrays them as being non-masculine.

Therefore, through situational acts of violence, it is clear that these participants mainly drew on hegemonic masculinity discourse as they reproduced and enacted many of the tenets of this identity especially the idea that the hegemonic man is powerful, tough, and can protect and handle himself in adverse situations. Thus, it is clear that power and authority, and the need to either gain access to these or reclaim them, were constructed as important mechanisms that tie masculinity to the enactment of violence.

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1: Consent Forms

Hello, I am …….. I am from the Human Sciences Research Council. Our organisation is asking people who are serving prison sentences for violent crime, as well as their relatives, to answer a few questions, which we hope will benefit the society and the community at large.

The Human Sciences Research Council is a national research organisation, and we are conducting research regarding the reasons people commit violent crime. We are interested in finding out more about the life history and choices we make as individuals, and how these affect our lives in the long term. We are carrying out this research to help the society, and those who make policy, to better understand how these choices are made in order to make interventions which improve the lives of South African citizens.

We are doing this research in a prison in Gauteng and a prison in the Western Cape. After combining all people's answers, we hope to learn more about violent crime, which will help us compile a report and make useful recommendations to the relevant authorities and organisations.

We will make sure that your name does not appear in the report, and we will keep anything you say in the interview confidential. Although you can talk in general about crimes you have committed in the past, we cannot guarantee confidentiality if you give us the details of a crime you may have committed for which you have not been charged or convicted, as we may be obliged to reveal this information if called on to do so by the relevant authorities.. Please remember this as you choose what to say.

Please understand that **your participation is voluntary** and you are not being forced to take part in this study. The choice of whether to participate or not, is yours alone. However, we would really appreciate it if you do share your thoughts with us. If you choose not take part in answering these questions, you will not be affected in any way whatsoever. If you agree to participate, you may stop me at any time and tell me that you don't want to go on with the interview. If you do this there will also be no penalties and you will NOT be prejudiced in ANY way.

If you agree to participate in the study, I would also like to ask your permission to contact one of your relative for us to interview and we will request the contact details of this person from you. We would like you to choose a relative who has not been to jail, is also male, is close to your age and grew up in the same home as you. We would like to do this because we feel it is very important to get more information from your family about your family situation and the home you grew up in. We also want to understand why your relative who grew up in the same home as you did not get involved in crime. This will help us to understand your story better. However, if you do not have a male relative or do not feel comfortable about us talking to one of your relatives, please say so. Remember your participation in the study is

voluntary and you will not be affected in any way if you decide not to give us permission to speak to your relative. However, if you are unable to give us permission to speak to your relative or do not have a male relative, we will not be able to include you in our research project because we need this information for our research.

If you agree that we can contact one of your relatives and you give us their contact details, we will first speak to your relative to get their permission to interview them. However, it is important to remember that your relative's participation in this study, like yours is completely voluntary. Therefore if your relative does not feel comfortable talking to us, we will not be able to include you in the study. We will inform you should this happen. However, please remember that neither you nor your relative will be affected in any way if either of you decide to not to participate. If you or your relative does participate in this research neither of you will receive any personal benefits but you will help us to understand violent crime and how we can prevent it.

If you agree to participate in the study, I would also like to seek your permission for us to look at the docket for your case. This will help us a lot in our research to make sure that we have the accurate and full information about your case before we do our interview with us. However, if you do not feel comfortable about us looking at the docket for your case please say so. Remember your participation in the study is voluntary and you will not be affected in anyway if you decide not to give us permission to look at the docket for your case. However, if you are unable to give us permission to look at the docket for your case, we will not be able to include you in our research project because we need this information to make sure our research reflects your story properly.

It is easiest for me if I can tape-record the conversation. This recording will be transcribed by someone who will not know your name. The tape recording will be destroyed once the transcript has been completed. If your name is mentioned in the interview, I will remove it from the transcript. There will be no way that anyone will be able to link your name to the answers that are given in the interview. In the final report, I will not be able to link your name to any statements that are given in the report. No one will be able to link you to the answers you give. The information will remain confidential and there will be no "come-backs" from the answers you give.

We would like to do three interviews with you, lasting approximately an hour each. The interviews will take place in the same place at the same time each week, for three weeks. The interviews will be recorded on an audio device for transcription purposes and will be safely and securely stored. I will be asking you a number of questions and request that you are as open and honest as possible in answering these questions. Some questions may be of a personal and/or sensitive nature. You may choose not to answer these questions. I will also be asking some questions that you may not have thought about before, and which also involves thinking about the past or the future. We know that you cannot be absolutely certain about the answers to these questions but we ask that you try to think about them. When it comes to answering these questions, there are no right and wrong answers. If I ask you a question which makes you feel sad or upset, we can stop and talk about it.

We have also made arrangements with Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (Gauteng)/ The Trauma Centre for Survivors of Violence and Torture (Cape Town) for you to have between one and three meetings with them at the prison if you would like to discuss your feelings about the interviews privately, after we have finished interviewing you. If you want further counselling support after these three sessions, we will refer you to the Department of Correctional Services' counselling services and put you in contact with a social worker or a psychologist.

Questions

If you have any questions about this research, you may contact the following people:

Dr Catherine Ward 021-466-7882

Mr Suren Pillay 021-466-7837

Ms Vanessa Barolsky 021-302-2824

Questions about your rights as a study participant, comments or complaints about the study also may be presented to the Research Ethics Committee, Human Sciences Research Council, Cape Town. Contact: Ms Jurina Botha, Secretary, HSRC Research Ethics Committee: 012 302 2009 or telephone 0800 212 123 (this is a toll-free call if made from a landline telephone; otherwise cell phone rates apply).

CONSENT

I hereby agree to participate in research regarding violent crime. I understand that I am participating freely and without being forced in any way to do so. I also understand that I can stop this interview at any point should I not want to continue and that this decision will not in any way affect me negatively.

I understand that this is a research project whose purpose is not necessarily to benefit me personally.

Signature of participant **Date**:……..

I give permission for the relative I nominate to be contacted for this research project and undertake that my relative will not suffer any harm from me if they decide not to participate in this research.

Signature of participant **Date:……..**

I give permission for the HSRC to look at the docket for my case so that they can have the full and correct information about my case.

Signature of participant **Date:……..**

I also understand that my answers will be recorded.

Signature of participant **Date:……..**

I have received the telephone number of a person to contact should I need to speak about any issues which may arise in this interview.

I understand that this consent form will not be linked to the questionnaire, and that my answers will remain confidential.

I understand that if at all possible, feedback will be given to my community on the results of the completed research.

……..

Signature of participant **Date:……..**

[This introduction and consent form as well as the questionnaire will be translated (and back translated) into the first language of participants].

Appendix 2: Interview Schedule

Second Interview:

This will have three facets to it:
(1) Ask for clarification or extension of anything confusing from the first interview.

(2) Ask the offender to describe experiences of violence growing up:

> Many people have either seen violent acts, or been victims of them. Could you tell us about your experiences of violence, either things you have seen, or where people you care about have been the victim, or where you have been the victim? By violence, I don't necessarily mean extreme acts — include things such as parents smacking children, as well as more serious things.

Allow the offender to talk freely, but explore the following areas:

- First memory of violence.
- How did people around him (his family, friends, teachers) resolve differences? Did they argue, fight, seek mediation, pray?
- Exposure to violence at home, at school, in the neighbourhood, in other arenas.
- Perpetration of violence: What is his first memory of perpetration? Has the extent of the violence escalated over time?

(3) What we'd like to do now is to talk about the violent incident that resulted in your being arrested.

Could you tell us in detail about that?

Have the offender tell the story in detail. Ask them to start the story at the beginning of their relationship with the victim (if any), and to describe the relationship up until the final event that ended in their arrest and conviction. If the event was committed in a group, they should also describe the relationships in the group. Throughout the narrative of the actual event, they should try to give a moment-by-moment account of facts and their thoughts and feelings. Ask specifically about substance use of both the victim and the offender at the time.

Appendix 3: Letter of Permission

Please see attached letter.

Reference List

Abrahams, N., Jewkes, R., & Mathews, S. (2010). Guns and gender-based violence in South Africa. *SAMJ,* Vol. 100, pp. 586-588.

Abrahams, N., Mathews, S., Martin, L.J., Lombard, C., & Jewkes, R. (2013). Intimate Partner Femicide in South Africa in 1999 and 2009. *PLOS Medicine,* Vol. 10 (4).

Almasi, B. (2015). Feminist Reclamations of Normative Masculinity: On Democratic Manhood, Feminist Masculinity, and Allyship Practices. *Feminist Philosophy Quarterly,* Vol. 1 (2).

Barolsky, V., Pillay, S., Sanga, N. & Ward, C.L. (2008). Case Studies of Perpetrators of Violent Crime: report by the Human Sciences Research Council on behalf of the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation. Department for Public and Safety: South Africa.

Blumstein, A. (1995). Youth Violence, Guns, and the Illicit-Drug Industry. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology,* 86 (1).

Bowman, B. Eagle, G. Stevens, G. (2012). What can a psycho-social perspective contribute to understanding and preventing the high levels of interpersonal violence in South Africa? Interdisciplinary approach needed to tackle violence. *Saturday Star,* p. 20.

Bowman, B., Stevens, G., Eagle, G., & Matzopolous, 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,* Vol. 45 (3), pp. 279-293.

Butchart, A. & Engstrom, K. (2002). Sex – and age – specific relations between economic development, economic inequality and homicide rates in people aged 0-24 years: a cross-sectional analysis. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization,* 80(10).

Cantillon, D., Ransford, C. & Slutkin, G. (2014). Epidemiology of Violence. In press: APHA 142nd Annual Meeting & Expo, New Orleans, LA.

Capraro, R. L. (2000). Why College Men Drink: Alcohol, Adventure, and the Paradox of Masculinity. *Viewpoint* (vol. 48): pp. 307-315.

Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and Research in Psychology. *American Psychologist*, Vol. 64 (3): 170-180.

Connell, R. W. & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. *Gender and Society*, (19), 829-859.

Courtenay, W.H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: a theory of gender and health. *Social Science & Medicine*, 50, 1385-1401.

de Viggiani, N. (2012). Trying to be something you are not: Masculine Performances within a Prison Setting. *Men and Masculinities*, 15: 271-290.

de Visser, R. O. & Smith, J. A. (2007). Alcohol consumption and masculine identity among young men. *Psychology and Health* (vol. 22 (5)): pp. 595-614.

de Visser, R.O., Smith, J.A., & McDonnell, E. (2009). 'That's not Masculine': Masculine Capital and Health-related Behaviour. *Journal of Health Psychology*, Vol. 14, pp. 1047-1058.

DeLamater, J. D. & Hyde, J. H. (1998). Essentialism vs. Social Constructionism in the Study of Human Sexuality. *The Journal of Sex Research* (vol. 35 (1)): pp. 10-18.

Demombynes, G. & Ozler, B. (2005). Crime and Local Inequality in South Africa. *Journal of Development Economics*, 76, 265-292.

Edley, N. (2001). Unravelling Social Constructionism. *Theory & Psychology* (vol. 11): pp. 433-441.

Felson, R.B. (2009). Violence, Crime, and Violent Crime. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence.* Vol. 3(1), pp. 23-39.

Fielding, N. (2004). Getting the most from archived qualitative data: Epistemological, practical and professional obstacles. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 7(1): 97–104.

Firth, H. & Kitzinger, C. (1998). "Emotion work" as a participant resource: A feminist analysis of young women's talk-in-interaction. *Sociology*, 32(2), 299-320.

Gear, S. (2007). Behind the Bars of Masculinity: Male Rape and Homophobia in and about South African Men's Prisons. *Sexualities*, 10: 209-227.

Ger, G., & Belk, R.W. (1996). I'd like to Buy the World a Coke: Consumptionscapes of the "Less Affluent World". *Journal of Consumer Policy*, Vol. 19, pp. 271-304.

Guerra, N.G., Huesmann, L.R. & Spindler, A. (2003). Community Violence Exposure, Social Cognition, and Aggression among Urban Elementary School Children. *Child Development.* Vol. 74 (5). Pp. 1561-1576.

Harnett, R., Thom, B., Herring, R. & Kelly, M. (2000). Alcohol in Transition: Towards a Model of Young Men's Drinking Styles. *Journal of Youth Studies* (vol. 3 (1)): pp. 61-77.

Hong, L. (2000). Toward a Transformed Approach to Prevention: Breaking the Link between Masculinity and Violence. Journal of American College Health, 48 (6), pp. 269 – 279.

Hunter, A. G. & Davis, J. E. (1994). Hidden Voices of Black Men: The Meaning, Structure, and Complexity of Manhood. *Journal of Black Studies*, 25 (1), 20-40.

Institute for Security Studies. (2015). Murder and Robbery - Overview of the official statistics: 2014/2015. https://www.issafrica.org/crimehub/uploads/SA-Crime-Stats%E2%80%932015-Murder-and-robbery-fact-sheetV2.pdf (accessed 9 October 2015).

Jewkes, R., Flood, M. & Lang, J. (2014). From work with men and boys to changes of social norms and reduction of inequalities in gender: a conceptual shift in prevention of violence against women and girls. *The Lancet.*

Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with Patriarchy. *Gender and Society*, 2(3), 274-290.

Kimmel, M.S. & Mahler, M. (2003). Adolescent Masculinity, Homophobia, and Violence: Random School Shootings, 1982 – 2001. American Behavioural Scientist, vol. 46.

Kimmel, M.S. & Messner, M.A. (2001). The Construction of Masculinity and the Triad of Men's Violence. Men's Lives, vol. 5.

Kramer, S. & Ratele, K. (2012). Young Black Men's Risk to Firearm Homicide in Night Time Johannesburg, South Africa: a Retrospective Analysis based on the National Injury Mortality Surveillance System. *African Safety Promotion Journal,* Vol. 10 (1), pp. 16-28.

Kuula, A. (2010). Methodological and Ethical Dilemmas of Archiving Qualitative Data. IASSIST Quarterly.

Kynoch, G. (2006). Urban violence in colonial Africa: A case for South African exceptionalism. Paper presented at Wits Institute for Social and Economic Research, 15 May

Lamb, G. (2008). 'Under the Gun': An assessment of firearm crime and violence in South Africa. Institute for Security Studies.

Langa, M. (2008). Using Photo-Narratives to Explore the Construction of Young Masculinities. *PINS*, 36, 6-23.

Langa, M. (2012). Becoming a man: Exploring multiple voices of a masculinity amongst a group of young adolescent boys in Alexandra Township, South Africa. University of the Witwatersrand.

Long-Sutehall, T., Sque, M. & Addington-Hall, J. (2010). Secondary analysis of qualitative data: a valuable method for exploring sensitive issues with an elusive population. *Journal of Research in Nursing* (vol. 16 (4)): pp. 335-344.

Marano, D. (2015). Juvenile Offenders and Guns: Voices behind gun violence. Palgrave Macmillan.

Matzopoulos, R.G., Bowman, B., Mathews, S. & Myer, J. (2010). Applying upstream interventions for interpersonal violence prevention: An uphill struggle in low- to middle- income contexts. *Health Policy*. Elsevier.

Matzopoulos, R. G., Truen, S., Bowman, B. & Corrigall, J. (2014). The Cost of Harmful Alcohol Use in South Africa. *South African Medical Journal* (vol. 104 (2)): pp 127-132.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2000). Becoming "Real Men": Adolescent Masculinity Challenges ad Sexual Violence. *Men and Masculinities*, 2: 286-307.

Messner, S.F. (1989). Economic discrimination and societal homicide rates: Further evidence of the cost of inequality. American Sociological Review; 54:597-61

Monuteaux, M.C., Lee, L.K., Hemenway, D., Mannix, R. & Fleegler, E.W. (2015). Firearm Ownership and Violent Crime in the U.S.: An Ecologic Study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine.*

Morgan, D.H.J. (1992). Discovering Men. Critical Studies on Men and masculinity, vol. 3. Routledge.

Morrell, R. (2001). Changing Men in Southern Africa. *Zed Books*.

Mullen, K., Watson, J., Swift, J. & Black, D. (2007). Young men, masculinity and alcohol. *Drugs: education, prevention and policy* (vol. 14 (2)): pp. 151-165.

National Injury Mortality Surveillance System. (2002). A Profile of Fatal Injuries in South Africa: 4th Annual Report of the National Injury Mortality Surveillance System.

Nattrass, N. & Seekings, J. (2010). State, Business and Growth in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Research Programme Consortium for Improving Institutions for Pro-Poor Growth.*

Norman, R., Matzopoulos, R., Groenewald, P., & Bradshaw, D. (2007). The high burden of injuries in South Africa. Bulletin of the World Health Organisation, 85 (9), 695-702.

Orpinas, P., Murray, N. & Kelder, S. (1999). Parental Influences on Students' Aggressive Behaviours and Weapon Carrying. *Health Education & Behaviour*, Vol. 26 (6): 774-787.

Pallitto, C.C., Garcia-Moreno, C., Jansen, H.A.F.M., Heise, L., Ellsberg, M., & Watts, C. (2013). Intimate partner violence, abortion, and unintended pregnancy: Results from the WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence. *International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics,* Vol. 120, pp. 3-9.

Parker, I. (1992). Discovering Discourses, tackling texts. Chapter 1 IN: Discourse Dynamics: Critical Analysis for Social and Individual Psychology. London: Routledge.

Parker, I. (2005). Discourse Analysis. Chapter 5.19 IN A Companion to Qualitative Research. Sage Publications: London.

Patton, M. Q. (2014). Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice. SAGE Publications.

Peltzer, K., Davids, A. & Njuho, P. (2011). Alcohol use and problem drinking in South Africa: findings from a national population-based survey. *African Journal of Psychiatry*. Vol. 14; pp. 30-37.

Prinsloo, M., Matzopoulos, R., & Sukhai, A. (2003). The magnitude of firearm homicide in Cape Town, 2001. African Safety Promotion, 1 (2), 19-25.

Rehm, J., Mathers, C., Popova, S., Thavorncharoensap, M., Teerawattanon, Y., & Patra, J. (2009). Global burden of disease and injury and economic cost attributable to alcohol use and alcohol-use disorders. *The Lancet*, Vol. 373.

Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., & Elam, G. (2003). Chapter 4: Designing and Selecting Samples. IN Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J. (2003). Qualitative Research Practice: A guide for social science students and researchers. SAGE Publications: London.

Ruggles, S. (2015). Patriarchy, Power, and Pay: The Transformation of American Families, 1800 – 2015. *Minnesota Population Centre, University of Minnesota.*

Schrok, D. & Schwalbe, M. (2009). Men, Masculinity, and Manhood Acts. *Annual Review of Sociology.*

Schwalbe, M. L. (2005). Identity stakes, manhood acts, and the dynamics of accountability. In Studies in Symbolic Interaction, ed. N Denzin, pp. 65–81. New York: Elsevier

Seedat, M., Van Niekerk, A., Jewkes, R., Suffla, S. & Ratele, K. (2009). Violence and Injuries in South Africa: prioritising an agenda for prevention. *The Lancet*. Vol. 374, p. 1011-1022.

Seekings, J. & Nattrass, N. (2002). Class, Distribution and Redistribution in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Transformation* (vol. 50).

Siegel, R.B. (1996). "The Rule of Love": Wife Beating as Prerogative and Privacy. Yale Law School.

Shields, S. A. (2008). Gender: An Intersectionality Perspective. *Sex Roles* (vol. 59): pp. 301-311.

Silverman, D. (2004). Who cares about "experience"? Missing issues in qualitative research. Chapter 18 in D Silverman (Ed.). *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice.* London: Sage.

Smith, D. J. (1995). Youth crime and conduct disorders, in M Rutter & D J Smith (eds), Psychological disorders in young people: Time trends and their correlates, Chichester, Wiley, p 395.

Stevens, G.R. (1994). 'Coca-Cola kids' – reflections on black adolescent identity development in post-apartheid South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology,* Vol. 27 (4), pp. 250.

Stevens, G.R. (2008). Men and Meanings of Murder: Discourses and Power in Narratives of Male Homicide in South Africa.

Stroud, A. (2012). Good Guys with Guns: Hegemonic Masculinity and Concealed Handguns. *Gender & Society.* Vol. 26 (2). pp. 216-238.

South African Police Services. (2013). An analysis of the national crime statistics: Addendum to the annual report 2012/2013.

South African Police Services. (2014). Annual Report 2014/2015.

The Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation. (2009). Why does South Africa have such high rates of violent crime?

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2013). Global Study on Homicide 2013: Trends, Contexts, Data. Vienna.

Wetherell, M. & Edley, N. (1999). Negotiating Hegemonic Masculinity: Imaginary positions and psycho-discursive practises. *Feminism and Psychology* 9(3): pp. 335-336.

Widom, C.S. (1989). The Cycle of Violence. Science (Vol. 244). Departments of Criminal Justice and Psychology, Indiana University: Indiana.

Widom, C.S. & Maxfield, M.G. (2001). An Update on the "Cycle of Violence" National Institute of Justice Research In Brief. U.S Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Willig, C. (2008). Introducing Qualitative Research in Psychology: Adventures in Theory and Method (2nd Ed.). McGraw Hill: Open University Press

Woolard, I. (2002). An Overview of Poverty and Inequality in South Africa.

World health Organization. (2002). World Report on Violence and Health. Geneva: Switzerland.