

**GENDERED AFFECTIVE ECONOMIES OF MALE SEXUAL VIOLENCE
AGAINST MEN IN SOUTH AFRICA**

A thesis submitted by

ELIZABETH CHITIKI

(2292892)

in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN PSYCHOLOGY

Supervised by

PROFESSOR PEACE KIGUWA

and

DR NKULULEKO NKOMO

at

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND

MARCH, 2023

DECLARATION

I declare that:

Gendered Affective Economies of Male Sexual Violence Against men in South Africa

is my original, unassisted work, and all of the research material used or directly cited quotes have been listed and acknowledged in-text and on the list of references. I am submitting this thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the field of Psychology at the University of the Witwatersrand. This work not been submitted before for any degree or examination at any other university.

Signed this ____13____ day of __March____ 2023 _____

Signature _____


Elizabeth Chitiki

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I, Elizabeth, Chitiki would like to acknowledge my sincere gratitude:

- I am grateful, foremost and always to God, the almighty, for the grace and mercy without which I would not have reached these heights.
- I also extend my gratitude to my supervisors Professor Peace Kiguwa and Dr Nkululeko Nkomo for their guidance, support and encouragement during this process.
- This study was made possible through the financial support from The Andrew Mellon Scholarship under the Governing Intimacies project at the University of the Witwatersrand.
- I recognize and appreciate the moral and emotional support, and occasional talks about my work from my dearest friend Tshireletso Letsoalo who constantly read my drafts and provided her invaluable insights, and my sister Agnes for providing encouraging and motivational talks and support during this ‘daunting journey’.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to my mom, Grace Dube, and my father, Stephen Chitiki. To my daughter, Kyla, and my sisters, Agnes and Josephine – with love.

Table of Contents

DECLARATION.....	I
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	II
DEDICATION.....	III
ABSTRACT.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
CHAPTER ONE:	14
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	14
1.1 INTRODUCTION	14
1.2. RESEARCH RATIONALE	20
1.3 CONTEXTUALIZING MALE SEXUAL VIOLENCE WITHIN THE #MeTooMOVEMENT.....	23
1.4 CONTEXTUALIZING SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN SOUTH AFRICA: STATISTICS.....	25
1.4.1 Sexual Violence Against Men.....	27
1.4.2 Responding to Sexual Violence Against Men	30
1.5 RETHINKING GENDER AND MASCULINITY IN MALE VULNERABILITY	31
1.6 THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY.....	34
1.7 THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS.....	34
1.8 THE AIM OF THE STUDY	35
1.9 RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	35
1.10 STUDY OBJECTIVES	36
1.11 OVERVIEW OF THE CHAPTERS.....	36
CHAPTER 2:.....	37
CHAPTER 2:.....	40
CONCEPTUALIZING AFFECT THEORY: AN UNDERSTANDING OF AFFECTIVE TECHNOLOGIES AS A CRITICAL ANALYSIS LENS	40
2.1 INTRODUCTION	40

2.2 THE HISTORICITY OF AFFECT.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
2.3 THE INDEPENDENCE OF EMOTIONS	40
2.4 THE SOCIAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXTUALISATION OF AFFECT.....	43
2.5 ADDRESSING THE ELEPHANT IN THE ROOM: ATMOSPHERIC AFFECTS	51
2.6 THE PERFORMATIVITY OF EMOTIONS	52
2.7 CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	52
CHAPTER 3.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
RESEARCHING SEXUAL VIOLENCE AGAINST MEN.....	54
3.1 INTRODUCTION	54
3.2 RESEARCHING SEXUAL VIOLENCE.....	54
3.3. THE NATURE OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN SOUTH AFRICA.....	58
3.4. SEXUAL VIOLENCE AGAINST MEN	61
3.5 MASCULINITY AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN SOUTH AFRICA AND GLOBALLY	66
3.6 MASCULINITY AND AFFECT	70
3.7. BIOPOWER AND AFFECTIVE RELATIONS IN MALE RAPE SUBJECT CONSTRUCTIONS	73
3.8 CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	74
CHAPTER FOUR:	76
METHODOLOGY	76
4.1. INTRODUCTION.....	76
4.2. CHOOSING AND DOING A QUALITATIVE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	76
4.3 EPISTEMOLOGICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL UNDERPINNINGS OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH	78
4.3.1 Phenomenology.....	79
4.3.2 Social Constructivism	80
4.4. RESEARCH DESIGN: DISCOURSE ANALYSIS – METHODOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS	81
4.4 RESEARCH DESIGN: STUDYING AFFECT	83
4.5. RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	84

4.6. DATA COLLECTION AND SAMPLING METHODS	84
4.6.1 Radio Talks as Sources of Data Collection.....	85
4.7. VIRTUAL ETHNOGRAPHY AS SOURCES OF DATA COLLECTION.	87
4.7.1 Sampling Virtual Ethnography	88
4.8 PROCEDURES FOR DATA ANALYSIS	89
4.8.1. Zoom meeting 1: Reading and examining action orientation and formulating a plan	91
4.8.2. Zoom meeting 2: Identifying, Framing, Positionalities, Discourses and Affects Offered..	92
4.8.3. Zoom Meeting3: Identifying the Relationship between the Objects, Discourses, Action-orientation and Subject position.....	94
4.8.4 Zoom Meeting 4: Particular Positions' Encouragement/constraints on of Subjectivities/Ways of Being.....	95
4.9. VALIDATION AND RIGOR: TRUSTWORTHINESS	96
4.10. PERSONAL REFLECTION ON METHODOLOGY	98
4.11. ETHICS: CONFIDENTIALITY AND ANONYMITY	98
4.13. CONCLUDING REMARKS	99
CHAPTER FIVE:	84
CONSTRUCTING THE VICTIM-WORTHY SUBJECT VIA REGISTERS OF EMPATHY .84	
5.1 INTRODUCTION	84
5.2 DISCURSIVELY FRAMING THE TALK	84
5.2.1 A 'Taboo' Talk	87
5.2.2 A 'Brave' Talk	89
5.2.3 Framing the Talk: Foregrounding the Sexual Violence Experience	93
5.3 VICTIM WORTHINESS WITHIN THE DISCOURSE OF TOXIC MASCULINITY	96
5.4 NEGOTIATING VICTIM WORTHINESS WITHIN A LEGAL DISCOURSE	102
5.5 <i>VICTIM WORTHINESS WITHIN TOXIC RELIGION DISCOURSE</i>	107
5.6 <i>VICTIM WORTHINESS: JUSTIFICATION, VALIDATION AND RECOGNITION</i>	111
5.7 CONCLUDING REMARKS	119

CHAPTER SIX:	121
HUMANIZING A (DE)HUMANIZED SUBJECT: UNDERSTANDING PRISON RAPE THROUGH AFFECTIVE TROPES	121
6.1 INTRODUCTION	121
6.2 FADING THE TALK	123
6.2.1 A 'Shameful' Talk	124
6.2.2. "I challenge You" Talk	125
6.3 DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS DISCOURSE	127
6.3.1 Human Rights Discourse: Victim, Activist and Advocate Subject Positionalities.	129
6.4 "THE SYSTEM FAILED ME": VICTIM POSITIONALITY	134
6.5 "LET'S CHANGE OUR ATTITUDES AND GIVE MEANING TO THE CONSTITUTION": ACTIVIST AND ADVOCATE POSITIONALITIES	146
6.6. "HE FORCED ME TO HAVE SEXUAL CONDUCT WITH HIM": VICTIM POSITIONALITY AND THE DISCOURSE OF CONSENT	151
6.7 CONCLUDING REMARKS	155
CHAPTER SEVEN:	157
UNMASKING EDUCATION INSTITUTIONAL CULPABILITY: AFFECTIVE ECONOMIES OF SHARED PAIN AND RAGE	157
7.1 INTRODUCTION	157
7.2 A BRIEF BACKGROUND OF PARK TOWN BOYS HIGH	157
7.3 FRAMING THE TALK: "WE ASK QUESTIONS HERE THAT ARE VERY IMPORTANT, SYSTEMATIC QUESTIONS, INSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS."	159
7.4 "WE INHERIT UNHEALTHY CULTURAL NORMS": INSTITUTIONAL FAILURE, TOXIC CULTURE AND TOXIC MASCULINITY DISCOURSE	160
7.5 SOLIDARITY DISCOURSE: "THE PARENT BODY NEEDS TO BE ASSESSED IN A REAL AND HONEST WAY WE ARE NOT GOING AWAY!"	171
7.6 DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS OF WHITE RAGE, WHITE NOSTALGIA AND WHITE FRAGILITY	180
7.7. CONCLUDING REMARKS	187

CHAPTER EIGHT:	189
FINDINGS DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	189
8.1. INTRODUCTION	189
8.2 DISCURSIVE WORK PERFORMED IN BROADER SOCIETAL RESPONSES TO MALE SEXUAL VIOLATION.	189
8.3 AFFECTIVE ECONOMIES UNDERLYING DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS OF MEN’S EXPERIENCES OF RAPE AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE.	196
8.4 MALE SEXUAL CITIZENSHIP VIA DISCURSIVE AND AFFECTIVE TROPES	198
8.5 REFLEXIVITY	200
8.6 LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	204
8.7 CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	205
REFERENCES	206

CHAPTER ONE:

Introduction and Background of the Study

1.1 Introduction

“((Eyes out)), LOL what the fuck is going on out here man” Terry: I froze in fear... they would have had to take me to jail. Get the strap."

"So Terry allowed himself to be groped because he didn't want to lose money? What happened to stand up for yourself ..."

"...even my little sister was knocking boys in high school for "harassing" her... she is a victor, not a victim” (Independent, 2018).

These are some of the responses that other men commented on, when Terry Crews, a Black American actor shared his experience of sexual violation. These comments draw on public discursive responses to the sexual violation of men. Thus, male sexual violence experiences, in some cases, are dismissed and joked about (Donnelly & Kenyon, 1996; Sivakuruman, 2005; Lee, 2000; Stanko, 2017). From the above responses, men might be prone to victim-shaming for not "knocking out" the perpetrator or standing up for themselves. In this instance, failure to do so is associated with "weakness" and femininity or even worse because some women can fight back against being sexually harassed. Consequently, men are not supposed to accept vulnerability "...a victor, not victim" and thus, their sexual violence experiences do not constitute "real" victimization. Helman (2017) argues that grievable bodies concerning sexual violence are associated with socially constructed ideologies. These ideologies seek to select bodies that are vulnerable to rape and those perceived as not vulnerable to violation based on race, gender and sexuality (Smart, 1990; Stewart, Dobbin & Gatowsk, 1996; Baxter, 2013).

Societal construction of what validates a sexual violence experience perpetuates discourses of race, gender and sexuality (Du Mont, Miller & Myhr, 2003). These discourses, as a result, govern bodies that are vulnerable to sexual violence and those that are not, hence, perpetuating the “real rape” discourse around sexual violence (Marcas, 2013). To illustrate, the gender stereotypical notion that women are ‘rapable’¹ constructs feminine bodies as vulnerable to sexual violence whilst policing the rape of other gender identities (i.e. masculine identities). Gqola (2015) argues that in South Africa, Black women's sexual violation is normalized to an extent that the bodies are considered un-rapable. Gqola in “*Rape a South African Nightmare*” (2015) draws on the infamous Jacob Zuma² and Khwezi sexual violence trial to illustrate how Black women’s bodies have a history of being considered “unrapable” in South Africa. Khwezi³ was the complainant in Jacob Gedleyihlekza Zuma’s rape trial. The trial ended with Zuma being acquitted of the allegations. Gqola draws on this case and others throughout the book to illustrate the trivialization and erasure of the sexual violence that many Black women experience in the country. Her argument is that Black women’s bodies do not enjoy a recognition of being human to warrant an intrinsic recognition that they can be violated in any way. Helman (2017) takes up Gqola’s notion of “un-rapable” to describe how her coded White body was differentially read as “un-rapable” from that of a Black woman. Helman’s argument is that the ready attachment of sexual violation to a Black woman’s body (and not White

¹ The concept "rapable" has been used to describe types or classes of people that occupy a social position of both racial and gender inferiority, which allows for their objectification in many forms, including sexual (Higgins & Silver 1991; Baxter 2003; Smith 2005; Lock 2006).

² Jacob Zuma is the Former president of the Republic of South Africa.

³ Kwezi was a pseudonym given to the complainant in press reports of the rape trial. Her name was Fezekile Ntsukela Kuzwayo.

woman) in a South African context means that such violation is simultaneously normalized and rendered meaningless.

Higgins and Silver (1991); Smith (2005); Lock (2006); and Baxter (2013) argue that socialization of "rapable" cases describes sexual incidents that have a possibility of being considered rape. Historically, virginal, or at least single women were perceived as "rapable". For instance, in South Africa and around the world, women are considered more "rapable" than men; homosexual men are constructed as more "rapable" than heterosexual men; young or females who occupy an upper-class status as more "rapable" than those who occupy lower socio-economic status. And in the United States of America, Caucasians are constructed as more "rapable" than other ethnic groups such as African Americans (Silver, 1991). Similarly, in South Africa, women and children are considered the population likely to be more vulnerable to sexual violence, and most of the sexual violence cases reported illustrate higher rates of sexual violence against women and children (Stats SA (2016/2017) Gqola, 2015). Therefore, indicating that women are considered rapable.

In this study, I focus attention on male sexual violence. My interest in this line of research was derived from my master's thesis where I conducted a study on the participation in anti-sexual violence protests from a critical sexual citizenship standpoint. My master's findings indicated that male narratives and experiences of sexual violence are seldom socially acknowledged, recognized and spoken about. Therefore, men who experience sexual violence are barely socially recognised as victim-survivors of such cases. For instance, Kramer's (2014) work on male sexual victims indicated that male victims of sexual violence perpetrated by women are seldom read as victims because their perpetrators are female. Therefore, these men are surfaced as unworthy victims. The main question to ponder here is, why is it that male sexual violence is seldom acknowledged? Constructing and positioning men's experiences of

sexual violence in comparison to women's creates a dichotomy of rapable/not rapable discourse, of grievable/ungrievable bodies. Are we saying that male bodies are not 'rapable' or are not 'grievable'?

In a South African context where rape against women and children, are mostly perpetrated by men, failure to recognize the hurt and harms of sexual violence on men who have been sexually violated reproduce the same discourses of silence around rape that reinforce rape cultures. Additionally, overlooking male sexual violence reproduces gender inequality discourse, where we choose not to grieve for other violated bodies based on gender (Helman, 2017). It reproduces discourses of rape culture, where regulations of other rapes are perpetuated, which then renders the fight against sexual violence problematic. Failure to acknowledge and address male sexual violence reproduces the cycle of silence discourse, where sexual violence issues are constantly swept under the carpet. Helman (2017) asserts that we need to critically think and question how other sexually violated bodies, those around them and the broader society respond to sexual violence. There is a need to be cognizant of how we respond to sexual violence experiences and the impact of such responses on subjectivity/subject construction. Put differently, questioning how other subjects are constructed as inviolable while other subjects are constructed as deeply violable (Helman, 2017; Gqola, 2007: 2015) creates and reconstructs new possibilities for new ways of being. For instance, heterosexual men have been socialized as strong, hence not vulnerable to sexual violence, which means that heterosexual male bodies are socially perceived as not 'rapable'. Non-normative sexual bodies are prone to sexual violence and their experiences are not acknowledged since they fall outside the normative construction of gender and hegemonic masculinity. Thus, sexual violence experiences of non-normative sexual identities and heterosexual men are not perceived as constituting harm.

Systemic and structural colonialization marked black women's bodies as "unrapable" and not embodying same meanings and attributes of 'human' in contrast to heteronormative white bodies. Parallel to these colonial racist body and intimacy regulations is a dominant essentialist African-centric logic that marks non-normative sexual bodies as "not normal", "unAfrican" and "a sin". In light of the growing body of research in LGBTQ+ studies that seek to debunk and disrupt these problematic Africa-centric understandings of non-heteronormative bodies, researchers such as Tamale (2011) argue that African sexualities are shaped by a variety of cultural, social, and political factors, including colonialism, globalization, and religion. Tamale's *"African Sexuality"* (2011) also highlights the importance of understanding the intersectionality of identities, such as race, gender, class, and sexuality, in shaping sexual experiences and identities. She argues that the experiences of LGBTQ+ individuals in Africa cannot be understood without considering the impact of colonialism and other forms of oppression. Thus, Tamale's African sexuality provides a framework for understanding the complexity and diversity of sexual experiences and identities in Africa, and challenges the dominant Western view of sexuality and gender. It has been influential in promoting a more inclusive and nuanced approach to sexuality and human rights in Africa. In addition, Currier and Gogul (2013) wrote about African anti-sodomy laws and their relationship to colonialism. In their article *"Unpacking 'culture' in the commonwealth: African anti-sodomy laws and unwanted colonial inheritances"* (2013), they argue that anti-sodomy laws in Africa are not simply a product of cultural traditions, but rather a legacy of colonialism and imperialism. The authors analyse the historical and political contexts of anti-sodomy laws in several African countries, including Nigeria, Uganda, and Zimbabwe, and highlight how these laws are used to control and oppress LGBTQ+ communities. They also discuss the role of international human rights organizations and activists in challenging these laws and supporting queer movements in Africa. Thus, they provide a perspective on the intersections of sexuality, gender,

culture, and power in Africa, and highlight the need for decolonizing approaches to LGBTQ+ rights activism. In a more recent study, Matebeni and Reddy (2018) explored the experiences of queer individuals and communities in Africa, focusing on South Africa and Uganda, and analysing how they navigate and resist the dominant heteronormative culture and institutions. It also examines the complexities of queer activism in Africa, including the tensions between the global LGBTQ+ movement and local cultural, political, and social realities. Thus, they contributed to the study of queer studies, African studies, and social justice, providing insights into the lives and experiences of queer individuals and the ongoing struggles for LGBTQ+ rights in Africa. Therefore, the works of Tamale (2011), Currie and Gogul (2013), and Matabeni and Reddy (2018) lay a groundwork for the inclusivity of the grievability of all bodies irrespective of gender, sexuality, and race. And in the case of sexual violence against men, this growing body of research opens an avenue to surface victim subject positions that have, otherwise, been governed⁴ within African societies.

Consequently, there is a need to critically think about sexual violence, victims-survivors of sexual violence and what constitutes a "real rape" concerning the act itself, gender, and cultural ideologies of violation with regards to masculinity and heteronormativity. Fundamental to gender and sexual equality is the interrogation of how male victim-survivors of sexual violence are constructed not only by sexual violence experiences but also how these experiences come to have meaning in contexts that are steeped in heteronormative and toxic patriarchal masculine matrices of power. Therefore, Helman (2017, p. 4) states "...making all lives grievable is fundamental to reconstructing the cultural contours of the human and thereby disrupting the endless stream of violence against those who have been dehumanised".

⁴ Here I use the word 'govern' as it is used by Helman (2017) referring to how some social beliefs and customs restrict other ways of being.

1.2. Research Rationale

Many studies on sexual violence have been conducted in South Africa and around the globe (Basile et al, 2009; Dunkle et al, 2013; Russell, 2007; Coetzee & Du Toit, 2018; Colpitts, 2019; Ward et al, 2018; Gouws, 2018). However, the main focus had been placed on the violation of women and children (Boonzaier & De la Rey, 2003; Boonzaier, 2008). For example, Boonzaier and De la Rey (2003) investigated 15 women's experience from partners and concluded that woman abuse is a pervasive social problem. In recent research, Ward et al (2018), completed a study that on sexual violence against children in South Africa. Their research point out a high incidence of sexual violence experiences across the population lifespan. Thus, out of the 5631 sample participants, boys accounted for 9.99% and girls between 15-17 accounted for 14.61% reporting experience of indirect or direct sexual violation (Ward et al, 2018). Therefore, Devries and Meinck (2018) in "*Sexual Violence against Children and Adolescents in South Africa: Making the Invisible Visible*", commend Ward et al (2018) for their work highlighting that studying sexual violence against children in South Africa is one of the tools to make "visible what is often a hidden issue" (p.e368). The focus of sexual violence against women and children resembles studies from other countries such as the United States of America. For instance, *Stemple* (2008) argues that the dominant strategies to combat sexual violence in the U.S.A and in global human rights work has placed much attention on the violation of women and girls.

Consequently, Jina et al in "*Unspoken victims: A national study of male rape incidents and police investigations in South Africa*" (2020), argue that the response to only focus on the sexual violence of women and children resulted in the overlooking of male victims of sexual violence that are continuously occurring within South Africa institutions. They continue to argue that although sexual violence has been well documented for children and women, there

is minimal literature on adult male rape victims. The research on male sexual violence have mainly been focusing on imprisoned men or those in the military. With a sample of 209 male sexual violence victims, Jina et al's (2020) study indicated that there significant differences in the prevalence and reportage of males sexual violence by age. For example, male sexual violence in adults was found to exhibit more violence, and most likely to occur in prisons and detentions. Therefore, Jina et al (2020) concluded that although there are social and political efforts to combat women and children sexual abuse, work on such violence against men is under-researched and seldom understood. Thus, male sexual violence needs to be recognized, and male vulnerabilities to sexual violation should be given equal attention (Jina et al, 2020). I argue that since researching sexual violence against women and children is unquestionably important, so is the research on the violation of men. I explore the gendered nature of broader social responses and discourses of male sexual violation. Recently, critical masculinity studies have questioned the traditional research of men that fails to engage critically. For example, Ratele (2014) has argued that much of the South African documented research on men remains under-achieving and problematic in the failure to challenge taken-for-granted social constructions of men as a problematic gender – a society that views men as inherently aggressive and violent. In taking up this caution, this study further sought to critically engage with traditional discourses of masculinity, in ways that problematize how men and masculinity are surfaced in problematic ways in discourse. Ratele (2014) has further argued that society needs to be sensitized to the fact that men are as gendered as women. As such, studies on masculinity need to adopt a 'hegemonic within marginality' perspective which requires traditional sensitivity and cultural intelligence. One way of doing this is to involve men in gender transformation (Colpitts, 2019). Thus, instead of perceiving men only as perpetrators of violence against women, perceiving men as equally gendered might serve to create different masculinity discourses (Ratele, 2014). Cited in Ratele (2014), Clowes (2013a) argues that

South African men are prone to physical, and sexual violence and health problems as a result of patriarchal norms. Therefore, “researchers and activists around masculinities apparently need to re-examine how to better represent to men the struggle for gender equality and progressive masculinities as imperative and not alien” (Ratele, 2014, p 34). In his later study on *Contesting ‘Traditional’ Masculinity and Men's Sexuality in Kwadukuza, South Africa* year, Ratele (2017) further pointed out masculinity traditions, gender and male sexualities as social discourses associated to particular contexts and time. And he argued for “the possibility of finding spaces for transforming gender relations and liberating masculinities” (Ratele, 2017, p. 1).

In light of the sparsity of critical and progressive work on masculinities in South Africa, there has been a bludgeoning focus on engaging critical masculinities (Mfecane, 2016; 2018;2020, Ratele, 2014; 2015; 2017; Hearn & Morgan, 2014; Morell, 2006; Morell et al, 2012; and Langa, 2010; 2012; 2020). One such call has been the attention of sexual violence against men to inform research, policy, and helping services with a comprehensive data for an inclusive understanding of male rape victimization (Arttime et al, 2014). In light of such a call, Kramer (2015), and Kramer and Bowman (2011) indicated that research on Female Sexual Abuse (FSA) has been focusing on understanding the characteristics of the offender leaving the victims of such offenses underexplored. Thus, they argued that men who are victims of FSA remain invisible because social constructions, and dominant discourses of victimhood remain gendered. This results in the limitation for male victims of FSA to self-identify as victims-worthy. Kramer and Bowman (2011), therefore, sought to reconstruct new understandings of victimhood that disrupts normative discourses of gender, sexuality and victimhood. In “*The Making of Male Victimhood in South African Female-perpetrated Sexual Abuse*”, Kammer and Bowman (2021) argue that non-prosecution, and light sentencing of female sexual offenders within the South Africa Legal System showcase the gendered nature

of sexual crimes where as women offenders receive minimal sentences compared to their male counterparts. As such, this has implications on the surfacing of victims of FSA – male victims of FSA are downgraded to restrictive and constricted positions (Kramer & Bowman, 2021).

Within South African society where sexual violence against women is high, one may question why we should care about sexual violence against men. Stats SA (2016/2017) indicates an increase in sexual violence in South Africa between the years 2016 and 2017 in comparison to the 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 reports. There was an estimation of 70,813 cases reported to the police with 48,481 (68.5%) of which were reported to be directed against women and 22, 332 (31.5) were reported to be directed against men. Thus, almost half of these cases were sexual violence reported by men. Although reports on male sexual violence are lower than that reported by women, there has been a slight development in these reports given that male sexual violence has a history of being underreported in the past years and the general response has been a stigma, blame, humiliation and disbelief (Sivakumaran, 2007). As a result, these statistics and the social responses indicate the necessity for researchers to challenge societal views of male sexual violence and masculinity.

1.3 Contextualizing male sexual violence within the #MeTooMovement

Additionally, I contextualized this study within #MeTooMovement. Although the movement highlighted violence against women, involving men in the movement is equally important in addressing sexual violence (Murray, 2017). #MeTooMoment became a useful moment that enabled (and undermined) certain narratives as far as sexual violence is concerned in global and South African public discourse. For instance, the #MeTooMovement might have been influential, in South Africa to evoke conversation around sexual violence and male sexual violence. For instance, four recent important temporal contexts in South Africa have been the #MenAreTrash, which in that context specifically addressed the mistreatment of women by

men as a way of combating gender-based violence (Matebese, 2017). The more recent #AmINext is also one of the historical time markers that challenges gender-based violence against women in South African communities. This movement was evoked by the story of Uyinene Mrwetyana who was raped and murdered at a post office in Cape Town, South Africa. The movement witnessed a national protest against gender-based violence (Masemola, 2019). The #RURelence list, that confronted rape culture around university campuses in South Africa (Macleod et al, 2018). For instance, by naming and shaming the perpetrators of sexual violence. The #TotalShutDown movement included a march to Union Building and the signing of a Twenty-four item memorandum against GBV⁵ by the President. It was also non-binary in composition. Each of these hashtags marks periods of heightened attentiveness and receptiveness to victim-survivors' experiences, which, though primarily focused on women and non-binary persons, saw many male victim-survivors also speak up. Thus, men can be involved in solidarity or as victims-survivors of sexual violence. The latter speaks directly to the title of the movement "#MeToo" which calls for all victim-survivors of sexual violence to share personal sexual violence experiences. Doing so creates social platforms to address, in this case, sexual violence against men. Therefore, the movements witnessed several male and female victims-survivors coming forward and acknowledging their victimization on social media regardless of class, gender, sexual orientation, and race (Murray, 2017; Manikond et al, 2018; and Phipps, 2021). Tarana Burkett, one of the leaders of the #Me Too Movement wrote:

“I’ve said repeatedly that the #metooMVMT is for all of us, including these brave young men who are now coming forward. It will continue to be jarring when we hear

⁵ Gender Based Violence.

the names of some of our faves connected to sexual violence unless we shift from talking about individuals and begin to talk about power.”

Thus, the #MeToo Movement highlights the intersectionality of gender and power in which [sexual] violence is weaponized to silence victims, to overpower survivors, and for the perpetrator to experience some sense of ownership.

With sexual violence largely reported to be directed toward women and children, some psychological research on men and masculinity has largely constructed men as problematic. Thus, men have been reported as perpetrators of sexual violence (MacCarry, 2007; Anderson, 2007; Baker, 2009). Research on young men and constructions of masculinity in Sub-Saharan Africa reported the side-lining men and boys within gender perspective and mainstreaming (Barker & Ricardo, 2005). Therefore, this research brings a new epistemology to the research of men and sexual violence by exploring gender perspective meanings when applied to African men on sexual violence. This research reconstructs men as subjects equally affected by the society that they form part of. As a result, I sought to bring about a new perspective in the (re)construction of psychology that speaks directly to the history, economic, political, and social structures of African society in conjunction with narratives of male sexual violation.

1.4 Contextualizing Sexual Violence in South Africa: Statistics

The South African Police Service (SAPS, 2021) records data on sexual offences perpetrated in South Africa on an annual and quarterly basis. Sexual offences are classified as, contact sexual offences, rape, attempted sexual offences, and sexual assault (StatsSA, 2021). The rate of sexual violence in South Africa ranks amongst the highest recorded in the world, ranging from approximately 46 000 to 61 000 sexual offence cases per year from 2011 to 2021. During this time span, the period 2012/2013 and 2011/2012 recorded the highest number of cases amounting to 60 888 and 60 539 respectively. The least number of cases was recorded in

2020/2021 (46 214) and 2016/2017 (49 660). Of the total sexual offence cases recorded between the year 2011 and 2021, the most common were rape (79%) and sexual assault (15%), while fewer cases were of attempted sexual offences (3%) and contact sexual offences (2%). Data compiled by the South African Police Service (SAPS, 2022) as at September 2022 suggested that Gauteng Province recorded the most number of sexual offences in South Africa (21%), followed by, KwaZulu Natal (18%), Eastern Cape (16%), Western Cape (11%) Limpopo (8%), Mpumalanga (7%) and the Free State Province (6%) had the least number of reported cases. Despite a minimal decrease in the number of sexual violation cases across the country comparing the years between 2011 and 2022, Sexual violence still remain a concerning social issues. (Adar & Stevens, 2000; Petersen, Bhana & MacKay, 2005; Di Silvio, 2011). Out of the sexual offences reported in South Africa (50 000) between the year 2011 and 2012, 40% were children; 48.5% were women; and men 11.4% of this statistic were men. It is estimated that every year there are 118.2 rape incidents per 100, 000 women (South African Institute of Race Relations, 2014; SAPS, 2014). However, as 9897 of these incidents occurred in the Eastern Cape Province (a ratio of 150 incidents per 100 000), it shows that sexual violence incidents are more prevalent in the Province than elsewhere in the country (SAPS, 2014). Comparing statistics between the occurrence of sexual violence between men and women, it is clear that women are the most likely to be victimized. However, given the under reportage of sexual violence in general, and the stigma associated with talking about sexual violence as a man, these statistics do not truly represent the actual amount of sexual violence cases. These statistics lay a ground work to sensitise the public, researchers, policy makers to mention but a few of the seriousness of sexual violence.

According to StatsSA (2001), 34, 2% of the victims were attacked by known a perpetrator, those attacked by spouses or lovers amounted to 16, 8%. In 25, 1% of sexual violation cases, perpetrators were a relative. StatsSA (2001) reported that most cases (88, 1%)

of the sexual violence were perpetrated by a single offender. In most cases, these violations were characterised by threats of physical injury, and the use of knives (68, 0%) or by a gun (16, 5%). Almost half of all rape cases (47, 3%) occurred inside the homes of victims.

1.4.1 Sexual Violence Against Men

Jewkes and Abrahams (2002) noted the increase in research work towards documenting male sexual violence. According to Bryant-Davis et al. (2011), there is a higher prevalence of male sexual violence than the research scholarship would suggest. Sivakumarani (2007, p. 254) argues, "...we know it exists but we do not know to what extent". It is estimated that 15% of men in America report at least one negative sexual harassment experience in work contexts (Sivakuruman, 2007). Societal reactions to male sexual violence are more or less similar to those of women in the sense that both cases are repeatedly degraded and overlooked, and are wedded into systems of power, hegemonic masculinity, and sexual culture (Sivakuruman, 2007). However, although the research on documenting male sexual violence significantly contributed to the knowledge gap of male sexual violence, this research, as evident in the literature, does not inclusively report on societal responsiveness to sexual violence against men. Social responses to male sexual violence might be similar to those of women at some level but the nature in which these incidences play out is different.

While social responses to female victims of rape are more linked to subordination and patriarchal and gender power relations, responses to male victims of rape are more linked to failures to live up to, and repression of acts that "damage" patriarchy and hegemonic masculinity (i.e. embracing vulnerability) (Javaid, 2017). Thus, the acceptability of rape vulnerability discourses is mainly associated with women whereas men have not gained equal attention within literature and in the political arena (Javaid, 2017).

Sivakumarani (2007) observed a general under-reporting of sexual violence especially male sexual violence. This is due to violence being highly stigmatized within families, groups, and communities. Studies by Felson, et al (2002), and Felson and Paré (2005) showed that men are reported to have a relatively higher ratio of unreported sexual violence cases such as rape, incest and sexual harassment due to a combination of fear, shame, guilt, confusion and stigma surrounding male sexual violence. Men may also be reluctant to talk about victimization, considering that male vulnerability has been overlooked within dominant masculinity, especially within societies that dissuade men from expressing [their] emotions (Sivakumarani, 2007). "The incompatibility between this understanding of masculinity and victimization occurs both at the level of the attack itself – a man should have been able to protect himself from being attacked - and in dealing with the consequences of the attack – to be able to cope like a man" (Sivakumaran, 2007 p. 255). What Sivakuruman describes here speaks directly to the social discourses and affective components that intend to yield invisible, voiceless subjects within sexual violence context. As a result, we need to adopt a critical eye on these kinds of discourses and social constructs as a mission towards creating affirmative and acknowledging spaces for male victim-survivors following sexual violence.

As illustrated by the Australian Centre for the Study of Sexual Assault (2006), some of the social and community factors leading to sexual violence include the disjuncture between the construction of ideal masculinity standards and the experienced reality of masculinity in the lives of many men. Therefore, in most cases, male sexual violence against men renders victim-survivors' inferior to these masculine ideologies. In addition, social constructions of an "ideal man" and broader cultural and historical constructions of patriarchal ideologies contribute to the denial of male rape. For instance, South Africa's violent past and the patriarchal society promote and sustain these kinds of gender inequalities concerning male rape acknowledgement (Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, 2001).

Rape directed toward LGBTQ⁶ people is more prevalent than the rape of heterosexual men (Harry, 1990; Herek & Gillis, 1999). The reason for this prevalence is that the LGBT community is at risk of sexual violence because they date men and are likely to be involved in homophobic violence (Davies, 2002). This means that sexual violence against non-normative sexual identities occurs as a result of hate crimes such as "gay bash" and is perpetrated by other men. This literature indicates affective components at play in the suppression of other forms of subjectivity. Here, for instance, collective hate and disgust circulates within predominant discursive constructs expressed through hate crimes (e.g. gay bash). This is one of many ways non-conforming bodies are sanctioned concerning heteronormativity and hegemonic masculinity. Consequently, more research is needed to address these social injustices.

Geographical characteristics of rape occurrence against the LGBTQ community are largely reported to be the victim-survivors home, community, workplace, party, public toilets, and so forth. Russell (2007) asserts that like any other sexual violence incident, rape directed towards non-normative sexual identities, for example, involves some form of physical force, coercion, threats, and the use of a weapon (for example, knives and guns). The history of male sexual violence dates back to the times of war. For example, Sivakumarani (2007 p. 253) asserted, "reports of sexual violence by men against men emerge from numerous conflicts, ranging in time from Ancient Persia and the Crusades to the conflicts in Iraq and the Democratic Republic of the Congo". Notwithstanding these accounts, Sivakumarani (2017) argues that comparatively not much sexual violence research exists on male sexual violence and sexual violence against men tends to be relegated to silence. Thus, silences around rape

⁶ Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer.

incidences occurring outside of prison settings and times of conflict are influenced by fears to disrupt gender and hegemonic masculinity ideologies (Russell, 2007).

Donnelly and Kenyon (1996), Crome (2006), and Foster (2005) reported that historically, male sexual violence was regarded as a subset of homosexual behaviour. The connotation of male sexual violence with homosexuality is still apparent within literature (i.e. men who are prone to the sexual violation are likely to be gay) (Foster, 2005). Jones (2000) asserts that male sexual violation within prison contexts is a way of wielding power. It is, therefore, perceived as a consequence of male monopoly and the violation of human rights (Sivakumaran, 2005). Thus, similar to the violation of women and children, mounting evidence within research depicts that young boys, non-normative sexual identities, and heterosexual men remain victims of patriarchal power relations and are vulnerable to sexual violence. This vulnerability is tied to traditional sex-role socialization and gendered "patriarchal" power relations (ACSSA, 2006).

1.4.2 Responding to Sexual Violence Against Men

To illustrate, that repressive affective technologies of sexuality and gender are at work within social discourses of male sexual violence, many men do not report sexual violence incidence because of personal and social fears (Fisher et al. 2003). Thus, stigmatization of gay men, for not conforming to heteronormativity, already regulates how they behave, their sexuality, and gender roles let alone speaking about the sexual violation. Furthermore, heterosexual men might refrain from reporting sexual violence due to possible fears of being labelled 'weak' or 'not man enough' because society has, for decades, constructed men as immune to sexual violence (Stuckman-Johnson et al, 1996). Consequently, internalized affects that include shame, self-disgust and fear have a possibility of inhibiting men from openly acknowledging rape experiences. For instance, male sexual violence experiences (committed

by women) are not, in some instances, perceived as sexual violence incidence but rather as a bad sexual experience'. This might be an adapted coping mechanism for making sense of male sexual violence experiences. Therefore, the social construction of gender roles and gender stereotypes possibly limit men from acknowledging sexual violence and regulates how men should handle, cope and make sense of sexual violence experiences (Davies, 2002).

1.5 Rethinking Gender and Masculinity in Male Vulnerability

Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) viewed gender as a system of social inequality with its logic and internal complexities. Hegemonic masculinity refers to, "the particular kinds of behaviour and ways of being in which we are made culturally dominant and comes to be viewed as a pattern of masculinity in general" (Kelsner et al, 1982, p. 10). Male domination – gender and power are constantly reproduced and reconstructed through gender relations and culturally exalted masculinities hierarchy. Therefore, researchers need to examine and critically question traditional conceptualization of masculinity and gender ideologies that are oppressive to identities that fall out of the "normalized" gender and masculine identities. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) refer to bodies as not docile to cultural messages but are addressed by social process and drawn into history without stopping being bodies'. Thus, they argue that bodies do not turn into symbols or positions in discourse. Meaning that masculinity is not static but rather learned and reproduced, and it is different depending on the geographical setting, periodical moments and cultural norms and beliefs. Hence, through social change, bodies are open to change (Beynon, 2002).

Morell, (2001) and Xaba (2001) argue that the historical significance of masculinity in South Africa and the ways these historically situated masculinities are connected with gender-based violence need to be interrogated. Thus, there has been extensive research in South Africa

about the relationship between violence and masculinities, especially the connection between modern-day violent masculinities and high rates of rape and violence in intimate relationships (Bitten & Naidoo, 2013). Therefore, constructions of masculinity represent an active doing rather than being, hence, performative masculinity is represented (Viljoen, 2008). Challenging traditional constructions of masculinity and the impact it has on male subjectivity is of paramount importance in locating and nuancing the ways men and the broader society perceive male sexual violence. The challenge to traditional masculinity has been labelled a "crisis of masculinity" (Campbell, 2001; Mager, 2010). Patriarchal masculinity is challenged through social change. Thus, gender ideologies and stereotypes about gender role expectations are deconstructed and reshaped in ways that are accommodative of all sexual identities despite gender and sexual orientation (Durham & O'Byrne, 2010). For instance, starting by constructing new ways of acknowledging vulnerability in the face of adversity such as sexual violence. Morell (2001) cited in Buiten and Naidoo (2013) asserted that the notion that society and hegemonic masculinities are embracing social change, and the contestation of established and hegemonic forms of masculinity is a significant highlight. Thus, social change is concerned with the recognition of masculinity vulnerabilities and the possibility of re-visioning. Consequently, rape narratives need to be written through the lenses of gender, and constructions of patriarchal masculinity need to be scrutinized simultaneously recognizing the history of male violence in South Africa (Salo, 2005).

Buiten and Naidoo (2013) found that sexuality and masculinity are performed in a variety of ways. Thus, masculinity is performed through different discourses such as proven heterosexuality discourse. For instance, to maintain one's sexuality and "manhood" as a man, men should be able to engage in sexual encounters with multiple women. Failure to do so results in questionable sexuality as a heterosexual man. The quest to demonstrate heterosexual masculinity has been proven to reach an extent of repressing and silencing sexual subjects such

as women and non-normative sexual bodies because prevailing discursive orientations centralise masculinity as natural, and sexual.

For a few conducted research on this subject, data has shown that few men use the term rape to label sexual violence experiences (Davies, 2002). Thus, there is a link between men's acknowledgement of sexual violence and hegemonic masculinity. In their research on men's acknowledgement of sexual victimization experiences, Arttime et al (2014) argue that silences around male sexual violence are better elucidated through cultural assumptions about gender and sexual victimization. Additionally, common rape myths such as "it is impossible to rape a man" and "men who are raped are to blame for not escaping" (Struckman-Jonson & Struckman-Jonson, 1992, p. 90) equally play a role in perpetuating silence around male sexual violence. Therefore, rape myths may affect men's acknowledgement of rape experiences, disclosure patterns and societal responses to male sexual violence. The failure to acknowledge and recognize male sexual violence reflects the notion that although women are characterized and associated with weakness and docility, masculinity is characterized by power and dangerousness. Hence, Hollander (2001, p.85) asserts, "despite the reality of violence against men...vulnerability is not part of shared cultural conceptions of masculinity". As a result, admitting to being sexually vulnerable, is perceived as an intimidation to masculinity and their perception of "manhood" especially if men were sexually violated by other men (Struckman-Jonson & Struckman-Jonson, 1992; Walker et al, 2005b). Furthermore, research has shown that gay, bisexual and transgender men are less prone to gender role stress in comparison to heterosexual men concerning the acknowledgement of rape (O'Neill, 2008). This is so because non-normative sexualities do not conform to traditional constructions of masculinity. Therefore, they might not possess beliefs that are threatening to their sexual subjectivity or "manhood" when reporting and acknowledging sexual violation.

1.6 The significance of the study

This research contributes to the study of men and masculinity by employing a multi-layered analytical lens. Focusing on public responses and personal narratives to accounts of male sexual violence, I combined affect theory and discourse analysis frameworks to understand men, sexuality, masculinity, and sexual violence. Discursive dimensions are useful in layering out constructs related to these accounts whereas affective dimensions provide underlying affective components in these constructs. The multi-layered approach is essential in the provision of further insight into the study of sexual violence against men. The multi-layered approach provides an understanding of male sexual subjectivity through the use of everyday language, as well as the underlying affective components. Not much research has been done simultaneously in the field of gender, masculinity, sexuality, and sexual violence against men. This study accounts for these gaps.

1.7 Theoretical Implications

The use of affect theory in the study of sexual violence against men provides a new site to interrogate these cultures of silence and hegemonic masculinity. The study highlights the technologies of power employed through affective investments that regulate and govern how male victim-survivors of sexual violence are understood and how certain subject positions are constructed via discourse. Thus, understanding the affective dimension brings about a new and diverse understanding of how men are constructed or self-construct parallel sexual violations. This kind of research critically challenges the universal psychological study of men and masculinity and traditional hegemonic social constructions of men. This study critiques dominant discourses and responses to sexual violence against men and hegemonic masculinity subjectivity constructions (re)produced concerning male vulnerability. Gill (1996) argued that discourse analysis actively constructs reality. Thus, through discourse, social, political, and

economic realities of men are (re)produced. Discourse here is implicated in enactments of social and cultural logics of masculinity.

Thus, Scharff (2017) asserted that subjectivity is shaped, (re) produced by discourse but also shifts as discursive shifts unfold within society and across time. Therefore, merging a multi-layered analytical lens in researching men is significant for new psychological understandings of the intersections of male sexual subjectivity, hegemonic masculinity, and sexual violence. Examining constructed discourses around men and masculinity has the possibility of creating new understandings of male subjectivity that may be different from problematic approaches. It creates new perspectives of men as sexual citizens whose sexualities and subjectivities are prone to the vulnerabilities within societies that they are part of. Therefore, the obligation lies in researchers to challenge the ways society views male rape and sexual violence.

1.8 The Aim of the Study

The main aim is to examine societal discursive constructions of male sexual violence, understand men's positionality and subjectivity in the context of being sexually victimized, and how they and the broader public negotiates their victim-worthiness in the aftermath of sexual violation. I do this by grounding my research in different radio talk shows (i.e. podcasts), and virtual ethnography (i.e. online platforms) that address different contexts of male sexual violence across South Africa.

1.9 Research Questions

Concerning the aim of this study am interested to explore the following questions:

- a) What discursive work is performed in broader societal responses to a male sexual violation?
- b) What affective economies underlie discursive constructions of men's experiences of rape and sexual violence?
- c) How is male sexual citizenship governed via these discursive and affective tropes?

1.10 Study Objectives

1. To explore societal discursive constructions, positionality and subject construction of male sexual violence.
2. To understand the performativity of underlying affective economies within these discursive constructions.
3. To understand the social logics of male sexual citizenship via discursive and affective tropes.

These research objectives are informed by the literature on discourse analysis and affect theory. Adopting a discursive and affective approach, I investigate societal constructions of male sexual violence. The results of this research are essential for weighing strategies to enhance understandings of male sexual violence and male subjectivity.

1.11 Overview of the Chapters

Chapter 1: Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to briefly introduce my research. Therefore, I provided a detailed description of the study rationale by problematizing sexual violence and arguing for the importance of the current study. As a result, I outlined the context surrounding sexual violence in South Africa and statistics within the past decade. Additionally, I highlighted the importance of rethinking gender and masculinity issues and male vulnerability concerning

sexual violence against men. I also outlined the theory implication, the research aim, the research questions, the research objectives and the significance of the study.

Chapter 2: Conceptualizing Affect: Understanding of Affective as a Critical Analysis lens

In this Chapter, I describe and discuss the theoretical framework and perspective used to inform my research process. Starting broadly from the history of affect theory to focusing on Spinoza's (1994) conception of affect. I then described how Deleuze and Guattari (1972) took up Spinoza's concepts of affect. Thus, I further highlighted how affect has been researched independent of emotions following affect theorists such as Massumi (2015), Thrift (2004), etc. A discussion of affect concerning emotions, social and cultural context was also discussed following affect theorists such as Wetherell (2012; 2015), and Ahmed (2004; 2014). For the conception of affect beyond the individual, I argue that emotions within discourse function to move bodies and form a collective in the understanding and negotiation of male sexual violence. I lastly incorporate how affect has been researched in connection to the atmosphere following Anderson's (2010) conception of affect.

Chapter 3: Researching Sexual Violence Against Men

I provide a literature review on the history of sexual violence, statistics on sexual violence in South Africa, and proceed to focus on empirical research conducted around male sexual violence both in South Africa and globally. Importantly, I look at masculine discourses on male sexual violence, and male vulnerability paying particular attention on how society talks about, and constructs male sexual violence.

Chapter 4: Methodology

The methodology chapter discusses and describes the research process. In addition to discussions around the research methodology and philosophical underpinnings of the methods used, data collection and data analysis procedures are highlighted. The chapter includes a section on the ethical considerations related to this study and a section on discourse analysis stages and processes followed which inevitably shaped the analyses.

Chapter 5: Constructing the Victim-Worthy Subject via Registers of Empathy

My analysis and interpretation of the data are spread over three chapters. In this first chapter, I describe and discuss the various societal discursive resources and affective technologies used to construct narratives of male sexual violence. These included the following: The different discursive framings of the talk, discursive constructions of toxic masculinity, the legal discourse, toxic religion discourse and issues around justification, validation and recognition. Additionally, affective economies of sympathy and empathy are also highlighted in connection to male sexual violence. This chapter is based on a podcast about four male victims of sexual violence from diverse backgrounds.

Chapter 6: Humanizing a (De) Humanized Subject: Understanding Prison Rape through Affective Tropes

This chapter describes and discusses societal discursive constructions and affective technologies of male sexual violence within the context of prison in negotiating victim worthiness. Thus, I discuss the subject positions taken up or resisted by male victim-survivors, as well as the subject positions conferred by/to others such as the hosts, guests and the audience. I also discuss the various power relations that surfaced in the construction of male subjectivity.

Chapter 7: Unmasking Education Institutional Culpability: Affective Economies of Shared Pain and Rage

I discuss the rape of young boys as well as the discursive and affective tropes underlying the different constructions and understandings thereof. Discourses outlined and discussed in this chapter are around institutional failures to acknowledge sexual violence issues within the educational system. The underlying affects of pain and rage are also described in connection to subject construction.

Chapter 8: Findings Discussion and Conclusion

I conclude this thesis by providing a discussion of the implications of the findings in chapters 5,6 and 7 and how the discourses used, the power relations and affective technologies referred to may or may not have been useful in the negotiation of victim worthiness being acknowledged and recognized. I provide reflexivity of the research process and lastly discuss the limitations of the study alongside recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER TWO:

Conceptualizing Affect Theory: An Understanding of Affective Technologies as a Critical Analysis Lens

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter I turn to affect theory to read and interrogate the ways in which affective investments underlie the regulation of male subjectivity concerning sexual violence and vulnerability. I argue that within much of the discursive positions and constructs that surround male vulnerability and sexual passivity lie affective investments and defences that function to organise social and political life in particular ways.

From the 19th century onward, there has been a significant turn to affect studies with some outstanding contributions from theorists such as Silvan Tomkins (1962), Gilles Deleuze (1994), Sara Ahmed (2004), Elspeth Probyn (2005), Wetherell (2012) and Brian Massumi (2012). These theorists have written from different disciplines including sociology, psychology, anthropology and philosophy, gender studies and cultural studies. The affective turn marks the importance of the study of emotions concerning everyday interaction within contemporary society. Such a turn allows us to explore the gendered organisation of social and personal lives in terms of their political processes via a lens that attends to the role and function of emotion and affect in this organisation.

2.2 The Independence of Emotions

Affect theorists have tried to reconceptualise affect in various ways. Thus, affect has been researched independently from emotions (Massumi; Sedgwick; Tomkins). From a non-representational perspective, affect is understood as independently operating social forces. Thus, theorists married to this tradition draw on empirical science to differentiate affect from emotion. For example, Massumi (1995) argues that emotions are subjective and pre-personal,

meaning that what one individual identifies as a certain emotion cannot be generalised to another individual. In understanding affect, Massumi notably differentiates emotion from affect, arguing that affects precede emotions, that they are biological wiring underlying emotions. Furthermore, Massumi (1995) stated that affect could be physically felt by the body, and acted upon. However, he believed that without the belief in the world's potential, it would be difficult for the body to act. Therefore, people are constantly led by the edge of affect as they experience events. Likewise, Whitehead (2012) regarded affect as a "mental pole" to a human's ability to act. By this, he means the capacity, thus, affect, as the feeling of capacitation and potential, contributes towards the seizing of new ways of being. Massumi (2012) does not compare affect to the thought process, rather he explains it as the movement of thought, the force of thought embodied as a way of thought surfacing. Thus, affect comes before conscious reflection already with a felt sense of potential alternatives. In this aspect, it constitutes inactive speculation (Massumi, 2012). Affect, throughout, is what could be called a "thinking-feeling." As a result, it is often when conscious reflection is silenced that thought is most effective. For example, more often, people speak about the importance of silencing the "inner monologue" to refrain from "overthinking." This silencing has been connected to people thinking that coincides with their movements, rather than direct them.

Like Massumi, Nigel Thrift (2004) separates affect from emotions. He analysed the operation and potential of bodily performed reactions, thus emphasising the body's modulations. He argues, "the living face is the most important and mysterious surface we deal with. It is the centre of our flesh. We eat, drink, breathe and talk with it, and it houses four of the five classic senses" (Thrift, 2004, p. 72). Thrift exemplifies his approach in his illustration of an artist who crumbles a set of cultural symbols and displays them through a slow-motion process to understand as they move. He uses historically established tools to engage the

unconscious of affect. Thus, the movement of the body and spatial formations create context within which emotion and physical shape activate intensity. He argues, "through our emotion, we reach back sensually to grasp the tacit, embodied foundations of ourselves" (Thrift, 2004, p. 67). The discharging of the responses of affect allows one to be truly free, as by expressing one's emotions and self-reflecting upon them, one develops a better understanding of oneself. According to Thrift (2004) the body is turned into a channel where affects, from an external source, filter through the body into an individual understanding, and facilitates a reaction of the body releasing that energy.

Additionally, Tomkins (1984) cited in Frank and Wilson (2020) also researched affect independent of emotions. According to Tomkins, there are nine innate affects that people are born with. These affects could be heightened and, therefore, they could be combined. These include Distress-Anguish, for example, a cry for help; Enjoyment-Joy, for example, forming social bonds; Surprise-Startle; Anger-Rage such as the need to fix it; Fear-Terror, for example, the signal to flee or freeze; Shame-Humiliation, for example, the need to protect or hide; Disgust, for example, wanting to vomit; and Dismal. He also divides these affects into two categories i.e. negative and positive affects. He argues that to maintain healthy psychological well-being, one should work towards maximizing positive affects and minimizing negative affects. Each of Tomkins' nine affects contain unique experiential monogram, each attaches a specific type of meaning to information as is processed, deposited and remembered. Thus, affect is the inborn, biological reaction to the accumulative, declining or persistent intensity of chemical reaction within the brain. consequently, this surfaces particular sensation, facial and body display, and skin changes. Affects feel satisfying, punishing, or impersonal in their ways. A feeling is, therefore, perceived as an awareness of an affect. Tomkins (1984) proceeds to explain that a feeling in connection with a memory of a similar, past experience is an emotion.

Thus, affect comes before feeling and feeling comes before emotion. It is like an innate build-up that leads to the surfacing of emotion through the highlighted process. Tomkins argues that emotions are the workings of affect. Respectively, inherent affect has a distinctive trigger, a level and an array of the intensity of neural stimulation over time. This stimulus may physiological or environmental. For instance, a previously experienced memory or some new environmental stimuli could trigger an affect. According to Tomkins (1984) physical expressions such as smiles, cries, and gazes are perceived as innate activation of affects which results in the embodiment of such affects through the expression of emotions. In this reading of affect, we may consider affect to be about embodied modulations, movement of one state to another, bodies capacitated to affect each other, and surfacing of intensities when we encounter each other.

2.3 The Social and Cultural Contextualization of Affect

A second reading of affect concerns the reading of emotions via cultural logics. That is, how we make sense of emotions via cultural frames that are in turn influenced by systems of representation. Affect has thus been researched interchangeably with emotions and in tandem with discourse (Wetherell, 2012), and culture (Ahmed, 2014). According to Wetherell the affective practice is the, "recruitment and often synchronous assembling of multimodal resources, including, most crucially, body states. It is the participation of the emoting body that makes an assemblage an example of affect rather than an example of some other kind of social practice" (2012, p.159). Highlighting the "particularity of embodiment" in affects, Wetherell (2012) continues to pinpoint affects in a dense web of "multimodal" somatic-to-semiotic interconnections between the discursive, the social, the psychological and physiological. The result is an immensely creative, alternately disconcerting wordiness in her text of which the following definitional morass is paradigmatic:

In affective practice, bits of the body (e.g. facial muscles, thalamic-amygdala pathways in the brain, heart rate, regions of the prefrontal cortex, sweat glands, etc.) get patterned together with feelings and thoughts, interaction patterns and relationships, narratives and interpretative repertoires, social relations, personal histories, and ways of life. These components and modalities, each with their logic and trajectories, are assembled in interacting and recursive, or back-and-forth, practical methods (Wetherell, 2015, p.13-14).

In her work, Wetherell (2015) is concerned with the ways in which affects become patterned, with an emphasis on order, temporally and intersubjective, through conversations, norms, situations, identities, classes, communal atmospheres, personal life-histories, to mention but a few. Wetherell (2015) argues that affective flows are deposited through practices into affective assemblages that animate both individual persons and quite larger groups. Therefore, Wetherell (2015) understands the work of affect to be in tandem with systems of representation and thus a reading of discourse. Thus, affect is demonstrated through body meaning-making, through physical action (i.e. yawning, facial expressions etc.) (Wetherell, 2015). This embodiment, therefore, is a channel through which we try to understand how people are moved. Affect, for Wetherell (2012), includes every aspect of emotions, sometimes physical disturbances and body actions such as sweating, and shivering to mention but a few. Additionally, Wetherell (2012) resonates with a new focus on materiality and rationality, the biological and the cultural. She tries to highlight the interpersonal and the pre-personal. Thus, she focuses on the relationship between affect and discourse. She argues that affects processes beyond, below, and past discourse. Thus, she sees affect theory as a tool required for lively, textured research on embodied social action. Social research requires methods that deal with the entanglements of embodiment and discourse. For instance, in personal narratives of violence, affects are

always present and are performative in how they work to construct subjects and reality. Therefore, Wetherell advocates for more dialogue between discourse research and affect scholars. This interweaving of systems of representation with affective logics is also supported by Harding and Pribram (2002) in their flagging of culture as a key site for unravelling power's effects through affective processes. Thus, discourse and affects can be located within text and they are both functional in subject construction. For example, Edley and Wetherell (1995) analysed the discourses and language used to define and regulate masculinity. They examined how cultural narratives, media representations, and institutional discourses contribute to the shaping of masculine identities and influence men's understanding of themselves and their roles in society. Thus, this study utilizes discourse analysis and provide an additional layering of affect theory to understand the constructions of male sexual violence.

Ahmed (2014), like Wetherell, views affect as socially and culturally interlinked. Ahmed (2014) argues that since the non-representational tradition view affects as pre-personal, they are, therefore, not clearly understood in the everyday life. Affective technologies are useful to understand the mechanisms of power and may enable a much deeper understanding of both the failures and successes of power. That is, whilst analyses of regimes and technologies of power benefit from structural, representational and symbolic dissections, the function of emotion and affect in the surfacing of subjects, the acts of resistance cannot be understated. In this study, I specifically draw on Ahmed's (2014) and Wetherell's (2012) conceptualization of affect because they align with the aims and objectives of this study – investigating the discursive explorations of affective economies of male sexual violence which seeks to understand social constructions of male subjectivity concerning sexual violence through discursive and affective tropes.

Sarah Ahmed's (2014) *Cultural Politics of Emotions* elaborates on emotions in terms of having feelings towards something, they are more than just the ways bodies affect each other or the discourse. She argues that histories that precede and direct bodily encounters and emotions are equally important when working with human bodies. In this case, Ahmed's approach to affect speaks directly to the social and historical socialization of male bodies as heterosexual, strong, pain resistant and successful. This also relates to Wetherell's conversation about the ways in which affect is interlinked to the past and present. Wetherell et al (2018) argue that the past is present in contemporary affective experiences. Thus, bringing into perspective how emotions and affective practices evoke connections to historical events, collective memories, and personal narratives. For example, they drew on the ways in which affective engagements with heritage shape individual and collective identities and contribute to the construction of a sense of continuity and belonging. This speaks in tandem with how history and culture shape understandings of male sexual violence and male vulnerability. These cultural and historical constructions of hidden male vulnerability or lack thereof, are significant in the interrogation of how such systems of power can be problematic. Ahmed (2004)'s elucidation of affect as part of what emotions can do, thus, posits emotions as not subject-centred and are not just socially mediated. Emotions, according to Ahmed (2014) show how subjects arrive in a world imbued with meaning, one that already circulates feelings that can be surfaced within sociocultural frames of meaning, that can attach to particular bodies, that modulate with varying degrees of intensity. If we consider the sociocultural frames and systems of representation that the male sexual victim-survivor exists within, then we must simultaneously consider the affective technologies that are part of this sociocultural frames, that are part of the subject's surfacing as a worthy victim. And within this space, the materiality and circulation of emotions are bound to stick and attach to individual and collective bodies

relative to the contextualization of the lived experience and the relationship between the personal experience and the historicity of the subject. Therefore, for Ahmed (200, 2014), Wetherell (2005; 2012), Wetherell et al (2018), emotions are also cultural practices and the subject embodiment of these. Meaning that if some subjects (e.g. women) are socialized to be emotional, and others socialized to be stoic (i.e. men) then, subjects are pressurized to embody this cultural socialization of affect.

Ahmed (2004) speaks of structures as a way of showing how other bodies are received or welcomed whereas others are rejected. In this instance, I look at how social discourses have normalized sexual violence against women and children whilst male victim-survivors of rape have less recognition within these positionings. How do male victims of sexual violence negotiate victim worthiness, taking or refusing subject positioning in the face of vulnerability, and how politics of recognition and acknowledgement of these positionings are constructed? Ahmed's description and application of affect theory resonate with Bourdieu's concept of 'habitus' – "the way society becomes deposited in persons in form of lasting disposition, or trained capacities, structured propensities to think, feel and act in determinant ways, which then guide them" (Wacquant, 2005, p. 316 cited in Navarro 2006, p. 16). In Bourdieu's explanations of how society, culture, norms and beliefs power relations are taught to different subjects it is indicated that the process of this socialization, social thoughts, and behaviours become engraved within subjects and are taken as internal dispositions that influence thoughts and acts. What Bourdieu explains here can be linked to notions of biopower and affect – how different subjects are controlled through internalized affects and biopower. To illustrate, traditional men have grown to believe in hegemonic masculinity ideologies to such an extent that patriarchal beliefs about male behaviour are believed to be biologically inherent. Thus, masculinity constructs have been, over time, deeply engraved as personal dispositions by men. Bourdieu

defines 'habitus' to be changing and varying according to situation, time and space. This speaks directly to how men become socialized subjects in relation to patriarchy, heterosexuality and dominant masculinity, however, with room to be challenged and reconstructed. For example, in contemporary trends in social research, a large body of research has shown male vulnerability and the recognition of LGBTIQ+. Thus, in this construction of masculinity lies affective dimensions equally performing construction work of (re)producing certain socialized emotional subjects. This means that new meanings can always be attached to affective experiences regarding, and understandings around male sexual violence experiences.

Ahmed (2014) introduces collective feelings. Here she argues that people are shaped by and even take the shape of contact with others. As a result, emotions interlink individuals and communities even if they do not positively reside in the subject figure (Ahmed, 2014). Therefore, how society responds to male sexual violence has a significant influence on male victim-survivors and subjectivity construction. In this instance, my interests lie in depicting the functionality of discourse and underlying emotions within talk, text and everyday language in relation to the accounts of male sexual assault. Questioning these (un)intentional and (yet) performative discursive and affective work in promoting/inhibiting men to/or from embodying vulnerability in the face of sexual violence. Therefore, I argue, it is difficult if not impossible to read these affects without looking into discourses because it is through talk, conversations and everyday language that emotions become existent and accessible to us. Thus, both Wetherell and Ahmed emphasize the embodied nature of affect and its role in shaping experiences and social interactions. Where Wetherell explores how affect is mediated through discourses and how these discourses become inscribed in and enacted through bodies, influencing our emotions, perceptions, and behaviors, for Ahmed affects can also be located in any kind of talk i.e. in discourse and in narratives. Therefore, Wetherell's discourse analysis

and Ahmed's theories of affect both engage with the surfacing of subjectivity through different positionalities and dynamics. For instance, they are both complementary in the ways in which subjectivity can be regulated through affective norms and the ways in which affective states are influenced by discursive practices. Thus, exploring the intersections between discursive power and affective governance in shaping social hierarchies, identities, and emotional experiences. For instance, in this study, the intersectional approach of affect theory and the examination of affective economies could intersect in discussions of how affective experiences are shaped by multiple social categories, such as gender, race, class, and sexuality. As such, this allows understandings of how male sexual violence intersects with systems of power and privilege. Edley and Wetherell (1995) examined how masculinity is socially constructed and understood within different societies and historical periods, thus, they explored how cultural norms, discourses, and practices shape the expectations, behaviours, and identities associated with being a man arguing that these systems of power are significant in subject constructions. As such, reading data through Wetherell and Ahmed perspectives permits the analysis of the role of discourse and affect in the formation of identities and subjectivities taking into consideration the ways in which affective experiences contribute to the construction and negotiation of social identities, and how this can reinforce or challenge dominant norms and discourses – challenging oppressive structures and promoting social justice parallel male sexual violence and vulnerability. This in turn, can bring alternative ways of being and relating.

Emotions construct subjects. This is what this research is interested in – investigating affective economies of male sexual violence against men, looking at how affective technologies are invested in the construction of male sexual citizenship, subjectivity and vulnerability. Since bodies have the potential to affect other bodies and to be affected (Massumi), emotions can then be simultaneously shared by multiple bodies. Thus, affects can work to secure forms of

collective which can lead to social alliances and collective politics. For instance, shared rape myths justifying that men cannot be raped or social constructions of male victims of sexual violence juxtaposition of being gay can be read as political performative work of affect.

For emphasis, Gould (2009, p.21) refer to affect as a "sensory intensity" that is "outside of conscious thought", which evokes a feeling that we are "experiencing something" which, "if forceful enough, can induce efforts – more or less conscious – to figure out what we are feeling and how to express it". According to Gould (2009, p.21), in that figuring, we are bound to draw on "culturally available labels and meanings, through which a gesture or linguistic naming that 'expresses' what we are feeling emerges". Thus, Gould's conceptualization of affect relates more to Ahmed's (2014) affective economies with regard to how he sees the influence of cultural labels on affects. To illustrate, in the context of sexual violence, the sensory intensities that being sexually victimized can provoke feelings such as "anger" and "shame". The embodiment of these affects has the potential of (re)producing different or even multiple subjectivities. In Bourdieu's view of culture, agency and structure power relations are created through habitus or socialized norms and tendencies that become part of an individual. Thus, men are socialized to ignore, repress and dismiss vulnerability.

2.5 Addressing the Elephant in the Room: Atmospheric Affects

The circulation of emotions can also be related to Anderson's (2010) understanding of affect through the concept of atmosphere. Thus, Anderson attempts to understand affective occurrences as excessive, collective, spatial and elemental. This means that affects are perceived in relation to emotion, space and society. The concept of the atmosphere is interesting because it holds a series of opposites: The presence and absence of affects, materiality and ideality of affects, definite and indefinite of affect, singularity and generality of affect, and in relation to tension (Anderson, 2010). Affects are then evoked by material imagination based on the movement and lightness of air. As for Anderson (2010), atmospheres are singular affective qualities that arise from, but exceed the assembling of bodies. As such, to attend to affective atmospheres is to learn to be affected by the uncertainties of affect/emotion, by that which is known and unknown, existing and absent, particular and indefinite. For Anderson (2010, p.78), "the atmosphere has long been associated with the uncertain, disordered, shifting and contingent – that which never quite achieves the stability of form". Atmospheres reflect an expressed world rather than a represented world (Anderson, 2010). They "radiate" from one individual to another in a "dyadic space of resonance" (Anderson, 2010, p.80). Griffero (2016) further defined, atmosphere as an extraordinarily repelling representative attitude; it is an echo of the felt space – a vibration in which the bodies, and objects meet and even merge. Thus, emotions are further described as atmospheres that are gradually discharged out (Schmitz et al, (2011). They proceed to argue, "an atmosphere [...] is the complete occupation of a surface less space in the region of experienced presence" (Schmitz et al, 2011, p. 55).

Anderson (2010) has argued that affective dimensions are utilized by those in power to maintain hegemonic ideologies, to repress, and deny new ways of being; i.e. being vulnerable

as a man. An emotional man is, therefore, seen as disruptive to hegemonic masculinity. Affective technologies and investments such as shaming, humiliation and guilty trapping are used (as illustrated in the section on social constructions of male sexual violence against men in chapter 1) to shun emerging subjectivity.

2.6 The Performativity of Emotions

Since affective dimensions are discursively used to maintain hegemonic ideologies, subjects are simultaneously created. Subjects that are passive and that conform to hegemonic ideologies or subjects that do not draw on any cultural forms already available within society (Reeser & Gottzén, 2016). For instance, this is evident when internalised shame and guilt become performative. For example, through affective investments, male victims-survivors of sexual violence internalize shame, fear and humiliation that in turn produce particular forms of male subjectivity. Thus, this is how affect circulates and the ability of bodies to affect other bodies (Deleuze & Guattari 1972; Ahmed, 2004). Therefore, Anderson (2010) argues that affective life can be political in the sense that emotions are manipulated to perform political work that is meant to discipline and control non-conforming bodies as part of the process of normalization. As such, I argue that discourse and affective technologies perform certain work in the construction of male sexual citizenship concerning sexual violence against men.

2.7 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, I explored and discussed affect from multiple perspectives. I highlighted how theorists such as Spinoza, Tomkins, Massumi, and Thrift have theorized affect independent of emotions, they argued that affects are the underlying biological blueprint of emotions. Thus, these affects are neural wires that require triggering to register emotions, then the body acts to express that which has been felt. They proceed to argue that internal and external stimuli can work to evoke feelings which then are embodied to show emotions. This

kind of understanding provides a valuable empirical perception of affects, however, these theorists have been challenged and criticized for their narrow understanding of affects. As such, theories such as Anderson, Wetherell and Ahmed sought to expand the understanding of affect as intertwined with emotions, social and cultural depositions as well as discourses. They argue that emotions cannot be separated from discourse and culture which are influential in their embodiment. They also argued that emotions are not housed within an individual or society, rather they are material and they circulate. Thus, the concept of atmosphere captures the understanding that emotions are always floating and they are dependent on the light of air and its circulation, attachment, and stickiness to the bodies. These bodies could be individual or social.

CHAPTER: THREE

Researching Sexual Violence Against Men

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I review previous research work on sexual violence and sexual violence against men. As such, I open the chapter with a description and discussion of a brief background on sexual violence. I then move on to discuss the history of sexual violence, sexual violence in South Africa, masculinity and sexual violence in South Africa, and masculinity and emotions. I close the chapter by providing a discussion of societal responses to, and discursive constructions of male sexual violence against men.

3.2 Researching Sexual Violence

Sexual violence has been defined as an act in which a person is threatened or into having sexual intercourse or performing other sexual acts without their consent. Sexual violence has been conceptualized as any forced sexual conduct against someone's will (Amstrong et al, 2018; Dartnall & Jewkes, 2013; Kelly, 2013). Sexual violation occurs on a continuum; it can vary from minor incidents such as sexual harassment, and coercive sex to the most horrible kinds of sexual violation such as penetrative rape, and rape that sometimes involves the most horrible physical harm. The issue of consent is also significant in research on sexual violence. In most countries, there is a legal age for an individual to consent to have any sexual relations. For instance, within South African law, children under the age of 18 are legal minors who are considered to not be fully capable of autonomously making decisions concerning sex or any other important life decision without the assistance of parents/legal guardians (Strode & Essack, 2010). The legality of consent to health-related interventions in

South Africa can be used as a basis for ensuring no advantages are taken when it comes to sexual conduct.

Sexual harassment is a form of sexual violence that involves any sexual misconduct that makes the other person uncomfortable. This kind of contact does not involve any kind of penetration (Hill & Kearl, 2011; Welsh et al, 2006). However, it contains some degree of inappropriate touching, inappropriate use of sexual language, or encounter. The harassment can occur once or on multiple occasions and can make the other person feel violated. In addition to other forms of sexual violence, coercive sex occurs when the other part is manipulated or convinced into agreeing to have sexual conduct with another person. This can happen through promising money (or anything of value to the person being violated) knowing that the person offered money would agree due to desperation, yet if the person was not desperate for what is being offered by the perpetrator, the person would not have agreed to have sex (Anderson, (2016; DeGue, & DiLillo, 2004; Pugh & Becker, 2018). Another example is when the victim-survivor is manipulated through blackmail or any other form of manipulation into having sex. Furthermore, penetrative rape is the kind of sexual violence that is considered to be at the end of the sexual violence continuum because of the severity and degree of physical and psychological harm it might cause to the victims. Penetrative rape includes the forceful penetration into the private organs such as the anus, vagina, or mouth using any penetrative objects such as a penis, stick, fingers and so on (Lowe & Rogers, 2017). Sexual violence may also include all forms in one incident, especially when looking at penetrative rape. Perpetrators of sexual violence have previously been believed to be dominantly male and strangers. Recent research has, however, indicated that although stranger rape occurs, many incidents of sexual violence have been reported to be perpetrated by those close to the victim. These include parents, uncles, intimate partners, and people of care.

Sexual violence has largely been studied as an issue affecting women. Generally, much of the research done focuses on how women are victims of sexual violence, physical abuse, and any other form of abuse in comparison to men who are dominantly researched as perpetrators of violence (Dartnall & Jewkes, 2013; World Health Organization, 2013 and Kalra & Bhugra, 2013). Previous work in this line of research has focused on intimate partner violence, gender-based violence, and domestic violence (Rennison & Welchans, 2000; Finkel & Eckhardt, 2013; Miller & McCaw, 2019). All this research constitutes issues related to the abuse of women. Although there is ample research on violence, the nature of the violence that is explored is typically physical rather than emotional and sexual. Concerning documented violence against men, it typically focuses on the sexual violence of young boys. Oftentimes the main aim of research on sexual violence against boys does not seek to understand how boys cope with victimization or to explore their experiences as victims of rape. Rather, the research typically explores how the sexual violence of young boys can be a determinant for increased aggression and risky behaviours in adulthood such as alcohol abuse and unprotected sex. Thus, the social response to sexual violence against boys situates their sexual violation concerning problematic adulthood behaviour.

Previous research on sexual violence tends to be gendered, classist, and racialized (Crenshaw, 2013). Thus, poor Black women dominate the participant groups of much of the research or are the primary participants in relation to research on violence written about the racialized frames of sexual violence in South Africa (Helman, 2017). In South Africa, sexual violence cannot be understood without taking into account the legacy of colonialism and apartheid, and the ways in which racialized power dynamics continue to shape social and cultural attitudes towards sexual violence (Helman, 2018; Judge, 2017). Helman (2017) highlights how the apartheid system created a culture of violence, particularly against Black

bodies, and how this culture has persisted post-apartheid. Helman (2017) argues that sexual violence against Black women, in particular, is often dismissed or minimized as a result of deeply entrenched racial and gender stereotypes that depict Black women as hypersexual and promiscuous. Thus, sexual violence has been used as a tool of oppression against Black communities in South Africa. She notes that during the apartheid era, sexual violence was used as a form of psychological warfare against Black communities, and that this legacy has continued in the post-apartheid era through the use of sexual violence as a weapon in gang violence and other forms of community conflict. Overall, Helman (2018) analysis of the racialized frames of sexual violence in South Africa underscores the need for a comprehensive and intersectional approach to addressing this issue, one that takes into account the ways in which power, privilege, and inequality intersect with gender and sexuality. Thus, interrogating the idea of ‘unrapeability’. Helman (2018, p.2) argues, “these racialized, gendered constructions have produced complexly disparate notions of respectability and harm, in relation to which only certain woman, at particular historical moments and under certain circumstances, are able to claim status as ‘legitimate’ victims/survivors of rape”.

Queer and feminist scholar, Melanie Judge (2017) examines how racial logics has been intrinsic to the systemic perpetuation of violence and inequality in South Africa, both during the colonial period and in the post-apartheid era. She argues that racialization is not simply a matter of categorizing people according to physical features, but is instead a deeply embedded system of power relations that shapes every aspect of society. She further highlights how such racialized violence affects different groups in different ways, and how it intersects with other forms of oppression such as gender, class, and sexuality. The violence of racialisation is, thus, a constant influence to remind ourselves in considering sexual violence. And yet, interestingly, Judge also critiques and cautions the tendency to only read race as exclusive explanatory

framework when making sense of violence in South Africa. That is, she cautions the tendency to rely on racializing discourse to make sense of perpetrators and victims alike, calling this a racialisation of violence. This caution is evident as pointed out before in Helman's and Gqola's powerful critiques of unrapable bodies.

3.3. The nature of Sexual Violence in South Africa

South African communities have been reported to be characterised by high rates of sexual violence in comparison to the United States and other countries around the world (Adar & Stevens, 2000; Petersen et al, 2005; Di Silvio, 2011). Out of the 500 000 sexual offences reported in South Africa between the years 2011 and 2012, children were 40% of this statistic; women were 48.5% of this statistic; and men formed 11.4% of this statistic. Thus, according to these statistics, women and children are typical victims of sexual violence. However, due to factors such as social stigma, sexual violence tends to be an under-reported phenomenon, thus, the statistics may not be the true representation of what actual amount of sexual violence incidents occurring (Sivakumaran, 2007). It is estimated that every year there are 118.2 rape incidents per 100, 000 women (South African Institute of Race Relations, 2014; SAPS, 2014). However, as 9897 of these incidents occurred in the Eastern Cape Province (a ratio of 150 incidents per 100 000), it appears that sexual violence is more prevalent in the Province than elsewhere in the country (SAPS, 2014).

According to StatsSA (2001), most victims were assaulted by known perpetrators from their community (34, 2%), followed by spouses or lovers (16, 8%). In 25, 1% of sexual violation cases, perpetrators were a relative, followed by 24, 0% who were victimised by known community members. The statistics around the type of perpetrator contradict the popular belief that the vast majority of sexual violence is perpetrated by strangers. Reported statistics prove otherwise. Similar to the South Africa statistics, it has been reported, in the

United States of America, that approximately 73% of sexual violence are committed by someone the victim knows, 28% of rapists are intimate partners, and 7% of the violation is committed by the relative of the victim (Newhope, n.d). In South Africa, StatsSA (2001) reported that 88, 1% of rapes were carried out by a single offender and in most cases, by threats of physical injury, and the use of knives (68, 0%) or at gunpoint (16, 5%). Almost half of all rape cases (47, 3%) occurred inside the residence of victims (StatsSA, 2002).

In a recent StatsSA report (2021) The least number of cases was recorded in 2020/2021 (46 214) and 2016/2017 (49 660). Of the total sexual offence cases recorded between the year 2011 and 2021, the most common were rape (79%) and sexual assault (15%), while fewer cases were of attempted sexual offences (3%) and contact sexual offences (2%). Data compiled by the South African Police Service (SAPS) as at September 2022 suggested that Gauteng Province recorded the most number of sexual offences in South Africa (21%), followed by, KwaZulu Natal (18%), Eastern Cape (16%), Western Cape (11%) Limpopo (8%), Mpumalanga (7%) and the Free State Province (6%) had the least number of reported cases. However, these figures do not necessarily show which areas have pervasive sexual violence due to varying populations amongst the Provinces. Areas with higher populations are expected to record higher numbers of reported cases compared to those with lower populations. Common places of sexual violence occurrences were at residences of victim/perpetrator constituting of 64% of total recorded cases, followed by public areas such as parks, parking areas and streets (30%). Relatively lower occurrences were reported in modes of transport (4%) and educational institutions, hotels, holiday resorts (2%).

In light of these statistics, it is apparent that sexual violence is a pandemic within South African communities. Women and children form the largest population affected by sexual violence. Although reports of male sexual violence are minimal as compared to women and

children, the under-reportage associated with male rape makes it difficult to have an in-depth understanding of its occurrence. The statistics also indicate the importance of understanding the type of offender/perpetrator, and the time, place and space where the sexually violent incidents occur. The two aspects are significant in warranting victim worthiness. In addition to the two aspects, the action that the victim takes in the aftermath of the sexual violence incident is equally crucial in the negotiation of victim worthiness. The important question to ponder in this case is: What warrants victim worthiness? To address this question, the next subsections describe and discuss the typical perpetrator, time, space and place of the incidents and the aftermath action, or reaction. The typical perpetrator of sexual violence has always been thought and described as a stranger, strong and muscular man. This image of the typical perpetrator has been traditionally used as a measure for the qualification of victim worthiness. Thus, other types of perpetrators were left out of the question. However, recent research on sexual violence debunks and labels this as one of the myths of sexual violence. According to Rape Crisis (n.d) perpetrators of sexual violence have been reported to be people close to the victim such as an intimate partner, relative and an acquaintance.

In addition, time, space and place of the occurrence of the incident is a vital aspect in the negotiation of sexual violence. The victim is usually asked to provide a detailed narrative of where the incident took place as well as the time. With regard to place, some places and spaces such as a club, tavern or a bar have become synonym to violence, hence talking about being raped at the tavern could discredit the victim's story. Victims who report to be violated in a particular place at a particular time are likely to be blamed for it. In South Africa, spaces such as the taxi industry have been recently researched concerning taxi rape. Temporary spaces such as the school and colleges and work spaces where high rates of rape culture have been reported in recent research within South Africa, and living spaces such as the home have also been

reported to have the potential for the occurrence of sexual violence. These include the urban and "township"/rural areas, spaces such as public bars, toilets, homes, and prisons are having also been reported to have high occurrence of sexual violence incidents.

Lastly, in the aftermath of sexual violence experience, the victim is expected to follow key protocol social and processual scripts. Thus, victims are usually questioned regarding the reportage of the incident, if they have disclosed the incident to someone, or if they have visited the hospital for a sexual violence kit. Most of this information is used as evidence especially within courtrooms. Thus, victim-survivors need to prove that they were indeed violated by providing detailed and logical narrative so as to warrant their victim worthiness.

3.4. Sexual violence against men

While the term 'Gender-based violence' is widely used in global literature, its meaning has become identical to sexual victimization and abuse of women (Lewis, 2009). Sexual violence scholars (Del Zotto & Jones 2002; Stempl, 2008; Apperlay, 2015; Sivakumaran, 2017) acknowledge and seem to reach a consensus on the lack of male sexual violence studies and pose that the international community is not tackling the issue. Storr (2011) challenges that we must recognize that men too can be weak and vulnerable to sexual violence which may constitute oral and anal rape including with objects, genital violence, forced sterilization; such as castration, sexual slavery, forced sexual activity with other people, animals, or corpses, and other forms of sexualised violence.

In other countries, the legal coding categories used in some jurisdictions, deny the very existence of male rape, and Ferrales et al, (2016) highlighted the Sudanese Criminal Code as a case in point. However, Nagai et al (2008) conducted a survey of men living in a conflict-affected state in Sudan and the results revealed that almost half (46.9%) had experienced or directly witnessed the sexual abuse of a man, confirming its silent existence. Based on the

limited literature on the men rape subject, and the observation that male victims are an often-unnoticed group that we neglect in terms of recognition, assistance and resources, Apperlay (2015) suggested that researchers and the United Nations should lead in reporting and condemning sexual violence against men by identifying men in policy and ensuring perpetrators are brought to justice internationally.

Male sexual violence during apartheid in South Africa was a significant issue, influenced by a range of social, cultural, and political factors. The history of colonialism in South Africa contributed to a culture of violence and power imbalances, including sexual violence. For example, European colonizers often perpetuated and normalized sexual violence against indigenous populations, which had lasting effects on social norms and power dynamics. Foster (2011) reported how Black men were forced to have sex with white women during slavery. This was not any different during the apartheid regime, with its policies of racial segregation and control, created a fragmented society with vast disparities and tensions. These divisions and inequalities exacerbated various forms of violence, including sexual violence. This contributed to a culture that tolerated and perpetuated male sexual violence. Foster (2011) further explained that Black men faced various forms of sexual violence and dehumanization under both state security forces and fellow inmates in prisons and detention centers.

However, it is worth noting that due to social stigmas, cultural norms, and the pervasive silence surrounding male victimhood, the experiences of male survivors of sexual violence during apartheid were often overlooked or underreported (Steinberg, 2004). It is only in recent years that more attention has been given to acknowledging and addressing the experiences of male survivors of sexual violence during this period. In addition, incidents of male sexual violence occurred in the mining hostels in South Africa, particularly between Black men during the pre-1994 era. Moodie (1988) reported that the mining hostels were large dormitory-style

accommodations provided by mining companies for male mine workers, who often lived in close quarters for extended periods. These hostels were characterized by overcrowding, poor living conditions, and limited privacy, which contributed to an environment where sexual violence could occur. Post-apartheid South Africa started witnessing a change in social policy to addressing the past violences. Thus, the post-apartheid Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) established in 1995 provided a platform for survivors to share their experiences, including instances of sexual violence. While the TRC primarily focused on human rights violations committed by the state, it also recognized and provided a space for survivors of sexual violence, regardless of gender, to come forward and have their stories heard. Additionally, efforts to address male sexual violence in South Africa have involved legal reforms, awareness campaigns, support services for survivors, and the promotion of gender equality. However, it remains an ongoing challenge that requires sustained efforts at multiple levels of society to create lasting change. The changes in the Sexual offense act of 1957 to the amended Sexual offences Act of 2007 showcases the different steps taken to address sexual violence. For instance, the 1957 Act was framed in gendered language, with the presumption that victims of sexual offenses were typically women and perpetrators were typically men allowed for the recognition and understanding of diverse victims and offenders. The issues of consent and marital rape were not explicitly outlined in the original Act and was later changed to criminalize marital rape. The concept of consent in relation to sexual offenses may have been limited or defined in a way that did not adequately address issues such as coercion or incapacity to give consent. These changes in definitions of consent are now available to constitute a sexual violence offence. Thus, the 2007 act aimed to address shortcomings in the 1957 legislation and bring it in line with contemporary understandings of sexual offenses, consent, and victim rights.

3.4.1 Sexual Violence Against Men in Prisons

Peel, et al. (2000) conducted research to estimate the frequency and effects of sexual abuse of men in detention in Sri Lanka by reviewing records of 137 Sri-Lankan men who had been referred to the Medical Foundation for the Care of Victims of Torture between the years 1997 and 1998; and conducting interviews. Of the 184 men, 38 (21%) reported having been victims of sexual violence while in detention. Forms of sexual abuse included assault and receiving electric shocks to the genitals, having sticks pushed through the anus, being forced to perform oral masturbation to fellow inmates and being forced to rape each other as a source of "entertainment" for officers and being raped. The study observed that men who had been raped were much younger, on average than those who had not been raped, suggesting that the perpetrators chose the younger and more vulnerable men to rape. The common myths associated with shame or questioned masculinity to male sexual violence victims were evident as most of the abused men did not report to authorities.

In the United States, Johnson et al (2000) studied data from state prisons and found that approximately 20% of male inmates reported a form of sexual abuse while in jail, of which 7% were raped during a period of only 12 months, 4.5% of the nation's state and federal prisoners experienced sexual victimization and 3.2% of jail inmates reported sexual victimization in six months. Stemple (2009) noted that these figures highlighted a significant problem considering that approximately 2.3 million people are incarcerated per year in the United States and a further 200,000 people per year in immigration detention.

Wooden (2012) conducted survey research through the issuance of questionnaires to inmates at a facility in California, USA to analyse the proportion of male inmates who had been sexually assaulted and to identify the demographic characteristics of the victims. The study found that in incarceration facilities, gay male inmates were more than four times as

likely as heterosexually identified inmates to become victims of sexual assault. Non-heterosexual inmates who identified as gay, bisexual, or transgender comprised a mere 3.7% of the prisoners, yet accounted for 57.2% of reports of sexual assault in detention. There was a higher prevalence of male sexual violence against nonviolent, first-time offenders who were small in physical stature, weak, shy and new and inexperienced to prison life.

Rape in South African male prisons is a serious and complex issue that has garnered attention and concern from various quarters. There have been reports and anecdotal evidence suggesting that sexual violence, including rape, occurs within South African male prisons (Gear, 2002; 2003; 2007). The prevalence of male sexual violence within prisons can also be traced back to the apartheid era where male political prisoners and detainees were often subjected to torture and sexual violence as a means of exerting control, asserting power, and undermining their dignity. These acts of sexual violence included beatings, sexual assault, forced nudity, and the use of objects for penetration. The aim was to dehumanize, demoralize, and break the spirit of those opposing the apartheid regime (Moodie, 1988; Gear, 2003; Steinberg, 2004). In post-apartheid South Africa, rape in prisons is often rooted in power dynamics, with perpetrators exerting control and dominance over their victims (Gear, 2002; Gear & Ngubeni, 2004). These power dynamics may be influenced by factors such as gang affiliations, social hierarchies, and physical strength. Gear and Ngubeni (2002) and Gear and Ngubeni, (2003) argue that certain individuals may be more vulnerable to sexual violence in prisons, such as younger or weaker inmates, those with perceived lower social status, or individuals who are seen as non-conforming to traditional gender roles. Factors contributing to the higher rate of male sexual violence in prisons include inadequate measures to protect inmates, overcrowding, and limited oversight. Additionally, there is also high rates of stigma and underreporting. Thus, the stigma and fear associated with being a survivor of rape in a

prison setting can deter individuals from reporting incidents or seeking support. The fear of being labeled as weak, homosexual, or victimized can further perpetuate silence and hinder access to justice or appropriate healthcare for survivors (Gear & Ngubeni, 2002).

3.5 Masculinity and sexual violence in South Africa and Globally

According to Connell (1983), hegemonic masculinity refers to a set of cultural ideals and norms that define what it means to be a "real man" in a given society or context. Connell (1983) argues that hegemonic masculinity is not simply a matter of individual Behavior or personal identity, but rather a social and cultural phenomenon that is shaped by broader power structures and social hierarchies. She notes that hegemonic masculinity is often associated with dominant groups in society, such as white, heterosexual, middle-class men, and that it is used to justify and reinforce gender inequality and other forms of oppression. Connell (1983) also highlights the ways in which hegemonic masculinity is not a fixed or static construct, but rather something that is constantly being contested and renegotiated by individuals and groups within society. She notes that there are often tensions and conflicts within dominant masculinities themselves, and that alternative forms of masculinity, such as gay or working-class masculinities, may challenge or resist hegemonic ideals in various ways. Morrell (2013) argues that the recent use of hegemonic masculinity in South Africa has marked a strong turn in the study of men from a gendered perspective and gender problems within South Africa. Thus the concept of hegemonic masculinity opens an avenue to the theorization of the role of men not as just oppressors but also as victims of unjust gender systems and as potential allies for gender equality. This aligns with Connell (1983) argument that not all men have access to hegemonic masculinity. As such, they are also vulnerable and are subjugated to their ideologies.

Research about heterosexual couples' negotiation of and communication about HIV/AIDS-indicated that men are dominantly taking, and making decisions in safer sex practices (Mkhize & Njawala, 2016). Mkhize and Njawala (2016) indicated that hegemonic masculinity was apparent in three ways. Firstly, men tend to date younger women whom they believe are easy to control. Secondly, the men seemed to be more financially stable than the women they date and lastly, there were differences in partner education levels with the male partner being more educated.

In line with Elliot's (2016) argument that masculinities are prone to change, a study done in the South of Australia indicated that hegemonic masculinity can change over time to suit the lifestyle of today's generation. Traditionally, dominant practices of masculinity are now replaced by other ways of gender and different ways of performing masculinity. Bartholomeus (2013) in the study about colluding or challenging hegemonic masculinity with young boys, found out that young boys engage themselves in plural masculinities and in plural gender activities including displaying intelligence instead of aggression/violence, taking part in "feminine" activities, showing care and love to others, and making friend across genders.

Bartholomeus (2013) argues that overlooking subordinate masculinities does not give room for moving away from hegemonic masculinity as a monolithic concept. Her study results debunked the constructions of "boys play with boys" and demonstrated that men show emotions in the constructions of their masculinity. Therefore, these themes are different from the hegemonic performed masculinity written by Connell and others.

It has also been argued that sexual violence is used as a tool for power at both individual and institutional levels (Ray, 2014). Jewkes et al (2010) argued that sexual violence occurs in repeated and patterned ways within social relations. Thus, heteropatriarchy fosters homophobia and the subordination of women. Exercising power in this manner has led to issues relating to

HIV and AIDS in women – due to a lack of power in negotiating safer sex (Jewkes et al., 2010). This argument has been evident in feminist research on gender-based violence where male dominance is exercised through violence to control women.

In this reviewed research, it is important to note that male bodies are discursively constructed as perpetrators of violence that occurs to women. Without contesting this discourse, what most masculinity and violence research fails to do is to understand that the "problematic" male behaviour might be a result of gender role expectations set out by traditional and hegemonic masculinity ideologies. Hence, critically researching men within their hegemonic marginality (Ratele, 2014) serves to produce different understandings of men, gender, and masculinity.

“The Second Wave of Violence Scholarship: South African Synergies,” (Bowman et al, 2015) is a critical review of recent scholarship on violence in South Africa. Bowman et al (2015) argue that there has been a "second wave" of violence scholarship in South Africa that has emerged in the post-apartheid era, building on earlier work from the 1980s and 1990s. According to Bowman et al (2015), this second wave of scholarship is characterized by a more nuanced and interdisciplinary approach to the study of violence, one that takes into account the complex social and cultural factors that contribute to violence in South Africa. They highlight the ways in which recent scholarship has focused on issues such as gender, race, class, and historical trauma, and has challenged earlier assumptions about the causes and consequences of violence in the country. They also note that this second wave of scholarship has been shaped by broader changes in the political and social landscape of South Africa, including the transition to democracy and the ongoing struggle against poverty and inequality. They argue that this new scholarship has the potential to inform policy and intervention efforts aimed at addressing violence in South Africa, and to promote greater understanding and empathy for

victims and survivors of violence. Overall, Bowman et al.'s analysis of the second wave of violence scholarship in South Africa underscores the need for continued interdisciplinary and intersectional approaches to the study of violence, as well as for policies and interventions that are grounded in a deep understanding of the social and cultural context in which violence occurs. They also emphasize the importance of recognizing the resilience and agency of individuals and communities affected by violence, and of working towards more equitable and just societies that promote human rights and dignity for all.

Additionally, Coetzee and du Toit (2018) explore the ways in which sexual violence in South Africa is intertwined with the legacies of colonialism and apartheid. The authors argue that colonialism and apartheid created a culture of sexual violence and domination that continues to shape gender relations in South Africa today. According to Coetzee and du Toit (2018), decolonizing sexual violence in South Africa requires a shift away from the Western-centric, individualistic approach to sexual violence that has dominated much of the discourse on this issue. They argue that this approach fails to take into account the unique historical and social context of sexual violence in South Africa, and instead reproduces colonial power dynamics by positioning the West as the source of knowledge and solutions. Therefore, Coetzee and du Toit (2018) call for a decolonial approach to sexual violence in South Africa that centres the experiences and perspectives of those affected. They argue that this requires a deeper understanding of the ways in which sexual violence is intertwined with other forms of violence, such as racial and economic violence, and a recognition of the ways in which colonial power structures continue to shape gender relations in the country. Thus, by recognizing the ways in which colonial power structures continue to shape gender relations in the country, people can work towards a more just and equitable society for all (Coetzee & du Toit, 2018).

3.6 Masculinity and Affect

Drawing on Ahmed's (2004) conceptualization of affect, investing in understanding how discursive and affective logics surface masculinities in particular ways in context of 'feminising' violence allows for the "decolonization" of traditional masculinities, that have, historically, perceived and constructed men as strong, unemotional, not vulnerable and so forth. Hardt (1999) argues that affective lens helps us to understand the role of affect and emotion in the subject's emergence. Reeser (2016, p. 11) argues that "autonomous affect may break the hold of masculinity on a discretely defined male body or it may disintegrate a body, rendering it vulnerable or connected to other bodies". What Reeser (2016) is referring to here is the "new strategy" in reconstructing masculinities, at the same time, bearing in mind that allowing oneself to be vulnerable, to be emotional, to "break the hold of masculinity" on a male body is not a bad thing simply an opportunity for gender construction of men who can acknowledge the pain, hurt, vulnerability or love and care, men who can allow themselves to share these feelings without feeling like they are not living up to the "ideal man". Affect, therefore, constructs an "unending chain of gender becomings" that were non-existent before "the active discharge of emotion" (Reeser, 2016, p. 111).

In chapter One, I discussed the role of gender and masculinity in male vulnerability, arguing that social constructions of gender and masculinity do not leave room for men to be "in touch" with their inner emotional selves rather men are culturally constrained to be stoic. According to Reeser and Gottzen (2018), this was rooted in a western masculine emotional regime where men were taught to relate emotion to weakness, thus, being emotional did not form part of masculinity. It has been argued that this regime constructed problems of individual men by emotionally crippling them through stoic practices. Which has also been criticised for creating angry, depressed and suicidal men. As a result, traditional notions of masculinity place

distance between men and their own emotional lives which makes it difficult for men to know their own emotional needs, especially how to emotionally respond to others (Seidler, 2007) cited in Reeser and Gottzen (2018). Therefore, work on affect and emotion provides alternate thinking avenues for masculinity's intersection with cultural upbringing, and to emote, as well as giving the freedom for the male body to produce other forms of being that are not already available outside social constraints (Reeser & Gottzen, 2018).

In their studies of the semiotic construction of masculinity and affect, Pimenta and Natividade (2013) found, after reviewing different magazines' cover pages and advertisements of different products alongside men advertisers, that men on these covers were portrayed embracing previously prohibited male social behaviours. These behaviours included sensitivity and showing emotions. de Oliveira Pimenta and Natividade's (2013) analysis highlighted that new masculine identity is connected with care, softness, style and good looks. These are characteristics that the traditional masculinity ideology defines as feminine. This was also evident in Reeser's (2016) examples of film segments and their representation of affect through non-discursive plays. Men within these films are portrayed acting outside the social constructs of hegemonic masculinity. Thus, they are, in the film, expected to perform the capitalist system and be responsible for their families. However, the man conveyed fails to speak, he sobs and loses the power to act, runs off and leaves his children and wife behind, and falls into sadness and cry. These embodiments of affect are a significant portrayal of the deconstruction of hegemonic masculinity, debunking traditional notions of associating emotions with femininity, and challenging stereotypes linked to an emotional man and gayness. Reeser (2016, p. 115) challenges this stereotype by arguing that "queer expression related to affect may signify non-normative or partially transformed masculinity more than they depict same-sex sexuality per se, functioning as a kind of a trope for masculinity's becoming". Consequently, the use of affect

theory in my study of men and sexual violence allows for the possible constructions of new masculine identities (e.g. men who can embrace the victim-survivor identity), acknowledgement of vulnerability that comes with being the victim of rape and sexual violence and realization of new ways of being through their narratives.

However, de Oliveira Pimenta and Natividade (2013) indicate that there is still a long way to go as far as the creation of new masculine genders is concerned. This was due to their findings that some texts of discourses still feed the old ways of being a man characterized by no emotional display, great achievements and power. de Oliveira Pimenta and Natividade's (2013) concern speaks to Jakupcak et al (2003) findings in their study '*Masculinity and emotionality: an investigation of men's primary and secondary emotional responses*'. In their analysis, they reported that masculinity ideologies and masculine gender roles were negatively related to men's global affect intensity, thus, they were related to men's fear of expressing emotions.

3.7. Biopower and Affective Relations in Male Rape Subject Constructions

Biopower refers to the practice of present-day society and how people are regulated through different technologies of power for the achievement of subjugation of bodies and the control of society (Anderson, 2010; Cisney & Morar, 2015). In Foucault's work, biopower came into being when there was a shift from sovereign power –which understood power as a point of everything, rules and regulations on subjectivity. Shifting from sovereign power to disciplinary bio-power allows for the thinking of the "self" which produces different types of subjects. Foucault argues that these subjects have different access to power such as categories of the "normal" and the "abnormal". It creates, therefore, particular ways of knowing subjectivity. Power shifted from disciplinary methods that used absolute violence targeting inflicting pain on the body to "gentle violence" in the name of humanitarian ways of punishment located within the discourses of care. As a result, power is exercised through institutions, such as political, educational, social and religious institutions as a way of sustaining hegemonic ideologies within society.

Turning back to sexual violence against men, as illustrated in the above discussion; how women's bodies are "grievable", "rapable" whilst men's bodies are not, I argue that biopower is performed through these discourses. However, not only discourse but also affective dimensions are used as strategies to discipline, to control actions, behaviours and any beliefs that threaten hegemonic ideologies within society (i.e. masculinity). Therefore, the concern is put on securing and maintaining forms of power through the construction of subjects that conform to the laid out societal norms whereas subjects that threaten these norms become prone to discipline. It is a way of normalization (Anderson, 2010). Contrary to the traditional, physical type of disciplining, biopower uses "humanitarian" methods of discipline and control

where affective dimensions become "object-target" for discipline. Anderson (2010) has argued that affective dimensions are utilized by those in power to maintain hegemonic ideologies, to repress, and deny new ways of being; i.e. being vulnerable as a man. An emotional man is, therefore, seen as disruptive to hegemonic masculinity. Affective technologies and investments such as shaming, humiliation and guilty trapping are used (as illustrated in the section on social constructions of male sexual violence against men) to shun emerging male sexual citizenship.

Since affective dimensions are discursively used to maintain hegemonic ideologies, new subjects are simultaneously created. Subjects that are passive and that conform to hegemonic ideologies or new subjects that do not draw on any cultural forms already available within society (Reeser & Gottzén, 2016). For instance, this is evident when internalised shame and guilt become performative. Through affective investments, male victims-survivors of sexual violence internalize shame, fear and humiliation that in turn produce docile forms of male subjectivity. Thus, this is how affect circulates and the ability of bodies to affect other bodies (Spinoza 1994, Deleuze & Guattari 1972; Ahmed, 2004). Therefore, Anderson (2010) argues that affective life can be political in the sense that emotions are manipulated to perform political work that is meant to discipline and control non-conforming bodies as part of the process of normalization. As such, I argue that discourse and affective technologies perform certain work in the construction of male sexual citizenship.

3.8 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, I reviewed research broadly on violence, sexual violence, sexual violence in South Africa, and sexual violence against men. The nature of sexual violence against men, masculinity and emotions. Current research highlights high rate of sexual violence in South African, and around the globe; with sexual violence against men being sidelined both in research as in the ways in which it reported.

CHAPTER FOUR:

Methodology

“The world is a thing in our consciousness... that is absolutely impossible for one person, but becomes a reality for two. The word is a direct expression of the historical nature of human consciousness” (Vygotsky, 1986, p. 256).

4.1. Introduction

This chapter describes and discusses the methodology and methods that inform the study. It also highlights the ontological and epistemological philosophical underpinnings of the study. I provide a subjectivism ontological position relating to social constructivism. These philosophical underpinnings are useful in understanding theoretical choices of affect and discourse as analytical lenses. Thus, this chapter speaks to the design, data collection tools, sampling methods and procedures, and data analysis that were used to gather and make sense of the data.

4.2. Choosing and Doing a Qualitative Research Methodology

The decision for a qualitative methodology as the broader research paradigm for this study is determined by the connection between the research objectives, the epistemological and philosophical foundations of qualitative research. To yield a comprehensive understanding of the theoretical and conceptual underpinnings for male sexual violence as well as the social response to male sexual violence, data had to be drawn from the online podcasts that publicly addressed sexual violence against men. These podcasts were a channel through which the public was sensitised to male sexual violence narratives. Thus, the study drew on non-numerical and subjective data that could not be statistically quantified. Therefore, utilizing a qualitative research methodology was more suitable for this study because a qualitative paradigm employs discourse in its intrinsic form and reserves the form and content of the

analysed texts. Qualitative methodologies are utilized to gather and make sense of data that seek to explore meaning-making for individuals, groups of people and communities (Creswell, 1998). Thus, qualitative research provides an entryway to the understandings of social constructions of perceptions and meanings as well as the ways in which these meanings vary depended on context and time. As a result, systems of meaning are ultimately subjective and personal (Dey, 1993). In this research, using qualitative data was significant in yielding valuable information about discourses emerging from the data. Additionally, it allowed the researcher to analyse male sexual violence experiences as well as understand affective (feelings and emotions underlying talk) and discursive dimensions concerning male sexual violence.

Following male sexual violence narratives, and societal responses to male sexual violence, a qualitative design conceptualizes lived experiences as social constructs, and as comparative (Deacon et al., 1999). Thus, as opposed to the quantitative methods that are objectivist and positivist in their research approach – focusing on numerical data and rationalization, qualitative researchers are subjective and anti-positivist in their approach. This means that the social life, culture and context of the subject being studied are essential in reality construction (Creswell, 2009; 2013). Therefore, qualitative methodologies differ from the quantitative methodologies based on what constitutes reality, and this difference influenced the research style and methods used in this study on male sexual violence. Subjectivists argue that there is no social world separate from social cultures, norms and beliefs of the society, and that characterizes people's "reality and social world" (Filmer, 1972, p. 49). As such, social and cultural institutions and ideologies are perceived to be constantly reconstructed and amended through the numerous experiences of everyday life (Makwambeni, 2018).

Therefore, qualitative design, attests to be the most suitable methodology for understanding societal responses to male sexual violence within natural settings, socio-political

and economic positioning. Social science research has foregrounded the necessity to study people within their natural environment (Cropley, 2015). Thus, central aim of a qualitative study is to provide in-depth descriptions and understandings of social actions and events in terms of specific context rather than trying to generalize the findings numerically and objectively. While quantitative methods use numerical data to answer research questions, qualitative researchers view numbers as a source of enquiry and a platform for further investigation and analysis. The choice of qualitative methodology was also useful due its flexibility in reading and making sense of data. Unlike quantitative research, qualitative research enables the researcher to "proceed inferentially from particulars to more general statements with a flexibility of research design" (Makwambeni, 2013, p. 113). Thus, qualitative research methodology allows for a relatively open and unstructured research strategy as opposed to one that comes with a strict and already laid out structure that limits the openness of research investigation. The flexibility of the qualitative research allows qualitative researchers to pursue other meaningful issues that may emerge from data corpus (Strelitz, 2002) as cited in (Makwambeni, 2013).

4.3 Epistemological and Philosophical Underpinnings of Qualitative Research

Tin this study, I argued that a qualitative paradigm is the most suitable methodology to implement to understand male sexual violence in specific socio-cultural, economic and political settings from which these meanings are shaped (Cropley, 2022). As such, tin this section of the chapter, I identify and discuss the key epistemological and philosophical underpinnings of qualitative research which inform the choice of affective and discursive analytical lens in understanding male sexual violence.

4.3.1 Phenomenology

Qualitative studies are largely situated within phenomenological philosophy. Phenomenology looks at human behavior, human thoughts and feelings as products of how people interpret their own world (Umanailo, 2019). Consistent with its phenomenological basis, qualitative studies are of the assumption that the research of human beings is a creative and subjective journey that investigates how the subject constructs knowledge and value. And this is point of departure for a qualitative researcher. Therefore, researchers using qualitative methods seek to understand the social world from the perspective of the owners of the narratives (Bryman, 1984; Creswell, 2009). Cropely (2022) concisely captures the ontological basis of phenomenology and its implications on the practice of qualitative research in overall, and particularly, in social science studies.

The phenomenologist's, and the qualitative methodologists' function is to capture the social construction process. To understand human behaviour, the phenomenologist seeks to view the world from the perspective of the subject intertwined with the social, cultural, values, and beliefs associated with the subject. Therefore, on these basis, qualitative research in social sciences, particularly in this study, focuses on how knowledge is created and how the subject views and interprets the world (Cropoley, 2015; 2022.). Furthermore, qualitative research is informed, therefore, by the understanding that knowledge and reality are socially constructed (Barbosa da Silva, 2008). Additionally, it asserts that individuals do not only respond rather they are co-creators of social ideologies and reality. Consistent with sexual violence directed towards men, and societal responses to such violence, the qualitative methodology phenomenological orientation stirs this study towards attempting to recover how the society and male victim-survivors of sexual violence construct knowledge, meaning and reality concerning sexual violence experiences.

4.3.2 Social Constructivism

The phenomenological turn to social science studies allows social constructivism to remain one of the main intellectual traditions that underpins modern-day qualitative studies in understanding society, human behaviour and meaning-making. Social constructivism is a synthesis of multiple theories diffused into one form. Traditionally, I have been perceived as an assimilation of both behaviorist and cognitive ideals. With the works of Lev Vygotsky (1986), sociocultural constructivism social constructivism went on to include theories about language, thought, and their mediation by society. Vygotsky (1986) argued that culture, other people, community and society are influential in knowledge production. Therefore, social constructivism relates to how knowledge is built about people, objects and everyday experiences, incidents, and the society through reflections and knowledge construction (Shor, 1992) as cited in (Hirtle, 1996). The primary goal of constructivism is a "democratic and critical" understanding of knowledge (Hirtle, 1996, p. 91).

In using methods grounded in social constructivism, knowledge is mediated through social context. Therefore, language including words and written texts play a mediating role within the constructivist environment. Thus, this connects to my choices in using discourse analysis in reading and making sense of male narratives of sexual violence (Pierre, 1996). The subject, in this instance, actively construct a world, and language assists in that construction (Kutz & Roskelly, 1991) as cited in (Pierre, 1996). Thus, spoken and written words in social contexts mediate meanings that are useful in leading the construction of concepts and knowledge. Foucault (1971) argued that subjects think and create knowledge based on the language they use within a particular discourse. Consequently, when subjects actively construct knowledge in social construct – mediated through language, it provides not only an important construction environment, rather the potential to transform the subject's social and cultural

reality (Pierre, 1996). The social constructivism tradition has informed modern-day qualitative social research based on its exclusive enunciation and conceptualisation of the connection between the subject, culture, context, and meaning. The social constructivism methodology is, thus, significant to this study, not only in comprehending societal responses to male sexual violence but also in accounting for the discourses and affects emerging from the podcasts that surfaced within specific sociocultural webs.

4.4. Research Design: Discourse Analysis – Methodological Implications

Discourse is informed by an epistemological framework of social constructionism. Harris (1981) described a discourse approach as a method to obtain a new understanding of a specific text beyond descriptive linguistics. Thus, the social context of language use is essential in the construction of 'truth' and meaning-making. In addition, Bauer and Gaskell (2000) argue that discursive research rejects the idea that language is simply a "neutral" means of describing and reflecting the world, rather its fundamental interest is within the construction of human experiences. Thus, they argued that a discursive approach to research has four key themes: 1) a concern with discourse itself; 2) A perspective on language as constrictive and constructed; 3) A prominence on discourse as performative and; 4) a belief in the historical organization of discourse. Discourse analysis is a research method for studying written, and or spoken language concerning its social context (Bauer & Gaskell, 2000). It aims to understand how language is used in real-life situations (Bauer & Gaskell, 2000). This study employed a discursive approach to research as a way of understanding how talk, text or written language is used to construct human experiences and social life. In the data corpus, online podcasts containing conversations around experiences of male victims-survivors of sexual violence were part of the text analyzed. Societal responses to male sexual violence were accessed through the use of online podcasts as sources for data collection. Thus, the discursive approach is defined

as a glue that sticks together the public and the individual. From a discursive framework, a narrative is understood as, "a construction, in talk, of sequence and consequence" (Taylor, 2006, p.95). Additionally, viewed a construction and a discursive resource. It encompasses: "stories, excuses, myths, reasons for doing and not doing", what might more specifically be referred to as, "micro-narratives" (Bruner, 1991, p.4). Micro-narratives, have been described in the literature as, "little narratives" (O'Donovan, 2006, p.475), and as "small, personal stories" (Fok, 2011, p.503) or "everyday narratives" (Doevenspeck, 2011, p.129).

This approach was relevant to this study because I wanted to understand how society constructs male sexual violence through talk. In so doing, it was important to look at the following: The functionality of diverse types of language – spoken or written; how people communicate values, beliefs and assumptions; underlying cultural rules and conventions in communication; and how people use language in connection with its social, political and historical context. Therefore, a discursive approach is beneficial, mainly, in addressing questions related to how male victim-survivors of sexual violence make sense of their experiences (particular to their lives) and how they use language to negotiate victim-worthiness. Secondly, it is beneficial in discovering common, discursive patterns in how individual experiences are constructed; thus linking the individual to the wider discursive locations in which subjectivities are situated.

4.4 Research Design: Studying Affect

A turn to affect in social science research has shown increasingly significant discourses, political, social and cultural underpinnings in psychology, critical theory and cultural criticism (Athanasίου et al, 2008). Thinking about the sociality of emotions and affectivity as highlighted by Ahmed (2014) means that human experiences and knowledge construction are shaped by the relationship between bodies and how surfaced affects function in relation to the temporalities and historicity of the experience. The surfaced emotions are useful in constructing particular subjectivity – victim-survivors. The implementation of an affective and discursive methodology allows for the examination of individual and collective emotional forces and encounters within social contexts. It is through the study of various configurations of affects that sites of memory, history, politics, and social and theory are generated. Athanasίου et al, 2008 asserted:

The notion of affect bears the connotations of bodily intensity and dynamism that energize the forces of sociality. It cannot be thought of outside the complexities, reconfigurations and inter articulations of power. The semantic multiplicity of the notion of 'affect' emerges as particularly suggestive here: affect as social passion, as pathos, sympathy and empathy, as political suffering and trauma affected by the other, but also as unconditional and response-able openness to be affected by others – to be shaped by the contact with others (p. 6).

Thus, the affective turn to understanding human thoughts, emotions and behavior could be understood to be stemming and framed within social constructivism and it upholds similar philosophical principles. Thus, emotions, as argued by Wetherell (2012) cannot be separated from discourse as they are both mediated by language. Additionally, affects cannot be separated from the sociocultural that are part and parcel of the subject as they are equally performative

in subject construction and understanding of knowledge, and reality (Ahmed, 2004, 2014). Bringing together affect and discourse as strands of inquiry, the study sought to understand how male sexual violence is discursively, and affectively constructed, I sought to understand how affective tropes permit or prohibit particular subjectivity concerning men, sexual violence and vulnerability.

4.5. Research Questions

This study aimed to explore how male victim-survivors of sexual violence narrate their experiences and the social responses to these narratives. To achieve this, the following research questions were used as a guide:

1. What discursive work is performed in broader societal responses to male sexual violation?
2. What affective economies underlie discursive constructions of men's experiences of rape and sexual violence?
3. How is male sexual citizenship governed via discursive and affective tropes?

4.6. Data Collection and Sampling methods

Purposive sampling was employed in online public forums and discussions that specifically addressed male sexual violence against men. Kelly (2006) defined purposive sampling as a strategy used based on the need for a specific kind of participants (Kelly, 2006). Purposive sampling is defined a cluster of strategies that include the selection of particular cases, or participants for a specific research purposes (Teddlie & Yu, 2007). Thus, to yield online comments and to find specific radio talk podcast online about male sexual violence, I focused on the radio talk shows that particularly address sexual violence issues. I also, followed

the particular podcast on Facebook, Twitter and YouTube to extract comments specifically relating to male sexual violence. Sources of data collection for this study were online public forums. Public data includes data that has been published in public domains such as newspapers and online forums. Posts and online forums on public responses to male sexual violence that were posted and were publicly accessible on online forums were used. Therefore, this study looked at Radio talk shows i.e. podcasts, Facebook groups and Twitter handles as sources of data collection. It was important to use online data such as posts, online conversations and radio talk shows because online public groups are platforms that provide an anonymous space for people to reflect on their experiences and perceptions/opinions of sexual violence against men, and to share these experiences with others. The strength of this source of data was that it provided access to more diverse opinions that might have not been accessible via individual interviews and focus group discussions. Opinions from public data were "naturally occurring" responses in so far as they were not in response to any prompt from me although, in the case of the podcast, responses were solicited by questions from radio hosts (Kaufman & Whitehead, 2018).

4.6.1 Radio Podcasts as Sources of Data Collection

One of the public forums that were used for qualitative data included radio talk shows published on a public online platform as podcasts. Online public platforms are a good platform for people from different backgrounds to communicate social concerns. Therefore, they were a good start for this research to look into what social constructions concerning male rape against men are created through public communication channels such as a radio. This decision intended to inclusively yield data that cuts across cultures and ethnic groups. The following steps were followed:

1. I followed the online comment sections of each podcast and extract messages that fall within the below-outlined sampling criterion.
2. I followed the radio station's Facebook page and systematically choose posts that relates to male rape and sexual assault against men. For the radio podcasts, a total of four (N=4) podcasts posted online were retrieved and transcribed:
 - i. The first radio podcast was retrieved from online. It was a conversation between the radio host and four male sexual violence survivors. This podcast aimed to allow survivors to talk about their experiences and share these experiences with the audience. The duration of this podcast was 57:01 minutes.
 - ii. The second podcast was a continuation of the first podcast. It was between the radio host and several experts in Just Detention International, parents of the victims/survivors of sexual violence and the audience. The duration of this podcast was 56:05 minutes.
 - iii. The third podcast was between the radio host and a survivor of prison rape with other Two experts from Just Detention International and the two people from the audience that sent messages to the show. The duration of this podcast was 46:26 minutes.
 - iv. The fourth podcast was about the rape and sexual violation of young boys at one of the high schools in South Africa. This conversation included the radio host, a parent of one of the victimized boys, and two expert from the justice detention centre. The conversation was also open to the audience to call in and two people called in and these were also parents who had children at the school. The total duration of this podcast was 70:28 minutes.

4.7. Virtual Ethnography as Sources of Data Collection.

Online public forums (web message boards) have been reported to be prominent concerning allowing asynchronous interactions, where participants can join in the discussions at their convenience, unlike other methods like focus groups where mutual time should be arranged for participants. Curl and Robinson (1994); Fawcett and Bunhle (1995) and Santon (1998) have observed that qualitative research projects have, for some time, adapted the use of online or electronic data collection methods. They argued that online forums allow people from diverse backgrounds and geographical areas to communicate and exchange experiences and perceptions. Online public forums have been applauded for their rich and informative nature as well as the minimization of travelling and venue costs for meeting face-to-face with participants. For this study, Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter online forums were essential in harvesting data that answered my research questions. These forums have grown to be popular as modes of communication in contemporary society. The following steps were used to collect data from Facebook, YouTube and Twitter pages:

1. Login to my personal Facebook page.
2. Search for Facebook comments that addressed rape and sexual violence against men especially following the radio talk show Facebook page.
3. Joining the relevant Facebook page for the radio station then going through the posts and in-posts comments.
4. Extracting and saving posts and comments related to rape and sexual violence.

4.7.1 Sampling Virtual Ethnography

Posts on rape and sexual violence against men that are posted to a publicly accessible Facebook group and Twitter as well as in the comments section were included in the data corpus. It was important to use these posts as data because these kinds of online public forums are platforms that provide an anonymous space for people to reflect on their understanding of sexual violence in general, and male sexual violence in particular. These platforms allow people to share these perceptions and experiences with others. The strength of this source of data was that it provided access to more diverse opinions than I could have not accessed via other forms of data collection such as interviews and focus group discussions. Facebook and Twitter conversations were ‘naturally occurring’ in so far as they are not in response to any prompt from myself/ the hosts. Groups and messages that fell within the following criteria were selected:

1. Speak about the rape and sexual assault directed towards men (gay men, bisexual men, transgender men and heterosexual men).
2. The content of the message should convey that it has been written by someone who has (not) experienced sexual violence.
3. Posts and comments should be a reaction to male victim-survivor of sexual violence addressed to either the victim-survivor or to the public at large.

Data from Radio talk shows, Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter posts were extracted and saved on a hard drive. The verbatim transcription method was used to capture every mood, atmosphere and tone of the conversations and texts to allow for the reading of affective dimensions within discourses because the interest lay particularly on wanting to see how online conversations about male sexual violence against men implicitly and explicitly unfold.

4.8 Procedures for Data Analysis

Data were manually retrieved from the online platforms and were saved on desktop for transcription and coding. Data were then analysed using discourse analysis. This analysis lens provided the researcher with an ability to identify emerging discourses concerning public responses to sexual violence against men as well as underlying affective dimensions of male rape and sexual violence.

Drid (2010) described discourse analysis as a method of analysing textual data, conversations and speech, thus, it relies on the usage of language and what it conveys or communicates. In pursuit of uncovering the global structure of naturally occurring stretches of language, spoken or written, using discourse analysis allows the researcher to study language bits in the contexts within which they are used. The context can be approached from a wider perspective where discourse interpretation and construction go beyond its linguistic boundaries to include the external world. As a result, it is believed that a great deal of significance can be obtained from the analysis of the broader social situation in which language is used. Therefore, discourse analysis was a perfect fit for the analysis of this study given that online data is comprised of textual data and conversations that occur within different social contexts. Hence, discourses that emerged from the data were drawn and critically analysed.

Critical psychologists have often drawn upon discourse analysis to facilitate a deeper understanding of the use of language and the functions it performs. Wetherell (1998) and Gill, (2000) have argued that there are different ways of doing discourse analysis. Within psychology, there are mainly two types of discourse analysis namely: Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA) and Discursive Psychology (DP) (Parker,1997; Edwards & Potter, 1992). Foucauldian discourse analysis seeks to uncover the power dynamics and social constructions embedded in language and discourse to unveil understandings of power, knowledge, and

subjectivity. However, while power is undoubtedly a crucial aspect of social life, Foucault's approach tends to reduce all human interactions and discourses to relations of power (Selby, 2007). This reductionist view can overlook other important factors, such as agency, resistance, and the potential for positive social change (Newton, 1998). To address these limitations, this study employed FDA and Affect theory for the analysis of both social discursive constructions of responses to male sexual violence and personal perceptions, emotions and experiences invested within discourse. The choice to use this type of discourse analysis is drawn upon Madill and Gough's (2008) suggestion of an eclectic of FDA and other approaches to provide a comprehensive understanding. For instance, Wetherell (2012) says it is necessary to draw on FDA to examine the social structures and institutional practices and affect theory to acknowledge the 'agentive subject' and discursive practices employed for the provision of fuller analysis. The usage of both strands of analysis allows for the reading of affective surfacing of the subject that can occur within institutional contexts and via social structural processes. For instance, empathy, anger/rage, pain or distress emerged as affective investments for subjectivity construction.

Consequently, Willig's (2008) six stages of FDA were adopted in this study. The stages are as follows:

1. Identifying how discursive objects were constructed.
2. How the subjects were constructed in multiple ways?
3. The examination of the action orientation.
4. The subject positions these broader discourses offer.
5. How particular positions encourage and constrain subjectivities or ways of being.

6. The relationship between the objects, discourses, action orientation and subject position.

In efforts to follow the above Discourse analysis steps outlined above, my supervisor, co-supervisor and I came up with a plan to sensitize ourselves with data. This strategy aimed to have a three-way conversation about the data, and create a platform where data could be read and understood by more than one person (The primary researcher), rather than be on the same page – which served as one way to validate data. Therefore, after data collection, we conducted four, one-hour-long weekly zoom meetings where we had a conversation, talking through data and making sense of it. I will highlight the outcomes of each zoom meeting:

4.8.1. Zoom meeting 1: Reading and examining action orientation and formulating a plan

After collecting and cleaning the data, I emailed my supervisors all the audio, video links and transcripts of the data. We decided to have a first meeting, and discuss the way forward. In this particular meeting, we checked and confirmed if we all have the same, and correct data, we also discussed data size to determine whether it was "enough" for the requirements of the study. At this point, I collected data from four radio talk shows, and YouTube and Facebook channels. After reviewing this, we decided that the data corpus was essential for the study. We proceeded to talk about things to look for in the data bearing in mind the steps in doing discourse analysis. Thus, we agreed that each researcher will listen and read through data on their own time, then meet to discuss our thoughts about the data in light of the methodology of the study. Thus, some of the things we decided to check as we read data included: 1. How the story is put together, 2. Tone and expression of the voice, and body movements, and 3. Looking into the comment section generated by the story. The main aim of this strategy was to create a platform for each member to share how they see the story, to have

a better idea of how to make sense of the data, and to help build on the analysis of findings. Doing this created a platform for me to respond to Willig's (2008) six stages of doing FDA. This could only be possible by familiarizing myself with data, at the same time, validating my interpretations with other members – supervisors. To end this zoom meeting, we agreed on the next date to meet and talk, and about the data.

4.8.2. Zoom meeting 2: Identifying, Framing, Positionalities, Discourses and Affects Offered

This zoom meeting focused on the podcast about four victims of sexual violence with one of the hosts from the 702 radio talk show. As a way of following the first step in Willig's stages of FDA, we looked at the different ways in which the host of the show employed particular discursive framings of the talk to construct objects and subjects (i.e. male victims). We highlighted how the host framed the subject of rape as "difficult", and "taboo". Her tone of voice also alluded to the difficulty that comes with talking about a sensitive subject. We continued to highlight how people set up the authority to speak. For example, the host positioned herself as a "proud feminist" and in so doing opened a platform for each guest to be given and receive different positionalities. Thus, this led to the guests' negotiation of their subjectivity concerning sexual violence. The focus on the framings was useful in understanding data and how the host co-opted the audience, and surface particular subjects. We also identified people who dominantly framed the talk within the podcast. For example, one of the guests, Reece, took up activist and educator positionalities. He then uses these positionalities to frame particular discourses such as the discourse of corrective rape. Thus, speaking to Willig's stage about how particular positions encourage and constrain subjectivities or ways of being. Thus, this strategy allowed for the identification of narratives within narratives, and in so doing, particular discourses were identified. These include the discursive construction of toxic masculinity, toxic religions and the legal discourse. These discursive constructions were taken

up as channels that surface particular subjects i.e. victims, or survivors. Thus, particular positions, such as those of an activist, allowed subjects such as Reece to acknowledge their survivor subjectivity as they have transcended the victim's position. We continued to look at how each victim-survivor in the podcast was given a chance to narrate their experience as well as how each experience was received and responded to.

Additionally, one of my supervisors questioned what to do with all this. Therefore, we had to figure out structuring questions for meaning-making. These included the following: 1. What is this text doing? this meant that I had to go on and interrogate the function of the text 2. How is the text doing that – this spoke to how the text creates discourses of male rape and its function in advocating for the recognition of male rape and the different forms of male rape and clarifying the confusion in the definition and construction of male rape. Thus, this led to the identification of the idea of victim worthiness which was the main theme across data – each guest had to negotiate their victim worthiness. Thus, this spoke to Willig's second stage on how the subjects are constructed in multiple ways. To end this zoom meeting, one of the supervisors questioned where affect is in this podcast. To address this question we looked at the framings and the discourses highlighted earlier. So, what the text is doing, is linked to the subjects being surfaced. Drawing on toxic masculinity and how the victim-survivors negotiated and became vulnerable to speak about a "difficult" and a "taboo" subject aimed to surface sympathetic and empathetic subjects (Other guests on the show and the audience). Questions were also raised to ponder on affect. These include: 1. What is the text doing to produce sympathy and empathy? 2. what affects are underlying the discursive construction during and after the framing of the talk? We further discussed the structuring of the findings chapters and decided that this particular podcast and the comments that emerged from it could make one a single results chapter build around identified discourses and affective economies of empathy

and sympathy to allow the audience to see men (particularly victim-survivors on the show) as victim worthy.

4.8.3. Zoom Meeting3: Identifying the Relationship between the Objects, Discourses, Action-orientation and Subject position.

In this meeting, the focus was placed on the rape experience within the prison context. Thus, we discussed the function of talk and identified emerging discursive constructions. Similar to the previous podcast, we highlighted the different framings taken by the host in co-opting the audience to the talk, the emergent discourses and subject positionings. For instance, in the opening of the talk, the host frames the conversation in the same manner as the host in the previous podcast by referring to the conversation about male sexual violence as sensitive. Unlike the first host, the host in this podcast extends his framing by challenges the audience to rethink their perception towards prisoners. This was one of the discursive strategies in sensitizing the audience and situating subjectivity – surfacing caring subjects. In this framing, the host takes up an advocate positionality exposing the failures of the prison institution, the correctional institution and the legal justice system to help and care for Isaak. Therefore, allowing the host to surface a social justice discourse. The notion of subject production was further linked to Foucault's ideas of biopower looking at how the subject emerges, how the subject becomes complacent in the production of self and how everyone in society is part of that production. Thus, by taking the advocate position, the host works to surface the audience in a particular way. In turn, Isaak also takes up particular positionalities such as that of a victim of rape and a victim of the system's failure. The discursive construction aimed to surface empathy through male vulnerability. As such, the audience was co-opted to deliberate on how social justice should look through the framing of three guests (i.e. the host, Sasha and Prince) taking up an expert in the field of social justice positionality. The reading and interpreting of

data were useful and insightful in laying out the groundwork for the second analysis chapter (i.e. humanizing a (de)humanized subject: understating prison rape through affective tropes).

4.8.4 Zoom Meeting 4: Particular Positions' Encouragement/constraints on of Subjectivities/Ways of Being

The sexual violence scandal at Park Town boys High was the focus of the fourth meeting. We spoke about how the host framed the podcast – the framing of institutional failure concerning the violation of young boys. In this podcast, particular positionings were taken and conferred. For instance, the host self-positioned as an activist to sensitise the audience to how the educational institution failed to acknowledge the violation of young boys. The positioning of the education system as a culprit allowed for the surfacing of victim subjectivities (the young boys). The conversation in the podcast surfaced with particular subjects who took up particular positions. For instance, Phelelani and Angelique positioned themselves as witnesses of how their children were affected by the abuse, and Joy equally witnessed the pain and death of her son. These witnessing positionalities allowed for motivated, confident and courageous subjects who stood up against institutional culpability. The surfaced subject also surfaced particular affects such as those of pain and rage. It was in the sharing of witnessing painful experiences that the audience is sensitized to the pain of others. Therefore, evoking the audiences' feelings of rage directed towards institutional failure. The failure was seen as an inhibition of particular subjectivities– the boys could not be acknowledged as victims by the school. Particular affects were also identified i.e. pain and rage. An interesting exchange between the host and one of the caller guests (Shallyz) exhibited particular forms of rage. While the host was angry at the failure of the school, Shallyz was angry at the idea of exposing the school. Her rage was linked to the discourses of white nostalgia, white rage, white fragility and fear; all to preserve the

traditions of the school. The insightful conversation usefully foregrounded the third and last analysis chapter.

Adopting these stages for data analysis allowed the researcher to examine how male victims of sexual violence were constructed and positioned throughout the data set. It allowed the researcher to analyse the ways 'subjects' are positioned concerning one another and how power can circulate through these positionings. For instance, how heterosexual male victims-survivors were positioned in relation to non-normative sexual identities, how power is being circulated in these positionings, and how each guest in the podcast was positioned, or self-positioned within the conversations. More so, Willig's FDA stages allowed the interrogation of what practices and behaviours are constructed as legitimate ways of being or experiences concerning male rape and masculinity ideologies – paying particular attention to the theme of victim worthiness within several discourses such as the discourse of toxic masculinity, discourse of religion and so forth. Additionally, the implications of positioning male victim-survivors in different ways were examined. For instance, what does positioning men within a discourse of victim worthiness achieve in terms of their potential subjectivity in the case of rape, sexual violence and vulnerability?

4.9. Validation and Rigor: Trustworthiness

In qualitative studies, 'trustworthiness' is used to indicate validity and reliability, and is further divided into credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Du Plooy-Cilliers et al., 2014). Firstly, credibility involves accurately interpreting the collected data (Du Plooy-Cilliers et al., 2014). Therefore, to attain credibility in this study, I used triangulation as an underlying method of the research design. Denzin (1978, p.291) defined triangulation as, "the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon" or the use of multiple

data sources and data interpreters to give a more comprehensive view of the factors contributing to an occurrence. As such, multiple podcasts and online comments from different online platforms were collected as part of the data corpus. Additionally, data were also read and interpreted by the researcher and supervisors as part of member checks to allow for a comprehensive interpretation and understanding of data. As a result, an in-depth understanding of a phenomenon from different insights was enabled (Downward & Mearmen, 2007). The use of multiple podcasts from different talk shows and online public platforms added to the credibility of data concerning male sexual violence. The researcher also spent a substantial amount of time reading data to better understand the role language, tone and body language played in the conversations as a way of gaining a more comprehensive insight into the discourses constructed concerning male sexual violence (Du Plooy-Cilliers et al., 2014).

Secondly, transferability allows for the results of a study to be applied beyond the specific research project (Du Plooy-Cilliers et al., 2014). To obtain this, the researcher sought to provide a thick and transparent description of the research process to allow for the study to be replicated in the future and for the readers to assess whether the findings are transferable to their settings (Korstjens & Moser, 2017). Thirdly, dependability is the stability of the research findings over time (Korstjens & Moser, 2017). The researchers maintained consistency by aligning the steps of the research process with the accepted standards for a qualitative research design (Korstjens & Moser, 2017). Thus, this means the researcher followed steps, methodologies and methods used to collect data following scientifically approved methods such as qualitative methodologies (Creswell, 2009), the use of virtual ethnography, scientifically proven sampling methods, in this case, purposive sampling, scientifically established analysis methods and procedures, in this case, affect theory (Ahmed, 2004; 2014;

Wetherell, 2012; 2015) as well as discourses analysis (Willig, 2001; 2003; Willig and Potter, 2008; Willig, 2013) to read and produce meaning from data.

4.10. Personal reflection on Methodology

Choosing a qualitative research method for this study was essential as I sought a subjective and in-depth understanding of how male sexual violence is spoken about, and how male victim-survivors of sexual violence narrated their stories. The incorporation of a qualitative study led to a decision to understand the construction of social life through a critical discourse approach. Thus the opportunity to read and analyse text within conversations allowed the production and reportage of the performativity of language and talk in understanding how subjects are socially constructed, and how people self-construct through different subject positionings. However, in as much as this was made possible through the chosen methods, qualitative research can also pose challenges in harnessing data to reach desired conclusions mainly because of its broadness, and that data is always open to different interpretations since these interpretations rely heavily on the subjectivity of the researcher i.e. researcher's values, and perceptions.

4.11. Ethics: Confidentiality and Anonymity

Firstly, ethical clearance (Protocol Number: H20/06/05) was obtained from the University of the Witwatersrand as approval for the continuation of the study. Research ethics refers to protecting the "dignity of subjects and the publication of the information in the research" (Fouka & Mantzorou, 2011, p.1). This research focused on online data that is already in the public domain. Therefore, no harm to the participants was anticipated or encountered. Most people who participated in talks on public forums do so under fake names or

unanimously, particularly in the commentary sections (see appendix A). As such, this study only use the data published on social media and radio talk shows; ethical considerations such as informed consent was not applicable. Given the nature of online public data, participants' original names – especially radio hosts and their guests are used in the final write-up of the research thesis as they appear in the podcast because these are already accessible to the public.

4.13. Concluding remarks

Research methods are step-by-step processes taken to carry out and execute a phenomenon under investigation. They help understand how and why a researcher used certain strategies in conducting research. As such, in this chapter, I discussed the use of qualitative methodology, ontology and epistemological philosophies underpinning the research. I highlighted and discussed phenomenological, subjectivism and social constructivism as a philosophical understanding of human knowledge construction. I also argued for the relevance and suitability of the use of affect and discourse in reading as framed within a social constructivism approach. Which as a result, are essential in reading and understanding the intersectionality between society, human interaction, and affects in knowledge and reality production. I then described and discussed sampling procedures for data collection and data analysis. Thus I highlighted how data was collected from the radio talk shows as well as the use of virtual ethnography in gathering data. Reflexivity, limitations and ethical considerations that went into the process of conducting this study are also described and discussed in light of the primary aim of the study. The following chapter introduces the findings of the study.

CHAPTER FIVE:

Constructing the Victim-Worthy Subject via Registers of Empathy

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine discursive and affective dimensions of public responses to sexual violence against men (heterosexual, gay, bisexual, and transgender men). Thus, looking at how male victims-survivors of sexual violence were constructed within contexts that are embedded with gender, sexuality, and masculinity governing ideologies. The main aim was to examine understandings of men's positionality and subjectivity in the context of being sexually victimized. The study sought to investigate the following questions: a) What discursive work is performed in broader societal responses to male sexual violation? b) What affective economies underlie these discursive constructions of men's experiences of rape and sexual violence? c) How is male sexual citizenship governed via discursive and affective tropes? The analyses outline structure focuses on: The discursive framing of the talk, I then discuss the main findings following the main discourses that emerged for the data corpus as sub-topics. These include 1. Victim worthiness Within the Discourse of Toxic Masculinity; 2. Negotiating Victim Worthiness Within the Legal Discourse; 3. Victim Worthiness Within the Toxic Discourse of religion; and 4. Victim worthiness: Justification, Validation and Recognition. I close the chapter with concluding remarks.

5.2 Discursively Framing the Talk

This chapter is centred around a podcast that focuses on male sexual violence in South Africa. This podcast was published on one of the radio channels in South Africa (i.e. SABC3). It was facilitated by a female host (Relebogile) to tackle different social issues affecting South Africa. In this particular podcast, we see four male victims-survivors of sexual violence who

provide a narration of different experiences of sexual violence. Two of the victim-survivors, Derik and Reece, are adult victims of Childhood Sexual Abuse (CSA) and the other two, Toki and Okuhle, are victims of adulthood sexual violation.

Upon data coding, the complexity and diversity of male sexual violence narratives become apparent. In understanding these discursive constructions of male sexual violence, a discourse of victim-worthiness becomes dominant as victim-survivors⁷ embark on a journey to negotiate the legitimacy and validity of their victimhood. They embark on a mission to convince the audience, the host and maybe themselves that they are victim worthy. Three main frames are used as the bases of negotiating victim-worthiness: 1) the sexual violation experience/incident itself is described; 2) the kind of the violation that took place is narrated and 3) the perpetrator is also described. These three aspects seem to be taken as key components constituting a "worthy victim." According to Christie (1986), it is believed that an ideal victim is someone, or a category of individuals, who, when exposed to crime are socially and most readily given a complete and legitimate status of being a victim. When introducing the concept, Christie relied on polarizing examples of two different victims to illustrate the point. First, a vulnerable old lady who was robbed in the middle of the day on the street by a big scary man; compared to a man at a pub who got into a drunken altercation with an acquaintance (Christie, 1986). Second, an ideal victim has to be vulnerable and blameless, simultaneously, the ideal offender should be bad or deviant. Additionally, the ideal victim stereotype is influenced by individual victim-related aspects, as well as the victim-offender relationship, the level of physical violence, induced injuries, and the victim's lifestyle (Stewart et al. 1996). In addition, Kramer (2014) in her psychological research on 'Surfacing the (im)possible victim: the role or

⁷ Following West (1999) and Chitiki (2018) I use the term 'victim-survivor' to signify the dual status of people who have been both victimised and survived sexual violence.

gender' argues that in the case of female-perpetrated sexual violence, social constructions of who the victim or the perpetrator is discursively problematic because these constructions imply the unlikelihood of female sexual transgression. As a result, men who are violated by women might find it difficult to acknowledge the victim's positionality and identity. Kramer (2014, p. 136) further argues:

...for men to occupy Female Sexual Aggression (FSA) victimhood they must resist both the aforementioned discourses as well as those that limit the possibilities for male victimisation. Thus, while FSA female victimhood is complex by its improbable perpetrator, additional gendering barriers that infer the improbability of both perpetrator and victim further complicate FSA male victimhood.

Therefore, in the case of male sexual violence, proving victim worthiness becomes a negotiation requiring certain aspects of the sexual violence narrative to be legitimized: Where did it happen? Who was the perpetrator and what did the victim do in the aftermath of the incident? Given that men are traditionally regarded as strong; they fail to fall within the category of those considered vulnerable. According to Eagle (2006), and Barth et al (2012) cited in Kramer (2014), social and gendered ideologies denote the incompatibility of victimhood and masculinity which results in a limited range of discursive possibilities for male victims. Therefore, male victims of sexual violence are only constrained to subject positions characterised by weakness, homosexuality or femininity.

In this study, the construction of victim worthiness takes shape through different framing and reframing of male sexual violence that takes place within the podcast. Each of these constructions serves a particular purpose in how the concepts of male sexual violence and male sexual victimhood are understood within a broader social context. The notion of who qualifies as a victim of sexual violence has links with traditional connotations of who the "ideal

victim" is. Traditionally, this speaks to people who are perceived as vulnerable and unable to defend or protect themselves – historically, women and children fall within this definition of an ideal victim because women and children were regarded as weaker counterparts to men. Therefore, "ideal victim," refers to the notion that victim status is socially constructed (Daly, 2014). The concept of victim-worthiness is then always determined by society or others. Society gives meaning to everyday life, and collectively (re)told stories make up the "rules and resources recursively implicated in the production of social systems" (Giddens, 1984.p.377). Societal and cultural framing of sexual violence and victims' experiences often prevents a dialogue that includes stories of people who have the same experiences but do not meet the criteria for what qualifies one as a victim (Hershkowitz et 2007; McElvaney et al. 2014).

5.2.1 A 'Taboo' Talk

In the podcast, male victims-survivors and the host are doing the work of showcasing that men are victims too. As the conversation unfolds, each experience is discussed and narrated to show and convince the audience that these four men are victim worthy.

The podcast starts with the host of the show welcoming the guests and introducing them to the audience:

Host: Today's discussion is going to be a difficult one, we're going to be speaking about something that is a quite taboo, and something that many don't actually want to talk about on a public platform. We are speaking about sexual assault. And in this case, the victims are men. Reese, Derik, Toki, Okuhle. Four men who have bravely joined us to share their stories of being victims of rape, four very different

experiences. Men who have graciously given the time and come here to share their stories and something that I cannot imagine to be easy.

Even in this very start, the audience is sensitized to the topic from a particular perspective. The minute she starts her show with something like, “I cannot imagine today as easy”. Already the host frames it for the audience that they should expect an intense discussion, “it is going to be a difficult one, something that many don't actually want to talk about on a public platform ...a taboo”. Already, the host is emotionally preparing the audience to expect an issue that is socially, politically, or religiously prohibited or restricted – male sexual violation. The host sets a mood that already surfaces a particular audience and a particular affective mood. She ensures that the audience is *attuned* to the invited guests and their stories. Then she proceeds to say, "...we are going to talk about it...", this phrase is functioning to defy the odds, to talk about the unspeakable and to invite the audience that although this conversation is, "difficult" we are going to make space for it and break the social barriers. Also, an issue that is not 'real' in the social imagination. This is part of the *attunement*. The work of the host as the facilitator of the dialogue is to disrupt the audience's social imagination to consider what may have been non-existent or in the realm of fantasy into something material or real. She affirms that it is a well-known idea that sexual violence against men has not been given a social space (assuming that even the audience is aware of that), but this particular space (the podcast) is going to give these men the space. This is part of recognizing and acknowledging the victimhood of male victim-survivors. Thus, deconstructing a traditional narrative of what issues are permissible in the social arena as well as deconstructing social norms. In so doing, the host is asking the audience to be ready, open-minded and empathetic in the listening and reception of the conversation to come. This kind of framing is almost a discursive, rhetorical and affective strategy because, in this sense, it attunes the audience to the

guests and the idea. There is an air of anticipation that she has set up, and also a promise. It sets the dynamics of the conversation, it now says these four men, the ball is in their court. The performance that is now required from them would be to convince the audience including the host herself that there is such a thing as a male victim-survivor. The framing of setting the mood, from the host, speaks to what Anderson (2010) conceptualized as an affective atmosphere. This means that within space (such as holding a podcast in a room), the lightness of air, the floating of mood and the circulation of affect have a possibility to “radiate” from one individual to another in a “dyadic space of resonance” (Anderson, 2010.p.80). Thus, as the host speaks about the “difficulty” the uneasiness and the *tabooness* of sexual violence as a topic, affects could move and stick to bodies (of the guests on the show and of the audience). As Griffero (2016) further defined, an atmosphere could be perceived as an excess resisting representational attitude; it is a resonance of the felt space – a vibration in which “the perceived and the perceiver meet and even merge”. Thus, emotions are further described as atmospheres that are gradually discharged out (Schmitz et al, (2011). And in this podcast, the host is an object of such discharge. The host then relies on “an atmosphere [...], ... the complete occupation of a surfaceless space in the region of experienced presence” (Schmitz et al, 2011.p. 55) for the assemblage of bodies – which can move the audience to be empathetic.

5.2.2 A ‘Brave’ Talk

After this introduction, we see that each guest is given a platform to speak about why they decided to talk about their experience; this sets the tone for each victim-survivor to start the negotiation work:

The host: Now I'm going to jump straight into the difficult part and I felt like it was important to have this discussion because some of my male

friends say they would never speak about anything that might have happened to them. So, I want to go around to everybody, and just find out what is your reason for speaking...

In the conversation, this is a starting point of the acknowledgement and validation of the victim – providing an equal opportunity for the victim-survivor to speak, ("I want to go around everybody"), and to hear personal motives behind the action of speaking out. This is a marker in the conversation for the journey of negotiating victim-worthiness for each victim-survivor. Attached to the action of speaking out is the "brave" framing that the host started with, 'Other men will not speak out. But these men will' hence, they are brave. The audience is, again, attuned to the victim-survivors because of their bravery and strength. By so doing, the host invites the guests on an emotional and personal level through self-disclosure, "And I felt like it was important to have this discussion because some of my male friends say they would never speak about anything that might have happened to them". Hargie (2021) defines self-disclosure as verbally revealing one's feelings, thoughts, ideas, or experiences. This is done normally in a therapeutic context, but in conversations, self-disclosure is useful in normalizing the situation and building rapport. Bray (2019) argues that self-disclosure can be used as a way to convey humility, humanity and understanding. Thus, in the extract above, the host is giving a personal narrative to reassure her guests that she has friends who are male, and she empathizes with the guests the same way she would empathize with her male friends if they were to experience the same ordeal. And this discussion "feels" ... "important" to her because it can open a channel for all men including her male friends to be comfortable in having, "difficult" conversations.

Jankowitz (2018.p. 70) argues, "encountering victimhood as socially constructed enables an analysis of wider socio-structural processes which define the 'victim,' who has the

power to do the defining and how the label of victim produces certain realities, beliefs, and knowledge." In resonance with Jankowits's argument, it is apparent that the host is trying to give the victim-survivors the power to define victimhood and their victim worthiness. Victims-survivors' responses to the question, "...what is your reason for speaking..." might shed some light on certain realities, beliefs and knowledge. Thus, one of the victim-survivors responded:

Reece: I think what's very important for me is that about 10 years ago, was the first time that I spoke out in public about it. And since then, I've been assisting and helping men being able to deal with the trauma and the consequences of childhood sexual abuse.

The Host: Now, in the case of yourself, Okuhle, I found your tweet on Twitter, where you were basically saying that you're HIV positive, because you were raped. And you are telling your story. And I know this is your first interview, what is the reason that you decided to finally speak out?

Okuhle: My reason was, I wanted to come out, because I want to be an HIV activist one day. So since I turning three years (living with HIV), last month, on my birthday, I decided to come out about my status to the world...

The Host: And your side Derik, what made you decide to come and tell your story?

Derik: The only reason I decided to speak out and continue to do so is to help other people. I know how much telling my story has healed me. And I needed someone else to speak up first, to convince me to speak out...

The Host: And from your side Toki, why did you decide to come out and speak?

Toki: I think my first time when I started speaking out was in 2007. But nobody believed me then ... I'm seeing so many male victims of abuse. And I thought the time was now for me to also speak out...

The above extracts indicate a sequence in which the conversation unfolds. The host gives each person a turn to speak, "...and from your side, Toki...and your side Derik...", and each guest is waiting their turn without speaking over others. This turn-giving and turn-taking create different positions between the host and the victim-survivors. Nasir et al (2021) argue that subject positioning in discourse construction serves to investigate the interaction of, and with particular subjects as they assume or reject particular positions or acts of positioning as well as how self-other positioning modes impact subsequent uptake of that positioning. Therefore, in the above extracts, the host takes up a position of power as the facilitator of the show, with the power to allow someone a chance/turn to speak, and the power to allow a safe space for each victim-survivor to argue their case. In turn, victim-survivors accept this positionality and they also respect this turn-taking sequence as they take up double positioning of a victim and advocate. In accepting these subject positions, victim-survivors are also drawing the audience into seeing them not only as victims but as activists who are there to empower others – advocating for male sexual violence. In so doing, the audience might be seeing the conversation as worthwhile, seeing their victimization experiences as worthwhile

which consequently leads to acceptance of victim worthiness. Therefore, a central point across victim-survivors' motivations for speaking out in their responses is advocating for other men who are victims of sexual violation. They also realize the reality that male sexual violation is a societal issue equally deserving of the attention, recognition and acknowledgement as any other form of sexual violence (Child Sexual Violence and, or Female sexual violence). They all say, "...no one believed me...so I want to speak out", "...assisting and helping men deal with the trauma and the consequences of child sexual abuse", "...I wanted to come out and I want to be an activist". All these intentions and reasons for speaking out are underlined by the history of not being acknowledged as a victim. Therefore, not only do victims-survivors are speaking out about their victimization, rather they are advocating for other male victims as they aim to redefine victim worthiness. Thus, according to the victim-survivors, this can be achieved through speaking out about male sexual violence experiences and creating awareness.

5.2.3 Framing the Talk: Foregrounding the Sexual Violence Experience

As the framing continues, the host proceeds to ask the victim-survivors questions about their experience. What she asks next speaks to the notion of establishing victim-worthiness based on the victim-survivors' actions in the aftermath of the sexual violence incident (Simone & Murumaa-Mengel, 2021). The host asks:

The Host: ...So um, let me start with you, Derik. I mean, what was reaction the first time that you told someone, what did they say back to you, and who is the person that you told?

Derik: ...the story came out from children first. And my family basically heard about it, and they didn't believe... I kept it for about six more years before I told my parents and I told my mom and dad first.

The Host: And from your side Reece, I mean, who is the first person you told him? What was their reaction?

Reece: ...Having kept these secrets for four decades, and not speaking about it to anybody, and the first family member or person I spoke to, and told about it was my wife.

The Host: ...from your side, Toki who was the first person you told, what was their response?

Toki: ...It was not a matter of telling from my side, I had to confess to my pastor that I had slept with a woman, but it was not sleeping, the woman had actually been forced to prove to someone whether I was a man...

The Host: ...Obviously, I mean, this is your first interview, you know where you are in a public platform. And I, I hope the fact that they are other survivors here makes it easier for you. But who was the first person that you told? What was their response?

Okuhle: ... I called my sisters, I told them, and then that was it.

Walklate (2007) described the process of becoming a victim as something to be achieved; victim status is negotiated during personal acknowledgment of victimization through social and institutional recognition. Thus, the question of whom the victim disclosed the incident and how the person reacted seeks to establish the ideology that if someone genuinely feels that they have been violated, then have to tell someone. This is one way of creating a witness – someone who can back up the story that the incident happened. Additionally, the

reaction of that person works to validate or dismiss the experience, "did they believe you?". Thus, being believed works to affirm and validate the experience, but lack of that thereof, leads to rejection of victimhood. Thus, victims rely upon this notion that someone has to believe them for them to be victim worthy. As shown in the above extract, some victims survivors took more time than others to disclose their experience, "...I kept it for about six more years...", "having kept this for four decades...", or "I had to confess to my pastor", "they did believe me... they did believe those children". All these responses are an indication of trying to find someone to validate the experience through social and institutional recognition (the wife, the church, and parents or siblings). According to Sivakumarani (2007), there has been a traditional general under-reporting of rape and sexual violence especially male rape and male sexual violence due to social stigmatization within families, groups and communities. Studies by Felson, et al (2002), and Felson and Paré (2005) showed that men are reported to have a relatively higher ratio of unreported sexual violence cases such as rape, incest and sexual harassment due to a combination of fear, shame, guilt, confusion and stigma surrounding male sexual violence. Men may also be reluctant to talk about victimization, considering that this is incompatible with dominant masculinity, particularly in societies in which men are discouraged to talk about vulnerability (Sivakumarani, 2007). As such, in this study, although the victim-survivors eventually told someone about their experiences, they did not do that right after the incident.

Moreover, in the conversation above, there is an apparent shift of tone in the host's questioning and diction when directing a question to Okuhle, "obviously, I mean, this is your first interview, you know where you are in a public platform. And I, I hope the fact that they are other survivors here makes it easier for you." Here she extends an empathetic tone by acknowledging that Okuhle is still new to speaking out about this difficult issue. Therefore, she

draws on the idea that other people in the studio have also gone through the same experience. This affective economy of empathy is used to reassure Okuhle that he is not alone. By so doing, trying to make him feel comforted and supported in this new position he finds himself. Shorrock (2011) as cited in Egan (2013) argues that empathy is a core important value which should be embraced and makes a relationship mutually beneficial. He suggested that it is a union which constantly requires work. Thus, by being empathetic in this instance, the host uses emotions to encourage Okuhle to open up about his experience, at the same time, sensitizing the audience that Okuhle might be requiring some empathy and, or sympathy has given that this is an experience he is still trying to make sense of in comparison to other victims who have been advocates in the matter for many years.

5.3 Victim Worthiness Within the Discourse of Toxic Masculinity

Once the host introduced the story to the audience and framed a stance of debunking the normative ideologies of which stories are non-permissible in a public sphere and whose stories are worthy of being spoken about, the conversation continues to highlight other social constructs such as toxic masculinity as a premise for understanding who falls within the category of a sexual violence victim. Thus, in the conversation, both the host and the victim-survivors interestingly invite a particular discourse in their framing and reframing. Thus, they draw on toxic masculinity to explain the ways in which toxic hegemonic masculinity creates/ (dis)allows forms of male sexual violence and victim worthiness. The conversation below illustrates this:

The Host: ... You know, we'll also get to show people at home that there isn't one picture, you know, Reece you are one of the first men who would have been out and speak. I mean, you've been speaking publicly for a long time... Do you believe that a person who has been a victim of rape

should have to disclose to their partner? ...do you feel like a person should have to disclose to their partner?

Reece: I don't think they should. I think you need to be empowered yourself. And it's your choice and your time...

The Host: And why is that?

Reece: I think I didn't believe that people would understand me, when I started looking in the net and trying to investigate for 15...

The Host: And that for me, just boggles my mind. Is the betrayal because you feel like you didn't trust me enough for the secret? Or is the betrayal the feeling that, you know, oh, you might be a little bit "damaged"? And I should have known before I choose to be with you if that if I'm making things? What is that betrayal that a partner would feel?

Reece: But I don't think the word "damaged" per se, yeah, because I think we don't want to talk about it because of a lot of the taboos. Yes, that first of all, males don't get raped, period. So most people don't believe that...there's a total disbelief, the way we are socialized as children, ...is that toxic masculinity. And I'm a victim of toxic masculinity, myself, and I'm a male, because I was brought up that cowboys don't cry, you need to take control, you're not supposed to show your emotions. If you cry, it's a sign of weakness, you do not discuss your innermost thoughts with any other male, we always tell each other we fine...And that could be suicidal...I'm a victim of toxic masculinity ...We don't

share our vulnerabilities...my kids never saw me cry until basically when I told them what had happened to me. And it was the first time... yeah, I've got it as a sign of strength. Some males still look at it and say, you know, cry baby, should not happen to us...so why are you crying about it...we all carrying our baggage.

This conversation comes to be after the host had followed up on the issues of disclosing the experience and the reactions. Thus, asking Reese why he found it difficult to tell his wife earlier than he did. The host comes in with the notion of fear based on the idea of being damaged. Reese acknowledges the idea of being regarded as “damaged” as a factor for not opening up, however, he brings up a discourse of toxic masculinity arguing that traditional ways of male socialization makes men fear speaking out about vulnerability and emotions. In the process of framing, and reframing male victim-survivors of sexual violence, it is almost impossible for one not to think about hegemonic masculinity and patriarchal ideologies. These are perceived as core creators of different gender roles, and heteronormative sexualities within society. This reference to hegemonic ideologies as an explanatory factor is taken up in the above conversation between the host and Reese as one of the explanations for why male sexual violence experiences are deemed questionable, or non-existent. This economy of hegemonic masculinity makes it difficult for male survivors to acknowledge vulnerability associated with male sexual violation as well as acknowledge victimhood without the need to have others (i.e. professionals) do the framing and reframing for them.

Additionally, in this conversation subject positioning is also apparent. The host is positioning Reese as someone knowledgeable and experienced in the issue as she asks for his professional perspective. She is conferring on him an expert positionality, that also co-opts the audience to carefully listen to Reese and accept his perspective on the matter based on his

credibility as an activist against male sexual violence. This expert positionality also does some work of accrediting victim worthiness – if Reece, an expert identifies as a victim, the concept of male victim worthiness gains its value and might encourage other male victim listeners to identify as such.

As much as the host uses others-positionality to position Reece, he takes up a self-positioning stance. He says, "...I am a victim of toxic masculinity...I am a male...I am a victim of toxic masculinity". This emphasis on being a victim of toxic masculinity sheds light on the reasoning behind the lack of, or hesitation to disclose the experience to others or rather of speaking out. He also says:

Reece: I think what is very important for me is that about 10 years ago, was the first time that I spoke out in public about it. And since then, I've been assisting and helping men being able to deal with the trauma and the consequences of childhood sexual abuse.

Reece immediately takes his position in the conversation as someone who has a vast experience (and knowledge) of male sexual violence because he has been working with victim-survivors of male sexual violence for a long time. In highlighting his positionality in the podcast, Reece draws to the audience, and the other guests that he is an expert, he sets the tone that he is going to be intellectually resourceful within the conversation or rather the audience is co-opted into that frame of mind. With the two subject positions Reece takes up, the audience sees him as both a victim and an expert – this double subject positioning allows for Reece's transition from a place of weakness (i.e. victim) to a place of power (survivor). The conversation gets shifted from Reece to Toki. The host invites Toki into the conversation to hear what can be learned from his experience and the work he has been doing:

The Host: In your case, Toki, what was your environment? I mean, did you have access to any kind of support beyond, you know, finding a group of men that you could talk to?

Toki: My story is quite funny...the next morning, which was a Monday after the ordeal had taken place, the same colleague who organized the young woman, to prove to him whether I was gay or not, actually gave me accolades. I was toasted as the man at work because I had for once in front of them all, through their knowledge proven that I also can sleep with a woman... ex-wife said to me, "you're not man enough" ... the only thing she saw was a husband, a potential father and a provider, there was no space for vulnerability, there was no space for an open, intimate conversation. And there was no space for empathy, I had to be strong come hell or high water.

The Host: And I mean, it's so scary and sad that we all know that person that would never believe...

Toki's response leans toward the idea of toxic masculinity as he is kind of taking up on the issue raised by Reece despite the host's question regarding the support he received. He shows that the only way a man can be supported in this case is when he is seen as conforming to the hegemonic masculinity expectations. Thus, being praised for showing sexual indulgence with the opposite sex – is seen as proof of "being a man". The concept of being a man" seems to be the key to the conversation with Toki's experience, "ex-wife said to me, you are not man enough". Thus, instead of being viewed as a victim, Toki is applauded, which downplays the whole experience he went through. Hence, not acknowledging his victimhood. Therefore, this is a great highlight of hegemonic masculinity's responsibility for creating uncomfortable spaces

that inhibit understanding of male sexual violence in society. The Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (2001) argues that social constructions of an "ideal man" and broader cultural and historical constructions of patriarchal ideologies contribute to the denial of male rape. For instance, South Africa's violent past and the patriarchal society promote and sustain these kinds of gender inequalities concerning male rape acknowledgement (CSV, 2001).

The positional framing from the host also brings her stance and purpose in advocating for male sexual victimhood into the conversation:

The Host: But while I'm a proud feminist, and I will have conversations around gender-based violence, I don't want to sit and ignore the fact that I'm anti-violence, and I'm anti-sexual violence.

for the host to self-identify as a feminist and to be advocating for male victim-worthiness means that she acknowledges that both women and men are victims of the same system – toxic masculinity and patriarchy. She starts with a self-disclosed claim to this identity as a discursive tactic ("I am a proud feminist"), and in so doing admits her original unwillingness to consider that men could be victims. And then she has come around to realizing men can be victims too. It is almost as though she becomes the 'voice' of the viewers who remain sceptical and she is doing the work of voicing this 'absent present' voice as a means of refuting this scepticism. Her framing juggles intertwined social frames. On the one hand, her self-positionality as a feminist grants her an authorizing position to speak on what counts as sexual violence. At the same time, she calls herself a "proud feminist" indicating her awareness that this position sometimes comes with public misgiving and suspicion of 'women hating men'. And so she deliberately frames this dual status: "proud feminist", to simultaneously legitimate her speaking authority and also to demonstrate awareness of a stereotype that may delegitimise

her. Given this dual positioning, she doubly asserts her authority to confer that there are indeed male sexual victims. Thus, this discursive tactic indicated the transition of the host as sceptic—from 'I do not believe' to 'Am a believer'. It shows how an original identity (feminist) can be introduced as a buffer to support non-belief and still be used as a buffer to support the belief. Parker (2013) steps when he speaks about discourses as conferring some rights on some and not others. i.e. discourse grants 'speaking rights'.

Apart from negotiating victim worthiness in relation to toxic masculinity, the conversation takes an interesting turn, where the legitimacy of the sexual violence experience is also constructed within legal terms and understandings.

5.4 Negotiating Victim Worthiness Within a Legal Discourse

Victim worthiness also has juridical value; victim status comes with legal implications such as specific rights during criminal proceedings, rights for a civil claim, and access to victim assistance services (Simone & Murumaa-Mengel, 2021). Thus, the legal system also helps define who falls within the category of a victim and who does not. In sexual violence situations, there are legal definitions attached to what legally qualifies a sexual incident – which comes with a legal implication of who could be a victim of a sexual offence. At the centre of the legality of sexual violence lies the notion of consent. In South Africa, the Sexual Offences Amendment Act (Act 32 of 2007) defines sexual acts as 'sexual offences' (i.e. as crimes) if they are committed without the consent (i.e. permission) of one of the people involved in the sexual act. The Act also take into consideration a person's legal age to consent or engaging sexual acts. Thus, the South African Sexual Offences Amendment Act (Act 32 of 2007) also recognizes that children are particularly vulnerable to sexual exploitation because they are less likely to understand the implications of a sexual act (Ndou, 2019). On the other hand, they may understand but are unable to make a proper decision about it, or are unable to resist, or unable

to communicate that they do not consent. In the conversation between Toki and the Host, the conversation touches on the legal implications of having sex with a minor. The extract below elaborates on the conversation:

Toki: And you know, if the case had been reported to the police, I would have been arrested. Because the woman was underage, she was 16 years, I was 20.

Toki contextualizes his experience from a legal perspective. First, he understands the struggle of having his experience legally framed as a sexual violence experience, reflecting on how he would have been painted as a perpetrator based on prevailing conceptions/norms of what constitutes rape. He understands the legal implications of sexual engagements with someone under-aged. Thus, he is aware that his experience, from a legal point of view, could be regarded as a crime (i.e. statutory rape", "...if the case had been reported to police, I would have been arrested...". In highlighting this point, Toki indicates an awareness of the complexity of his victim worthiness. Taking up the conversation, the Host interjects:

The Host: Wow, so I just want to understand, so you were put now in a situation I mean, you already mentioned the parts about having an erection and ejaculating. How did they even get the schoolgirl to put you in a space where you were vulnerable...Did she ever come out and tried to paint it in a different way from what it was...

Toki: She did. In fact, she tried at some point to extort some money from me...

The host draws on the idea of erection and ejaculation. These two notions are essential in the narrative of men and sexuality. And in most cases, being able to have an erection and

ejaculate stipulates the idea that the person enjoyed the experience. And it also speaks to the difficulty this reaction would pose for Toki to claim victimhood. The Host points this out to lay the ground for the legal implications that come with having an erection and ejaculating during a sexual violence experience. She then goes on to say, "how did they even get the school girl to put you in a space you were vulnerable?" constructing this kind of rhetorical questioning conveys how the host is also grappling to understand the possibility of a "school girl" making a "man" vulnerable. This discursive framing once again tries to do the work of *attunement*. The use of active versus passive language to describe the actions and positions of the different players, "put you in a space where you were vulnerable" (Active). You were "vulnerable" (Passive). The language attunes the listener to recalibrate their understanding of victimhood. The above statement posits the gender dynamics of who should be in a powerful position in this experience contradicts the heteronormative notions of a "strong man". Thus, it is difficult to even for the host to picture the person who is supposed to be strong getting victimized by someone who should be subordinate. This framing of the situation also draws the audience into the same kind of questioning and seeking answers. We also see the follow-up question from the host, "Did she ever come out and tried to paint it in a different way to what it was...", this highlights that the situation could be interpreted differently – with the possibility that the "schoolgirl" given her age (legal inability to give consent), could also claim victimhood – which has the possibility of counterclaiming Toki's victim worthiness. The host continues to point out the legal "technicalities" to further challenge Toki's victimhood:

The Host: WOW. And it's such a complicated one because technically, by law, the way that the law stands, if anyone under the age of 18, cannot give consent, those circumstances are almost irrelevant. But, we know, the legal system is evolving and growing and changing. I've

never come across this type of a case where, you know, if this were to go to court...the law would simply say, you penetrated a child...

The traditional definitions of sexual violence (specifically rape) focused exclusively on penile-vaginal penetration. This, by definition, excluded the rape of men by other men, the rape of men by women, or the rape of a woman by another woman. In the case of Toki, the implications of foregrounding penetration are an obstacle to claiming or defending victimhood. Thus, in the conversation, the host educates the audience that from a legal perspective, as long as there was penetration, and the fact that the girl was underage, other explanations are dismissible by the law. However, she also leaves room for this negotiation to carry on and allows Toki a space to keep the fight for his victimhood, "...the legal system is evolving, growing and changing". In the above extract, the host is attempting to do two different kinds of work. On the one hand, she draws recourse to the law to argue against Toki's victimhood, "WOW. And it's such a complicated one. because technically, by law, the way that the law stands, if, if a child who is anyone under the age of 18, cannot give consent, those circumstances are almost irrelevant". However, at the same time, she seems to attempt to navigate the rigidity of it. And thus, she falls back on the idea that the law is evolving and so its understanding of victimhood may one day change and, therefore, accommodate Toki's frame of the victim. The Sexual Offences Amendment Act (Act 32 of 2007) provides an expanded definition of rape by making it applicable to all forms of sexual penetration without consent, irrespective of gender.

Toki's narrative co-opts other victims-survivors in the room into the conversation to help him understand what happened to him or rather frame the experience for him. Thus, Reece takes up the conversation:

Reece: So it could be corrective, right. Yeah, you went through a corrective rape, but from a legal point of view, the 25-year-old associate who you were working

with is actually guilty of two offenses. Number one, he's prostituting an underage individual, and number two, is within the Sexual Offences Act, there's compelled rape. Right. So this is in the law, see, as compelled be the underage young girl via financial reward, right to rape you as the victim. So he's guilty of both prostituting a teenager or a youngster and he's guilty of compelled rape. And within the law, he would be considered the rapist as well and I'm actually even thinking while you know we may speak about your situation as victim and perpetrator I am confident enough to say that she's also a victim, yes absolutely like she's a child, she should never have been in that situation, so, victim of circumstance, victim of many things she is also a victim. However, with your experience you know, if you're now sitting in the therapist chair that would be your perpetrator over and above the other person who orchestrates it.

Reece, in a sense, cut the whole narrative, and he frames it for both the audience and fellow survivors. He brings in different perspectives of the experience. In a way, he acknowledges all the parties involved; from assuring Toki, and providing him with a sensible explanation of who he is in this particular experience, to also lay it out for the audience that the female under-aged perpetrator could be acknowledged as both the victim and the perpetrator. By drawing on the constitution, Reece holds everyone respectively accountable (i.e. he seems to be taking an objective and somewhat fair approach to the situation); the guy who orchestrated the whole ordeal was also held accountable. By taking up this conversation, Reece draws on coercion discourse interlinked with toxic masculinity which alludes to the fact that men cannot/are too weak to resist female seduction. In drawing on this discourse, he also offers the

host (as a feminist) and her viewers who may identify as feminists or just not be convinced yet, a palatable narrative framing: that is, we can still be feminist and believe that a male sexual violation has indeed taken place and also still accommodate our belief that a child has been violated. The big bad guy here is not Toki but a toxic hegemonic system.

There had to be a negotiation amongst the three interlocutors (Reece, Toki and the host) that this was qualified rape. The facilitation of this negotiation through discursive constructions of toxic masculinity allowed the reframing of Toki's sexual violation experience, as inclusive of male victimhood. However, when it comes to Toki's narrative, almost everyone (in the podcast) is trying to negotiate and reframe it carefully.

Therefore, drawing on the legal discourse and highlighting the underlying legalities surrounding Toki's experience, in a sense, is a way of (de)constructing survivors' experiences –women *and* men are constructed as victims of toxic masculinity. Through this discursive construction, sexual violence can always be framed and reframed to accommodate different sexual violence experiences throughout this particular conversation and within a larger society. Thus, toxic masculinity and the legal system are constructed as challenges that have implications in the continued struggle to confront male sexual violence experiences and recognize victimhood in relation to male sexual violence.

5.5 Victim Worthiness Within Toxic Religion Discourse

In addition, the framing and reframing go beyond looking at toxic and legal discourse to inviting a more complex discourse of religion. This speaks to the ways in which religion plays a particular role in understandings of male sexual violence and understanding of own experience as a victim. Just like toxic masculinity, religion has defined gender role expectations for both men and women, and upholding one's role within a church setting, as well as within

religion at large, is paramount. Drawing on religious discourse, one of the survivors, Toki, explains his experience with a church leader upon disclosing the sexual violation experience.

Toki: ...though their knowledge was proven that I also can sleep with a woman, on the flip side at church I was seen as a sinner...and telling the pastor I had to tell him not from: from my point of view of a victim, but as a perpetrator. Because of society, he would not have believed me, the first thing he did was to open the Bible and tell me how guilty and sinful I was...

The Host: I think the difficult part about your story is us having to acknowledge the role of the church in rape and protecting it and everybody knows of the stories of the Roman Catholic church and the jokes that they make about priests but the reality is while church can play an amazing influence in somebody's life they can also play a big part in ruining somebody's life.

In the first extracts above, Toki highlighted the diversion between religion and hegemonic masculinity. In as much as he was appraised for being man enough (i.e. by his fellow work mates), he also finds himself on the crossroads as he does not experience the same praising from the church, "...at church I was seen as a sinner..." He narrates how religion worked against him. Perhaps as part of negotiating manhood, to prove that he was not 'gay', Toki is seemingly left with nowhere to turn not even the church. As much as Toki draws on religion, the ambiguity of religion is still apparent in the ways in which he was treated after disclosing his experience – being told to repent his sins. Once again, this invites Reece into the

conversation to add his perspective to the religion discourse he constructs alongside the notion of victim blaming:

Reece: I mean my experience with males that I've dealt with is that the church takes either two roles and I always say when men come and talk to me; I say your religion is between you and your God, and the priest must keep out of this area and I'll keep out religion because men often come to us and they say the priest has asked him that your fate has already been determined so now you have to find out that this happened to you for a reason. What is the reason that this happened to you? because it's your journey in life, and what are you going to learn from this? and how is this helpful as a victim to be able to deal with feeling that you have been raped or you've been violated? Now you're saying that there's a reason for this to happen and you need to find a journey. And then the other man comes to me and he said they've said that they've had to go into enormous amounts of praying in groups and with elders to find out what they did wrong. So again they're protecting the perpetrator from what they did wrong and so religion has got a part in life, but religion when it comes to victims they mustn't get involved with trying to put the blame on the victim and in both those circumstances they're putting the blame on the victim, not on the perpetrator, you know I learned a term recently I just have to share this term that I just learned two days ago and now I understand why I had to learn the term "spiritual bypassing".

Thus, Reece points out the notion of victim blaming where a survivor is made to find a reason for what happened to them, maybe they sinned and got that experience as a form of punishment which somehow, religion plays a part in perpetuating sexual violence. Basing his perspective on his expertise, "in my experience with males I have dealt with", Reece also deconstructs the toxic religion discourse by emphasizing that religion should not determine victim worthiness, "I say your religion is between you and your God, and the priest must keep out of this area". Therefore, he speaks to the toxicity of religion in this case. The discourse of religion and the ways it is socially constructed in the narrative remains ambiguous, yet it still occupies the same status as toxic masculinity.

Within the discursive construction of toxic religion, the host and Reece are doing the dominant framing about how the audience should make sense of what is narrated to them. Reece was speaking as an expert and activist who has trained in this area of abuse and healing, and the host was also speaking as a feminist against sexual violence. Additionally, social status intersects with race in the construction of male sexual violence experience. This is apparent when Reece, a white middle-aged man adopts a subject position of educator, advocate and expert. Traditional racial ideologies are that white masculinity is defined by power, superiority, intelligence, control and resistance to control (Schwalbe, 2014). As such, White men educate, create, lead; others follow. Reece displays these qualities. As an expert, he speaks for everyone, overlooking cultural variations that exist in human relationships and society's responses to sexual violence, and information disclosure. Reece speaks with authority and finality. Even the host immediately self-corrects herself when he disagrees with her sentiments. At the same time, Toki does not have a sophisticated language to speak about his rape ordeal and waits for Reece to name his experience. Thus, he controls the discourse and associated affective responses from fellow "victims" and the audience of the show.

5.6 Victim Worthiness: Justification, Validation and Recognition

The need to validate male sexual violence experiences stems from the reframing, and reconstruction of what it means to be violated as a man, taking into account the different experiences that could be defined and conceptualized as sexual violation experiences. In the podcast, an interesting conversation takes place within this justification, validation, and recognition discourse. Thus, the conversation between the host, and Toki in the extracts below, highlights the validation, and need for recognition within male sexual violence conversations.

Toki: ...a bit of grooming took place. And the person who grooms doesn't do so unless they've broken down your barriers, and they understand your weak points or your vulnerabilities. And by the time they get to this actual physical activity, you are basically indirectly consenting, not that you saying yes, I'm conscious and aware, and I'm agreeing to this. But you've indirectly said whatever happened must happen. And after all has happened, you then realize, I've been in this situation, I do not want to be there...

The Host: Did she ever come out and tried to paint it in a different way to what it was? I mean, other than then reporting back that Oh, no, he ejaculated. Let's celebrate him was there ever a point where she implied that you may have taken advantage of her.

Toki: She did. In fact, she tried at some point to extort some money from me. ...she said to me, what if I were to have your child? And I said, you can't have my child, why would you and she said to me, remember what we did, she took out the morning after pill. She says to me, if you want to be my man, we can

continue, like nothing happened...And you can continue to be my man and do as most men do in the village, provide for their women...

The Host: ...And for me to also just highlight that sexuality is irrelevant, completely.

Like I don't want anybody at home thinking, Well, you know, maybe because this one is gay is why it's completely irrelevant, completely...I'm thinking about the thoughts of, you know, corrective rape, where men will say, No, you as a lesbian, you don't know good dick. So I'm going to show it to you. That's literally the feelings that I'm getting from what you're sharing with your story.

Toki: Definitely.

Toki and the host get into a constant back-and-forth of trying to contextualize and find legitimate ways to explain how sexual violence perpetrated by a woman can constitute violence. As a result, the host tries different discourses through which to understand. She questions non-consensual sex with a woman as well as vulnerability as points of entry into the understanding of victimhood. She asks, "was there ever a point where she implied that you may have taken advantage of her". In this instance, Toki should provide sensible answers to justify that his experience was an actual violation. By so doing, the focus is placed on 'facts' that qualify a sexual experience as legitimate, "non-consensual sex", "vulnerability", and "taking advantage". Towards the end of the conversation, the host asks Toki a challenging question, "so how are you consolidating that for yourself? On your way to your healing journey". She does not want to come out and dismiss his framing of the experience as rape, but she proceeds to bluntly ask, "how do you consolidate that for yourself?" A connection between corrective rape and lesbians is made to highlight a somewhat equal weight between Toki's 'coercive' sexual violence experience, and corrective rape directed towards the LGBTQI+ community.

By so doing, she, then offers that narrative to him saying, "was this the same for you?" And then he says, "definitely". Therefore, providing Toki with a palatable narrative allows the audience to also take it up so that they do not see him as someone who committed statutory rape but rather as corrective rape. This is another discursive rhetoric: transposing of discourse used by the host. This is a strategy of using another discursive frame to read current events. By transposing a discourse deployed in a particular context (corrective rape) that surfaces a specific type of victim (black lesbian), the accompanying affects of empathy and righteous rage also get transposed to the new context. The affective connotations of the one context become the affective connotations of the new context. Her efforts to "understand" as well as the provision of a safe space for the survivor to answer some questions regarding the experience, speaks to the notion of wanting to justify, validate, and make the experience recognizable to oneself – as a victim, and to the public at large.

Part of the process of justifying, validating, and advocating for recognition, continues to carry the discourse of victim worthiness – who gets to 'claim' victim worthiness. This gets validated based on the understandings of who the perpetrator is. The conversation between the host and Okuhle highlights the negotiation of victimhood also focusing on the nature of the perpetrator, the nature of the perpetration and the actions of the victim in the aftermath of the incident:

The host: Okuhle. I mean, you've already alluded a little bit to what happened, and you mentioned was about three years ago. Can you share with us what you recall, when you were raped?

Okuhle: I don't remember anything, because I was a bit drunk. We went to the club with this other guy whom I was still dating by that time. And then he left me

in the club because we had, we had a fight in the club, and then he left me them.

The Host: And which area was this club?

Okuhle: Melville, Melville, okay? When he left me it was when I asked those guys to help me with texify. And then they said, okay, it's fine. We're going to help you. And then when I wanted to go approach them again. I said, Guys, I'm getting drunk. Can you please texify for me, and then they said, okay, we staying around, we can go because we don't have our phones with us. We can go and fix if I went. Then we went to their home. I stand outside. And then they got in the house and then they come back. The other one came back and said, you can't stand outside. It's winter, or it's cold.

The Host: So you guys were walking, walking.

Okuhle: It's not far from the club.

The host: And then you went to the inside.

Okuhle: When we get inside the other guy is having a gun and is already naked. I said to them, guys, I can't. I can't stand I can't stay here. Let me go and ask someone to texfy for me and go home.

The Host: He went away. It wasn't registering what was happening. You just saw him with a gun. He was naked, naked.

Okuhle: And then they said, we're going to have fun. I said, fun How? Because I Want to, I want to go home. They said, No, we're going to have fun. They took my phone, they locked the door. And then that's when everything started. After that, they locked me in the house. They went to the club again, I think, because they came up around four drunk. And then they said to me, oh, you can go home. And then I went, I went to the street. I didn't know where I was going. Because it was it was very dark. Like four. I saw some security guys, those who patrol with cars. And then I approached them. I told him the story. They said, let's go to the house. I said, I don't remember the house cause even here, I don't remember did I get here. And then they took me to home. And he said to me, go and open the case. I didn't go and open the case. And then I started getting sick.

The Host: So just so I understand. You don't you didn't recall what took place? Because you are drunk? Do you think that they had drugged you?

Okuhle: They didn't do anything. They just told me we're going to have fun. Okay. And then I asked this other guy because I saw his gun. I said, can you please at least use condom? They said no, you South African, you think you are smart?

The Host: And in, this in this moment? were you fighting them off of you? Or is it still a blur because of the alcohol? And I'm not asking this in any way to excuse anything that took place. I think it's to also just get an understanding of where your mental or mind space was at.

Okuhle: Oh, I was drunk. I said, No, it's fine. Whatever they do, it's fine.

The Host: Why did you feel that it was fine?

Okuhle: I didn't try anything I didn't. I was shocked. With the this is going to happen rarely, without anything, because my phone was off.

The Host: Have you thought about going to open a case?

Okuhle: It's something that came up now. Which is Okay, now I can do whatever it takes.

The Host: And, you know, it's obviously the experiences are so different. Because the age and the power dynamics make it make a difference. But in your case, I mean, somebody's sitting there with a gun. I know a lot of people victims of rape get asked, why didn't you fight off?

Okuhle engages into his narrative detailing the event prior to the incident, during the incident and after the incident. The host's questions serve to highlight a sequence of events to determine the qualification of the experience as rape, "which area was the club? ...And you guys were walking...? And you went inside...? Because you are drunk...? Why did you think it was fine...did you think of opening a case?". A place of the incident always matters when victims are describing the experience. A home, a bar or a prison, all this specific information influence the audience to validate or dismiss the victimhood. A place like Melville is regarded as a busy and a dangerous place hence perceived as high-risk places for crime. As such one might be convinced. Secondly, walking late at night is also another aspect that is usually checked to verify the audience. Then, the willingness or resistance also plays a role in showing

or persuading the audience that one is a victim. As such, willingly going inside the house, could also make the experience questionable. The state of mind is also considered in most rape cases – if the victim claims to be intoxicated, that might also raise eyebrows. Lastly, the actions after the incident matters. Thus, reporting the case to the police is one of many questions used in sexual violence incidents. Mostly people get suspicious if a person claims to have been violated and yet not report the case. All these different questions the host engaged with was also opening a chance for Okuhle to negotiate his victim worthiness. Therefore, he responds with various responses to convince the host and the audience, “I didn’t do anything, I was shocked, and my phone was off, ...they took my phone... they locked the door...I saw his gun...”. Part of convincing the audience in most rape cases include showing that there was no option to escape the incident. In this case, Okuhle made the case that he did not have any means to call for help, and one person against two people also pose a threat to be overpowered. Another form of threat he brings to light is the gun. This also sensitizes the audience that he was in danger, so he resorted to giving in to save his life. Therefore, for the case to be convincing, it needs to fit into a socially constructed, and accepted descriptions of sexual violence perpetrators. Which, then works to create a sense of victim worthiness to trigger certain affects from the audience – sorrow, and empathy.

Therefore, the discursive construction of victim worthiness allows an audience a different perspective on how they relate to victims-survivors of male sexual violence. The following comments from the audience demonstrate empathetic responses:

Comment 1: The freezing part from Okuhle 😞😞😞 You just freeze and your mind automatically tells you what’s going to happen to you but you can’t do

anything at that time 🙄🙄🙄 I still remember all the faces I saw that day during that freezing period 😞 Hope we all find healing 🙏

Comment 2: The pain in Okuhle's voice 😞 😞 😞... May you all find healing and strength

Comment 3: I understand why Okuhle wasn't talking much because the WOUND is still fresh and you could even hear the pain in his voice when he speaks.

Comment 3: The younger guy in studio with you really needs to deal with what happened to him, it's almost sounds as if he thinks it was his fault. He needs to be referred to psychologist for counselling, he might know that it was not his fault nor that he deserved it but I get the feeling that he does not believe it.

The audience empathizes with Okuhle and his narrative. Empathy is built on the idea of vulnerability. Okuhle is seen as an object of vulnerability as he is still trying to find ways to heal from the trauma. Hence the audience sensed the “pain in his voice when he speaks...” – an immediate surfacing of empathy that happens from the ‘reading’ of pain in bodily presentation. His embodiment of pain is read by the audience in a way that invites empathy. And they understand, “...why Okuhle was not speaking much the WOUND is still fresh...” This speaks to the equation of talking with healing. The beginning frame by the host and her question to them on why telling their story: to use their voice and stories to heal others and themselves. So talking (the ability to tell/speak) is equated with the depth of healing. In Okuhle’s case, his woundedness is still ‘new’. Therefore, Okuhle is perceived as someone who has not healed from the experience – he has not gone to a psychologist/therapist and he has not

done any kind of activism work that can be used as an empowerment tool for the victim in the healing journey. Additionally, empathy is also seen to be given based on how the audience embodies the shared pain as they resonate with his lack of power during the incident, "...you just freeze...I still remember the faces I saw during the freezing period..." Thus, one of the commentators relayed their own experience and reassure Okuhle that freezing is a normal reaction during a situation where one feels threatened. The relatability of his experience allowed them to embark on a journey to empathize with and support his healing process. The last commentator also highlighted, "...I get the feeling...". The readings of interiority (not speaking/believing it is his fault/not dealing with what happened) support readings of unhealed pain. This sense of someone's emotions that are 'stuck' has the potential to evoke responding empathy in the audience (Ahmed, 2014). Also, listening to all four narratives, all of them, except for Okuhle, seemed to be speaking as people who have, to some extent, transcended what happened to them, so that they can reflect and talk about their experiences. However, Okuhle was the only one who still seemed stuck. Therefore, the sense of stuckness lured the audience to be apathetic. As such, some comments recommended that he finds psychological help and wished him healing, "...he needs to be referred to a psychologist for healing..."

5.7 Concluding remarks

Overall, the text centres around the conversation with four men who share their sexual violence experiences. Victim worthiness is negotiated to indicate men are victim worthy. Thus, there different framing that the host and the victim-survivors undergo create different subject positioning with some people positioned as experts in the field, and others as more vulnerable as they are still trying to heal from the experience. There the performative work constructs particular forms of being a vulnerable subject concerning male sexual violence. Thus, the podcast showed and educated the audience on different ways men could become victims of

sexual violence and it debunks traditional social understandings of who a "real victim" should be. For example, Reece as an activist shares his knowledge and experience to educate both the audience and the other victims-survivors in different areas to understand the complexity of male sexual violation concerning social institutions such as hegemonic masculinity and religion. For this education, the audience can take with their understandings and perceptions. Therefore, the entire discussion focuses on the notion of reconstructing male sexual violence and negotiating victimhood.

CHAPTER SIX:

Humanizing a (De)Humanized Subject: Understanding Prison Rape Through Affective Tropes.

6.1 Introduction

Affective dimensions apparent across the data set indicated the different ways in which male sexual assault against other male bodies and vulnerability seem to surface affective investments in how society responds. According to Ahmed (2014), to say that emotions do things means that emotions (dis)allow, (dis)connect or (de)attach the individual space with the social space, the individual and the collective. This means that emotions can be used to feel for others or oneself and can materialize to formulate collective understanding and action. Thus, we are connected to others through emotions, and the work that they do, and it is this connection upon which we may develop a sense of ourselves – particularly in relation to others and *other* others. Ahmed (2004) argues that what moves to produce emotions are objects of emotions. In this case, the prison institution, the rape experience, and the treatment Isaak received from the prison could be perceived as objects (not to say emotions and feelings are vested in them) in play or circulation that results in the anger, rage, pain, shame to mention but a few. For instance, activism work characterizes the move and affective assemblages of collective resistance dependent on the nature of the issue. Looking at sexual violence in general, it is a social injustice issue which distils the objects that move, materialize, (de) attach, and have/not a sticking effect culminating in the evocation of pain and rage leading to the possibility for public action/non-action or consciousness-raising. This according to Ahmed (2014), is dependent on the ways in which affects move, materialize, align, attach, and stick the bodily and social world together (or apart). In this sense, the concept of affective economies speaks to the ways in which emotions and feelings are neither residence of any subject, object or place nor as coming from without. Emotions are seen, in this light, as mediate forces between the

psychological and the social. The performativity of affect occurs as they move, attach and circulate among bodies, signs and objects in any form – between, sideways or backward. For instance, fear works "through and on the bodies of those who are transformed into its subjects as well as its objects" (Ahmed, 2004, p. 62). Fear (re)establishes distance, the spacing between bodies, and serves to solidify the existing social hierarchy, white people over Black people. This means that emotions can circulate to affect certain bodies and can be interpreted differently depending on how one could read signs or objects or emotions whether they move sideways, or backwards.

In the previous chapter, victim-worthiness was discussed and contextualized within a general social context, each guest at the show was allowed to showcase their victim-worthiness. In this chapter, the central theme within the data, of defending or validating male sexual violence and victimhood, is contextualized within the prison context. Thus, the focus is on the reproduction of the subject in the talk and the surfacing of emotions in relation to prison rape. In this chapter, therefore, I seek to continue investigating the following questions as outlined in the methodology chapter: 1) what discursive work is done to bring the societal responses to male sexual violation? 2) what affective economies underlie these discursive constructions of male experiences of rape and sexual violence? and 3) how is male sexual citizenship governed via discursive and affective tropes?

This chapter is centered around a podcast that focuses on male sexual violence in South African prisons. The podcast is taken from Gauteng's Talk Radio 702 after a show facilitated by a male host (Eusebius) to tackle the different issues affecting South Africa, particularly, male sexual violence. In the podcast, the host explains that he was motivated to talk to Isaak on the show after he watched his documentary 'Taking off the Mask' where Isaak tells the story of how he survived prison and how the justice system failed him when he was raped. The host

featured it in his show at the time (2019) on 702 as a way of tracking sexual violence as topical within South Africa. Isaak was convicted for a crime he says he was not responsible for, in 1999 when someone in his community was murdered. When he first entered Allandale Prison, Isaak describes how he knew he would be a target for rape. The podcast is about a male victim-survivor of sexual violence within the prison context; Isaak - who provides a narration of his experience of rape in prison. The podcast consists of three guests and the host. These include Isaak who is described as a survivor of prison rape and ex-prisoner, Prince Nare, Co-director - of Justice Detention International - South Africa, and Sasha Gear, Co-director - of Justice Detention International - South Africa.

Throughout the podcast, discursive constructions of victimhood concerning male sexual violence in prison become dominant as Isaak embarks on a journey to negotiate the legitimacy and validity of his victimhood. Thus, the mission was for the host to assist and facilitate the convincing of the other guests on the show the audience and the society at large that Isaak is victim worthy. The analyses outline structure focuses on the following themes and sub-themes: 1. Framing the talk within Human Rights Discourse: Humanizing the Subject; 2. Human Rights Discourse: Victim, Activist, and Advocate Subject Positionalities. The second theme has three sub-themes: 2.1. Victim Positionality: "The System Failed Me"; 2.2. Activist and Advocate Positionalities: "Let's Change Our Attitudes and Give Meaning to the Constitution"; 2.3. Victim Positionality and the Discourse of Consent: "He Forced Me to Have Sexual Conduct with Him". I close the chapter with concluding remarks.

6.2 Framing the Talk

The conversations and the journey to defending and negotiating victimhood begin with a particular framing from the host as he opens the conversation to the public. The framing is on humanizing Isaak as a subject worthy of empathy and human dignity. Thus, the host

performs reconstructive work on male sexual violence and what it means to be a victim as a man given the social taboo of the subject of male sexual violence.

6.2.1 A 'Shameful' Talk

It is important to highlight some of the prevailing social taboos affecting male subject construction in relation to sexual violence and vulnerability to situate the relevance of the framing the host undertakes. The following extract is a response to a Twitter advertisement about the podcast before the airing of the podcast about prison male rape. This comment illustrates these social taboos about male sexual violence:

(Twitter comment) Comment 1: Why are we talking about bum holes?

The commentator clearly expresses disinterest in having a conversation about male sexual violence, let alone listening to the narratives of the survivors. Inasmuch as this question is rhetorical, such a reaction constructs a dismissive discourse where other violated bodies are unrecognizable. Furthermore, although the above statement is dismissive and horrible, it is equally homophobic and shameful. The word "bum-holes" socially relates to homosexuality and is constructed as one of how the LGBTQ community, especially gay men, engage in sexual intercourse. Therefore, not recognizing the significance of speaking about sexual violation of this nature (men-to-men sexual violence) speaks widely to homophobic ideologies where the violated homosexual body is regarded as insignificant. Thus, male sexual violence experiences, in some cases, are dismissed and joked about (Donnelly & Kenyon, 1996; Sivakuruman, 2005; Lee, 2000; Stanko, 2017). There are also underlying shaming undertones in the above statement. By writing in such an explicit manner, the commenter draws on shame to portray the conversation as a humiliating subject, which in turn should become shameful to talk about. Consequently, male-to-male sexual violence is objectified and minimized to "bum-

holes" and thus, male sexual violence experiences do not constitute "real" victimization. In this case, "why are we talking about bum-holes" permits affective technologies such as shaming, guilt, and humiliation to repress, reproduce, and reconstruct subjectivity. This speaks directly to the extract above; Isaak's experience is ridiculed/ silenced as a way of maintaining hegemonic masculinity.

Inasmuch as the above statement by the commentator is homophobic and dismissive, it is equally performative. It has the potential to affect and move the audience in particular forms – such as sidelining the experience.

6.2.2. *"I challenge You" Talk*

The host opens the podcast by showing an awareness of these current social constructions of male sexual violence; that it is a subject socially understood as taboo, painful, and difficult to talk about. Hence, the acknowledgement work sets a particular atmosphere for Isaak, the audience, and other guests in how they should carry the conversation forward. The host started the podcast by saying:

The host: Now at this hour we are going to be dealing with a really important, very difficult subject. Very often when it comes to prisoners or one that has been sentenced, many of us are deeply un-empathetic to the conditions under which they are held in various correctional facilities or holding cells or police stations. But I think it is because we think they just got what they deserve to be treated poorly and quite frankly some of you will go as far as to say that they don't have any human rights than those of us who are not criminals. While the fact of the matter is...every single person deserves to be treated with dignity whether they are law-abiding citizens or not. ...the government is uncaring about the poor conditions under which you live if you are a convicted

criminal or an awaiting trial prisoner who has not yet been sentenced. ...We sometimes condemn people that are for so many years waiting in fact to have justice dispersed. And one of many different kinds of abuse that happen in our prison system is rape and we don't talk about it. There is a taboo around sexual violence in society in general. There is a taboo around male rape in our homes, and in our communities and there is a particular taboo around prison rape. The moment we come to realize this as a reality is when we say really unfunny things like "papacokil", when someone we don't like or maybe someone from the community gets sentenced to prison. And there has been a really important documentary by the title – taking off the mask. That has been put together. It was launched yesterday and I have seen it. It features the story of Isaak who is from Paarl in the Western Cape. Who is an ex-prisoner who bravely tells the story of being a rape survivor in South African prison not just once off but multiply so. It's really a difficult story and am incredibly grateful for his bravery to work with Justice Detention International initiative South African Charter and also the opportunity for the media to address the story. And I think this is the area we cannot afford to be neutral. It requires a part of social justice. Because the rights of the prisoners do matter as of every single South African.

In the above extract, the host performs advocacy work and frames the conversation by deconstructing the traditional and current negative understandings and perceptions of the treatment of prisoners. He proceeds by contextualizing human rights issues within the prison context and highlights the difficult conditions and experiences of prisoners. The host states, "very often when it comes to prisoners or one that has been sentenced, many of us are deeply un-empathetic to the conditions under which they are held in various correctional facilities or

holding cells or police stations". This kind of talk challenges the audience to start questioning their reactions and feelings towards prisoners. Although the center of the conversation was not focused on prisoners in general, this kind of framing was used as a stepping stone to invite a more difficult conversation about prison rape, "...we cannot afford to be neutral...". Thus, the audience is given a chance to self-reflect before Isaak started sharing his experience. This could be understood as a kind of framing focusing on the audience's emotions in preparing their reception of Isaak's story and victimhood. Although it is not definite whether the audience will not "be natural", the host relies on the potentiality of emotions work to shape the 'surfaces' of the audience and the guests on the show. By challenging the audience, there is a potential for the host to surface particular subjectivities within the audience. Since bodies take the shape of the very contact they have with objects and others (Ahmed, 2014), it is anticipated that the audience could resonate and empathise with Isaak.

6.3 Discursive Constructions of Human Rights Discourse

The host continues the advocacy work and draws on the discourse of human rights, "but I think it is because we think they just got what they deserve to be treated poorly and quite frankly, some of you will go as far as to say that they don't have any human rights than those of us who are not criminals. While the fact of the matter is, as our opening lines this morning, every single person deserves to be treated with dignity". This statement is directed to the audience and the guests on the show, it focuses on the emotions of the audience. The host uses a second person point of view, "you" as the one who would probably feel guilty of being judgmental towards Isaak. Pointing out that "every single person deserves to be treated with dignity" is a presumption for the audience to be moved by this thought and it is this movement that would enable them to be empathetic. This is an appeal to the audience to think about human rights and dignity despite the social background or the crimes a person might have committed.

The appeal is not about the audience but the feeling of the audience. Once they empathize, they possibly could see him as deserving of human rights (Ahmed, 2014). Following scholars like Sara Ahmed, Lauren Berlant, and Pedwell's (2014c) views on empathy as relational, interactive and circulating, as the guests and the audience listen to Isaak's narrative, there is a possibility for them to imagine and identify with his pain and suffering. Thereby, allowing for recognition of common humanity and equality. Ahmed (2014) argues that relating to the suffering of others creates a category of "less relatable" others. And as per Butler's (2004) terms, sympathy can create a distinction between more and less grievable lives. In so doing, the host constructs Isaak as a humanized subject. The audience is, thus, challenged to not view Isaak as a "criminal", but rather as a person first. Much of human rights research regarding sexual violence has been placing more focus on the persistence of female sexual harassment within various corporate industries such as factories, businesses and other kinds of workplaces (Beuchler, 1990; Bunner & Dever, 2014; Grosser & Tyler, 2021). Although some of this scholarship highlights the sexual harassment of men, the focus is within the workplace. Thus, the prison context has not received much attention in addressing human rights and the sexual violence that occurs in high volumes. The context of the prison has allowed the public to sideline the injustices that happen behind prison bars. The activism work apparent in this podcast showcases the need to challenge this status quo. Therefore, the audience is encouraged to keep in mind that the violation of Isaak's body through rape diminishes human dignity and that it should not be a part of the punishment of the crime for which he was incarcerated, but rather a violation of human rights and human dignity. This type of framing is useful in setting a precedence for Isaak to negotiate victim worthiness.

Additionally, part of advocating for male sexual violence is for the host to be cognizant of the emotions attached to the subject of rape and make the audience aware that they might

find the conversation emotionally difficult. This provides an emotional preparation to everyone in the show; Isaak, other guests, and the audience to engage in the conversation about male rape. Thus, he says, "we sometimes condemn people that are, for so many years, been waiting to have justice dispersed. And one of many different kinds of abuse that happen in our prison system is rape and we don't talk about it. There is a taboo around sexual violence in society in general. There is a taboo around male rape in our homes, in our communities and there is a particular taboo around prison rape". The host continues to deconstruct the social normalization of male sexual violence as a taboo. He also uses this conversation to break the taboo and the silence around male sexual violence. This kind of work within the talk paves a way for Isaak, the guests, and the audience to speak about the unspoken – male rape. In so doing, multiple subject positionings are opened up and eventually utilized to accomplish both the advocacy work and claim of victim worthiness.

6.3.1 Human Rights Discourse: Victim, Activist and Advocate Subject Positionalities.

Simonson and Kjaergard (2017) assert that human rights are a concept that link laws and morality regarding the treatment of individuals. They argue that law and morality draw different issues to the attention of society – which then brings together societal order. As a consequence, legal rights in relation to sexual violation and agency speak to the rights of choice and dignity embedded into the South African constitution. These rights are an obligation for society to uphold. In this case, with the lack of acknowledgement and practice of such rights, the legality and morality of society become questionable. Additionally, the concept of morality speaks to the notion of doing what is right. Therefore, the host in this podcast draws on a human rights discourse to question the law and the morality of the audience in relation to the recognition of Isaak as a victim of sexual violence.

In the opening and framing of the conversation, several subject positionings are created. As the host takes up the position of an advocate, he also positions Isaak as a victim (as a position), worthy or deserving of human dignity and human rights. These are two powerful positions to shape the conversation as they are essential in doing the persuasive work for the audience to recognize Isaak as a victim. In the process of these subject positionings, the audience is also given a chance to take up different positionalities – as allies in support of the human rights and recognition of Isaak as a victim of male sexual violence, or remain adamant to traditional constructions and understandings of male sexual violence. Looking at the above-constructed positions (i.e., advocate, ex-convict victim-survivor, ally and non-ally), the conversations started on a very strong foot in debunking the silence and lack of recognition of male sexual violence (and victimhood) within society. As such, Isaak's claim of a victim-survivor of sexual violence as an *ex-convict* maybe distinguishes him from other male victim-survivors of a similar violation. There is maybe more work for him to do than it is for others who are not ex-convicts or that society may deem “less” responsible than someone like Isaak with his history.

How the host in this podcast frames the conversation at the beginning is different from the host in the previous chapter in the sense that, in the previous chapter, the host was not speaking in the context of prison rape and this host is more fully on the side of the victim in general, with less skepticism/reservations compared to the previous host.

The host is making more effort to discredit traditional social notions that prisoners deserve bad things to happen to them – being mistreated and raped in prison. This means that Isaak will have to do two kinds of work: 1) showing the audience that he is a human first irrespective of the crime he committed and; 2) negotiating that he is a victim of sexual violence. Thus, some victims are required to exert more effort to validate their victim worthiness. In this

case, Isaak's subject positioning as an ex-convict who is a victim-survivor of sexual violence places him in a difficult position to gain empathy from the audience; hence, the need to humanize him before he gets into detail with his story.

As the conversation moves forward, the subject positioning of each guest becomes clearer and we start to see how each positioning bolsters/anchors the advocacy for the recognition of the victim worthiness of survivors of sexual violence in prisons. The host started by introducing each guest in the podcast, thanking them for reaching out and availing themselves to discuss this difficult topic with the audience of the show, particularly Isaak:

The host: Firstly, Sasha Gear is a coordinator of Justice Detention International, thank you very much, you and your colleagues for reaching out to us here on this program. For being with us today. I really appreciate it.

Sasha: Thank you very much for having us.

The host: It's only a pleasure. Next here is co-director Prince Nare. Prince, thank you very much to you as well for the work that you do and for coming into the studio today.

Prince: Thank you so much

The host: And then Isaak. Who is like I said an ex-prisoner. He is the one who features in this documentary. He is here with me in the studio as well. Isaak "Qua mora" and thank you so much for coming into the studio.

Isaak: Thank you for allowing me to be here.

The host: I listened to your story as I watched the documentary yesterday and I cannot think just how much it must have been like for you on an emotional level, not only what you have gone through but the possibility of being traumatized every time you have to stand in front of the audience to tell your story even if I know obviously that you have committed to take the mask off and to tell the story.

In the above extract, the host attaches a particular title to each guest as he introduces them, "ex-prisoner, rape survivor, coordinator, co-director". As such, the introduction of the guests is essential in highlighting positionality, who is who in the conversation, which also determines the value and kinds of contributions that positionality brings to the conversation, and the role of each one in the construction of subjectivity and knowledge within the male sexual violence discourse. For example, being a co-director within a human rights organization brings with it knowledge and new understanding (for the audience) to understand the subject of male rape and victimhood.

In addition to subject construction, the host does the extra work of attaching particular affects as he continues to introduce Isaak, "I cannot think just how it must have been like for you on an emotional level", "...the possibility of being traumatized...". The choice of emotional words and phrases performs the work of humanizing Isaak by highlighting his emotional vulnerability and trauma, allowing the audience to see him as someone worthy of their empathy. The possibility of being an "emotionally traumatized" subject is part of many characteristics of a victim which invites an empathetic response. Furthermore, the utilization of phrase, "you have committed to take the mask off" is also another term the host uses to create and showcase a vulnerable subject. All this framing work performs the role of inviting an affective response from the audience – to be able to see Isaak beyond the mask (his past crimes,

gender and or sexuality). This leaves space for the audience to hear Isaak's story without presumptions, pre-judgments, and biases.

Kramer and Bowman (2020) in their study on the making of male victimhood in South African female-perpetrated abuse argue that contemporary constructions of victimhood are anchored based on the emphasis on hierarchies of vulnerability, body betrayal, emasculations, and pre-conception of "moral" sexuality. This consequently makes it impossible to detect let alone claim male victimhood. Thus Isaak, in the above extract, is taking his "mask off" and makes himself vulnerable through the narration of his rape and mistreatment in prison to attain victim worthiness.

Moreover, the host continues to do the advocacy and subject construction work. The following extract is another illustration:

The host: As I looked forward to meeting you today, but I also thought to myself as a human being, not as a journalist, as a human being I am also looking forward to meeting you because it must have been really, really difficult to keep on telling your story. Before we get into the details, can I ask you this question, "what is your reason, your personal motivation for why you are happy to tell your story even though it must be difficult to keep on going back to 1999?"

Still doing the framing, the host avails a platform for Isaak to argue his worthiness as a victim. In addition to the earlier humanization of subjectivity and deconstruction of traditional notions of prison and prisoners with regard to deserving human rights and human dignity, the host continues to frame the conversation and the subject of victim worthiness to personify Isaak. The host actively aligns himself with Isaak, he says, "I also thought to myself as a human being, not as a journalist, as a human being". Stripping himself of his professional jacket, the

host co-opts the audience to do the same. That is, to take off any form of affiliations, cultural beliefs, or professional identity to understand Isaak's story on a person-to-person level. In this sense, there is the possibility of listening with an empathetic ear which can lead to the recognition and acceptance of Isaak as a victim.

6.4 “The System Failed me”: Victim Positionality

Flynn (2015) states that when it comes to the law, people desire to obtain justice. However, looking at a larger scale, the law has globally continuously failed in providing justice, empowerment, status or control to sexual violence victims. He further argues that the justice system has failed to adequately consider the complexities and individuality of sexual violence experiences. Flynn (2015) relates these failings to the dominant cultural, political and social narratives around what constitutes 'real rape'. Thus, there has been an increase in the critique of the justice system regarding cases of sexual violence with the notion to provide better integration of victims' needs in legal proceedings. Consequently, this critique could enable the facilitation of opportunities for the interruption of the recognizable narratives of rape, justice and the lived, versus stereotyped, experiences of sexual violence victims.

Additionally, Seidman and Pokorak (2011) highlight these systematic failures arguing that the legal response to sexual assault historically focused on the criminal prosecution of perpetrators, seeking accountability through the punishment of offenders. The needs of victims, who were often left injured physically, emotionally, and financially were not generally the goals of the legal system. They further argue that the main legal concern for the justice system has traditionally been the protection of the perpetrator while the victim's honesty and chastity were always challenged. Thus, this led to victims' need to provide proof of utmost resistance which led to difficult successful prosecutions.

The following extract showcases some of the failures of the criminal justice system's response to rape as well as the failure of the civil justice system to adequately respond to the pressing needs of Isaak as a victim of rape. Seidman and Pokorak (2011) suggest the need for systemic changes to address rape victims' immediate legal needs, provide long-term structural support for victims in society, and enable victims to access the legal system to assist them as they heal and recover from the trauma of rape.

The host moved on to ask Isaak, "what is your story, what is your personal motivation that you are happy to share your story?". Thus, this line of questioning places Isaak in a position of vulnerability who is 'happy' to share his story because of a "personal motivation" to let the audience know of his unhappy experience of sexual violence when he was incarcerated. He wants to inform the audience about this experience with the hope that the audience will be able to appreciate that he is victim worthy. Here is what he said:

Isaak: Thank you. The reason why it is important for me to tell my story if I go back to 1999, I have been seeking for so many years to find somebody to hear me, to help me. But they discriminated me. But I think in a way for me it is like the perpetrator had for so many years so much power over me. Because, um, the correctional services, the justice system kept quiet because I told them what happened to me. But they didn't want to hear me, they discredited me. So, in a way for me that was my main focus at the end of the day to get a platform and to tell people about what happened to me. Even though it is sometimes quite hard for me to stand in front of strangers, that I don't know, and to tell my story...

In the above extract, Isaak explains that he has been searching for someone to hear his story. Thus, being heard in this sense speaks to the lack of recognition of male sexual violence, and that, society does not acknowledge men as victims, or their pain and vulnerability. After spending years awaiting acknowledgement, Isaak wants to make a plea to the audience to reconstruct social understandings of male vulnerability. As a result, this can provide an affirmation for Isaak's experience and recognition as victim worthy – not only as a victim of male rape but also of the failure of the correctional and justice systems in intervening on his behalf and others who share his experience. Simonson and Kjaergard (2017) argue that in theory, everyone is empowered to practice their human rights, however, this is not always the case in practice. Thus, human rights provisions are commonly general and abstract. Simonson and Kjaergard (2017) further assert that the standard claim of human rights should be provided to people based on their humanity rather than membership of narrow categories such as class, community, gender and sexuality. Therefore, the host's discursive construction of human rights becomes significant to the audience as a tool to evoke and question their morality – urging them to do what is right – validating Isaak as a victim based on his humanity rather than his social status as a gay man or as an ex-convict.

Additionally, Isaak draws on the discourse of social discrimination to argue that he has been neglected as a victim, "...they've discriminated me...the correctional service, the justice system kept me quiet...". Using these phrases, Isaak positions himself as a victim of a system that discriminates and rejects his victim worthiness. Thunberg and Bruck (2019) in their study on young victims' positioning and narration of victimhood, argued that people who position themselves as victims in the face of a crime or adversity receive support as compared to those who do not. The reception of support functions as a way for victims to keep intact their personal and narrative identities. This is highlighted in the above extract as Isaak provides his narrative

and self-positioning, his position as a neglected victim evokes the potential for support. As such, in narrating his experience, Isaak draws on different victim positionalities, with each position doing a particular work in the negotiation of victim worthiness.

The host quickly takes this opportunity in the conversation to support Isaak's position and bring to light his experience in relation to the crime for which he was convicted to humanize Isaak. The following extract demonstrates:

The host: So let's think about the circumstances that led you to finding yourself in prison. My understanding is that there was a murder in the community and that got you arrested as you tell it in the documentary. And it seems the justice system and the community were under the impression that the community wanted someone to be held accountable and as the lucky in the draw...that person ended up being you.

Isaak: Yes, if you are being found at a certain time... by the crime scene you will probably be liable of what happened at the crime scene. So, I think they did not do the investigations thoroughly. That's why they picked on me even though evidence say I didn't do the murder. Yeah.

The above extract allows Isaak to shed some light on the crime he was convicted of. Having this opportunity works to show the audience that Isaak might be a victim of the criminal justice system – in other words, he "was found at the wrong place, at the wrong time", which in turn makes the audience see him as a victim of circumstances. Thus, this construction of the story continues to humanize him – and the audience is being asked to identify with this as what happened to Isaak could have happened to anyone.

Therefore, the unfolding sequence of events in the conversation gradually prepares Isaak to be seen as a subject embodying multiple kinds of victimhood. The host says, “it seems the justice system and the community were under the impression that the community wanted someone to be held accountable”. This kind of framing is performative in exonerating Isaak, the blame is pointed at the justice system and the community. This shifts the audience's focus from Isaak as a villain in the story to blaming the justice system. This also gives the audience a chance to think of Isaak differently – as a victim of the system. In his response to the host, Isaak takes the position presented to him and he uses it to further support his positionality as a victim of circumstance. Isaak uses specific terminology that alienates him from the subject of a villain and rather that of a victim. He says, "they picked me", "they did not do the investigations thoroughly", "...being found at a certain time... by the crime scene you will probably be liable". This kind of self-positioning provides the benefit of the doubt to the audience and allows a chance to convince the audience that he is a victim. The framing by the host and its adoption by Isaak generates compassion. And it is the extent of this compassion by the host that gives Isaak the confidence and bravery to take up this victim positionality. In terms of the audience, the taking up of a victim positionality for Isaak could encourage their empathy for Isaak, therefore, aligning the audience with the guests and the host. This alignment is not only about the individual guests and the show's audience (the collective body that emerges from the empathy that is produced or generated from the framing and the constructed positionalities during the conversation). It is also an alignment around certain principles of the justice system, law, morality and humanity. Vyas and Panda (2019) in their study on the reification of victimhood highlighted the significance of collectivism in shifting the sense and meaning of victimhood by communicating a sense of resistance. The host and Isaak, use detachment as a form of resistance to his given position as an ex-convict who may have been

falsely arrested and convicted of a crime he did not commit owing to the failures of the criminal justice system. The exchange between the host and Isaak is an attempt to introduce an affective conversation with the audience. The transformation is enacted through the talk between the host and Isaak – from the figure of the convict or ex-convict – with all the meanings or affective associations that this figure conjures up (apathy, in deference or hostility) to a victim of sexual violence. The talk not only humanizes Isaak, but it is also attempting to collapse the distinction between perpetrator and victim, that a perpetrator (especially one who is falsely accused) can be a victim in the many ways Isaak has been victimized. Thus, the affective transformation – from an apathetic audience to an empathetic audience is performative in the negotiation of Isaak's victim worthiness. Therefore, the neglect, indifference or downright violation of Isaak by the criminal justice and correctional services systems is the catalyst that makes this conversion a likelihood.

Being wrongly convicted could potentially evoke empathetic feelings for Isaak to be perceived as an innocent man convicted for the crimes he did not commit. In addition, Isaak suffered a horrible rape experience while in prison. The framing of Isaak's narrative constructs an innocent subject and a victim of the failures of the system. To co-opt the audience into understanding Isaak, his sexual violation when he was in prison is attributed to the failure of the system in wrongly imprisoning him for a crime he was not responsible for and in not protecting him during his incarceration. Vyas and Panda (2019) explain this intended shift as a social repositioning, in this case, for the audience to recognize, deconstruct, and re-interpret their construction of victimhood. This representation provides the audience with a chance to reevaluate their feelings and perceptions about Isaak's vulnerability. Such a representation suggests that empathy is bound up with the audience's ability to reassess their attributions of

guilt and culpability. If Isaak is a victim of a callous and uncaring system, then he deserves all the empathy he can get from the audience. This can potentially secure his victim worthiness.

The discursive construction of the mistreatment of Isaak concerning male sexual violence, and within the context of prison was reported to stem from both the institution and the helping professions such as the wardens, the judge/priest, and social workers. In responding to sexual violence against men, social reception of the sexual violence incident seems to be significant in shaping how a male sexual violence experience is validated. Thus, after highlighting that Isaak is a victim of circumstances, the host embarks on a journey to continue unmasking the system's failure in acknowledging and recognizing male sexual violence. Additionally, unmasking how the system downplays the male sexual violence experience is a process to render the male body grievable. Helman (2017) argues that grievable bodies concerning sexual violence are associated with socially constructed ideologies. The author further asserted that we need to critically think and question how other sexually violated bodies, those around them, and the broader society respond to sexual violence. There is a need to be cognizant of the ways in which we respond to sexual violence experiences and the impact of such responses on subjectivity/subject construction. Therefore, the podcast host engages with a particular framing to deconstruct these exclusive social constructions of a "real" victim. When is it given, grievability allows for the construction of subjectivity – the acknowledgement of victimhood. Yet, when withheld, it denies the victim the opportunity to claim the victimhood identity. Butler's (1999) work on gender performativity could be useful in understanding the ways in which doing gender is socially construed through hegemonic social ideologies. Butler confronted the belief that certain gender behaviors are natural demonstrating that what is thought and believed to be associated with femininity or masculinity is an act of some sort, a performance. Following Butler's line of thought, it could be argued that the commenter's

statement (in the above extract) functions as one way of constructing the ways in which gender, and or sex is performed from a narrow and limited dichotomy of male/female

As a way to keep unveiling the failures of the system and showcase Isaak as a victim, the host provides Isaak with a platform to narrate the sequence of events that unfolded when he reported the rape experience to the officials. The extract below illustrates:

The host: When this horrific, horrific incident happened how did people around you respond? I mean prisoners because it is so crowded. I mean I can't even imagine, you know, anyone pretending as though they don't understand what the hell is going on or were you shouting for help, how were you in that particular moment? what was the response of other prisoners in particular?

Isaak: They did not care because they were busy doing their own thing...

The host: Isaak, I want you to slow down the story at this point. And I want you to just step by step go through what happens in the next couple of days and weeks, OK, and there is a point I want to make with the public. So just go through with me one point at a time. Do not rush the story. You were so brave that the first person that you disclosed to after what happened was the nurse, did the nurse do anything?

Isaak: Absolutely nothing. She told me that I should go and wash my stinking body.

The host: The next person you had an opportunity to disclose to was a warden, how did the warden respond?

Isaak: He laughed at me in my face.

The host: Then you had an opportunity to talk to a district official, how did they respond? or was it a priest?

Isaak: Priest yes.

The host: Ok, so you also had an opportunity to speak to a priest.

Isaak: Yes

The host: What did the priest say?

Isaak: The priest said I must repent from my sins.

The host: Then you had an opportunity to speak to a social worker.

Isaak: From that time when I spoke to the social worker she told me that they can't give any psychological help because I am still awaiting trial, so they don't give awaiting a trial that service.

The host: Officer of the court, a judge failed you. How does that make you feel as a human being?

Isaak: I felt in that moment that I'm not worthy to be alive, am not worthy to be a human being.

The host: [Afrikaans] I do not know what to say. Sasha and Prince help me out here before we take a break. The most fundamental value in our society, inside a prison and outside the prison, that we strive to preach is self-worth. Isaak's self-worth was neither affirmed nor respected,

nor his right to dignity was upheld. Violation in society does not get more fundamental than that, does it?

While asking Isaak to narrate his experience, the host starts by affirming his courage to speak out. The host says, "you were so brave". Drawing on the discourse of courage can perform an empowerment work for Isaak as he continues to share his vulnerability. When one is seen as brave, one gets respect and empathy for their bravery which then is associated with victim worthiness.

The host then provides Isaak with a platform to explain his story. He invites Isaak to narrate step by step and "slowly" what happened after reporting the rape experience. Isaak described how the social worker, the psychologist, the warden, and the priest downplayed the situation. In the above extract, it is apparent that the justice and correctional services systems failed Isaak as a victim through the lack of acknowledgement and recognition. The narration of events is very detailed, "she laughed at my face", "she said go wash your stinking body". The choice of words and phrases Isaak uses in describing the experience of disclosing his story could evoke different emotions – sympathy, and empathy from the audience. This kind of articulation of vulnerability places him in a position of a victim. In highlighting the system's failures, Isaak becomes a victim who is deserving of empathy. Helman (2017) provides a narrative of how, because of the color of her skin – as a white woman, her rape and presence at the sexual violence healthcare center was a shock to health service providers and it was quickly recognized as opposed to the experiences of other victims – Black victims. Thus, Isaak's treatment by the prison personnel is far from the same as the Black women. His is ironically similar to the white woman in the story. In the sense that both their bodies are not immediately recognizable as rape victims. The point of differentiation is in how the white woman's body is able to surface empathy and care in the aftermath of recognition. The Black

man's body must battle two things: recognition and empathy. Thus, based on social ideologies prisoners deserve to be punished and not cared for. The responses of the officials: "stinking body", "repenting for one's sins", and being "laughed" at by one of the wardens. Sexual violence experiences of male prisoners are viewed as not shocking with the contemplation that the sexual violence against prisoners or any form of mistreatment is "normal". In their study on 'Factors influencing incarcerated offenders' perceptions of correctional officers in South African correctional centres', Bello and Matshaba (2022) used a cross-sectional survey of 315 male prisoners to investigate whether experiences of abuse and brutality, social distance and corruption predict incarcerated offenders' perception of correctional officers in South African correctional centres. In their findings, Bello and Matshaba (2022) reported that the effects of abuse and brutality, and corruption lessen prisoners' confidence in correctional officers, decreasing the ratings of their procedural fairness, and their overall effectiveness or performance.

Isaak's description of how the prison personnel responded to his ordeal is functional in how these personnel become affective objects. The description is directed at the audience and the guests on the show and their emotions. In this description, the bodies of the social worker, warden and lawyer are objects of pain for Isaak, he shares how the relation of his body with the bodies of the prison personnel affected him. It is Isaak's pain that potentially becomes an object of sympathy for the guests on the show and the audience. As Isaak interacts (in sharing the details of his experience) his body has the potential to affect others or other bodies (other guests, the host and the audience). It is this movement of affect and the ability of emotions to entangle that mediates the capacity for the audiences' and the guests' bodies to act. This capacitation could either be elevated or diminished – to sympathize or empathize (Ahmed, 2014). This potential increase or decrease in the power of action need not only involve actual

action. It could also include the power to think, feel or do anything else that the body can do in relation to other bodies or among other people. The emphasis in the podcast then is to affirm for the audience the potential for moving, acting, perceiving, and thinking differently in response to this violence. Thus, male prisoner bodies are, in relation to Helman's (2017, p. 4) argument, "used and expected to be violated". For instance, Sonke Gender Justice (SGJ) (n.d) reported that prisoners in most South African prisons including those sentenced and awaiting trial are prone and subjected to poor conditions of incarceration. For instance, the cells are overcrowded, they lack proper sanitation and ventilation, insufficient health care and nutrition. In addition to these reported conditions, Correction1 (2013) published a disturbing video of a South African prisoner being physically tortured and injected with anti-psychotic drugs without their consent. This indicates they the prisoner's body is "expected to be violated" as Helman (2017) argues.

As argued in the previous chapter, part of validating victimhood in the face of sexual violence includes the notion of witnesses and confirmation from other people. Therefore, disbelief by others always leaves the victims doubting their experiences or suffering in silence. This was showcased in the above extract – no one acknowledged Isaak's experience when he disclosed it, rendering the experience illegitimate. The host, therefore, uses this as a base to argue human rights and blame the system. Positioning oneself as a victim of the state constructs an ideal victim. Therefore, showing the audience the mistreatment that Isaak experienced within the prison constructs a victimized subject; a subject that deserves sympathy and empathy. Thus, the focus shifts from Isaak to the state as a villain in the story. Through this construction, there is a possibility to resonate – everyone has been or can be a victim of a system at some point.

6.5 "Let's Change Our Attitudes and Give Meaning to The Constitution": Activist and Advocate Positionalities

There has been a growing body of social justice movements around the globe focusing on sexual violence issues. With the growth of social media, hashtags such as #Metoo, #tiMesup, #stopKavanaughH, and #MuteRKelly1 are many of the illustrations of the affective economy of anger in the aftermath of sexual violence. Battaglia et al. (2019) have documented how the rape culture is normalized in the U.S. by highlighting how Trump, the former U.S. President mocked and constructed the #MeToo movement as creating "a very scary time for young men in America. . . [but] Women are doing great" (Fink & Diamond, 2018). Many activists and social justice advocates have used hashtags and other forms of advocacy to express their outrage about sexual harassment around the world. Additionally, worldwide movements have emerged, such as #MeTooIndia, Italy's #QuellaVoltaChe, Spain's #YoTambien, Arabic-speaking 160 #AnaKaman, and others (Adam & Booth, 2018).

There has been a call for action—scholarly and hands-on activist and advocacy work to enact real change and center the most vulnerable voices in leadership, development, and narratives (Battaglia et al, 2019). Additionally, Edström and Dolan (2019) based on their research carried out in Uganda in 2015 explored how a group of male refugee survivors of sexual violence were able to organize, heal and become activists, and they reflect on how society can understand and engage with this struggle through advocacy and a global networking strategy to continue destabilizing the silence over male victimization in sexual violence.

Linder et al (2016) in their work examined social media as a tool for campus sexual violence activism and reported that social media is significant in raising awareness, community building, and interrupting power dynamics as activism strategies.

Looking at the ways the host takes up the role of an advocate and an activist, and how he framed the conversation from the start, could be argued to creatively construct a frame from which the audience should see Isaak by humanizing and exonerating him. the other guests on the show, Sasha and Prince, augment the activism and advocacy of the conversation:

Sasha: It does not, and I think that it is what you were talking about that violence Isaak experienced brings together to a vast society's greatest taboo, hence, the people who were entrusted with authority, with the duty to care and manage people in prison and elsewhere are also people from our society who shape those taboos... it's a cultural change that's needed to change...

The host: ...the gap between what we can speak to in social legal studies and constitutional law seminars are experiences of real human beings...dignity is undermined when they are being reduced by an uncaring state... it shows that as South Africans we need to do a double job when we pat ourselves at the back for the theoretical framework that we have around rights.

Prince: Definitely, I think you put it quite comradely there is a huge gap between what is written in our constitution that guarantees safety and dignity for everyone including inmates and the reality and experiences of many people including the people in prison. What happened to Isaak makes it quite meaningless what is written there when it is not lived experiences by people in prison...because if you are locked up you cannot protect yourself right? That authority comes from the state and

when the state does not fulfil that duty then what is in position is just words.

The host: It will take many of us from all walks of life to start changing our attitudes to give meaning to those words and the constitution.

In the above extract, Sasha, Prince, and the host keep on highlighting the systematic failures. In so doing, they appeal to the audience to show that the issue is beyond Isaak as an individual. This kind of advocacy work is intended to drive the audience into having an open mind about general human rights concerns, "it will make many of us...to start changing our attitudes...to give meaning to the constitution". The discussion takes the form of reminding the audience that South Africa is a country with a constitution that emphasizes human rights and dignity, there is a need to put the constitution into action. Therefore, having the audience ponder on this social issue could open a new understanding of what it means to be a victim of sexual violence in the context of being a victim of the system. To push forward collective activism and 'recruit' the audience, the host and Sasha draw emphasis on social responsibility and active citizenship by outlining the dangers of how an issue viewed as individualistic could be catastrophic to the public if neglected. They aim to encourage collective action. The conversation below demonstrates this point:

The host: It states in the documentary that some 300 000 persons leave correctional facilities every year, ... it says in the documentary that really beautiful but scary points...health needs are not met then we let into families and communities wounded persons with deep scars that they once created and carried with inside prison. And what that suggests to me Sasha is that even if you don't care about Isaak, because you say that

he is a murderer...it is not in our own selfish interest to not care about what happens in prisons because actually you potentially unleash bigger psychological problems in communities by not caring...

Sasha: Absolutely, I think in a way it's quite understandable given the level of violence and pain in our community. We want to just disappear the problem and we locate that problem in the people who we call criminals and we put behind bars and we put all our anger, hence, reattribute feelings into those people. That was our consideration for the fact that prisoners are not people who disappear and never come out. They do come out; they bring with them their experiences in prison back into our community. The trauma he brings out with him and that does not affect only him it affects other people around him. It is also the socialization of people behind bars, of many of our young men that are learning how to be a man. They are learning in an environment where they are being taught some of the toxic notions of masculinity.

Another way to appeal to the emotions of the audience was to provide the narrative that although they might not be experiencing the harsh conditions of the prison, what happens in prison can still affect society. Thus, the audience is sensitized to appeal to the conditions of the prisoners as this harms society at large, "the trauma he brings out with him does not only affect him...it affects those around him... prisoners are not people who disappear and never come out. They do come out; they bring with them their experiences from prison back into our community". This kind of emotional appeal is a word of warning to remind the audience that they are not as safe as they would like to think; that the damage to one of the systems within

society can affect the whole. Therefore, calling them to act – to understand the harm of the lack of recognition of the dignity of all. In foregrounding self-interest within the notion of caring for one another, the host wants to evoke an empathetic response from the audience, “even if you don't care about Isaak...that it is not in our selfish interest to not care about what happens in prisons because you potentially unleash bigger psychological problem in communities by not caring”. With these words, the audience is challenged to care about the community and to see Isaak's victimhood as intertwined with their self-interest. Here, self-interest is equated with collective interest, or collective interest serves one's interest. Challenging one's lack of care involves the work of challenging oneself to start questioning one's assumptions about ascribing culpability as well as victimization. This emotional discursive undertone is performative in co-opting the audience to have an open-minded perspective on Isaak as victim worthy.

6.6. “He forced me to have sexual conduct with him”: Victim Positionality and the Discourse of Consent

Muehlenhard et al (2016) posit that discursive constructions of consent, and wanting to have sex are socially perceived as similar. Thus, 'unwanted' sex is non-consensual and wanted sex is consensual. While wanting sex and consenting to sex often correspond to each other this is not always or necessarily the case (Muehlenhard et al, 2016). For instance, a person may consent to unwanted sex to gain the approval of their peers, to secure a job or promotion at work, to get a higher grade or to avoid other forms of violation such as physical violence (West, 2010). In the case of prison rape, men sometimes consent to unwanted sex out of a sense of fear, or some other understanding of wanting protection in the prison. This shows that there can be considerable differences in what the individuals involved are wanting and, consequently, what they might be willing to consent to (Muehlenhard et al., 2016). Arguably, consent is not meaningful unless it is informed. Furthermore, while discussions of consent tend to assume that the individuals involved know in advance what they are wanting and are willing to do, research findings indicate that many are regularly uncertain about this (Beres et al, 2014; O'Sullivan & Gaines, 1998). For example, a person may agree to engage in sexual activity because they are afraid. Therefore, even though verbal consent is given, it is forced or pressured, and thus, non-consensual.

After highlighting the need for society to collectively act against a toxic system, the host takes the conversation back to Isaak for him to continue to negotiate his victim worthiness and Isaak draws on the discourse of consent or lack thereof to negotiate victim worthiness:

The host: ...when I watched the documentary because in one of the prisons that you were, Isaak, correct me if I am wrong, one of the perpetrators or new perpetrators whatever the case might be, wanted to almost strike a bargain

with you- I will protect you ... if you allow us to have sex with you- to rape you.
Then will make sure that other people will not do that to you as well.

Isaak: That is correct.

The host: How did you process that? What went into your head when they said that?

Isaak: Well, for me... that moment I felt I should decide, but I have to do it because now I am here and because if I do not allow that, they will just take me, just like a piece of meat.

The host: No one in our correctional facilities, Prince, should ever feel like they have been reduced to a thing.

Thus, the idea was to formulate a convincing case with evidence to negotiate victim worthiness. Isaak highlights that the sex was forced/ pressured, so it cannot be consensual (willing and wanting). The choice of diction such as, "a piece of meat", and "they will just take me" contributes to the notion of victim worthiness. Isaak talks about being reduced to a piece of meat – he, therefore, conveys to the audience how he was objectified. Keonig et al. (2020) described agency as a term that speaks to autonomy. But also, goes beyond autonomy to include issues around choice and self-determination. Linking choice and sexual behavior relates to the ways in which one can have the ability to make choices, ability to engage in any kind of sexual contact with any person they desire. However, this was not the case in Isaak's situation. Although he says, "I felt I should decide", this kind of self-determination was only to self-comfort and save any amount of 'dignity' he might have left. Thus, coercive sex is still a violation. Hence, he uses the discourse of choice to argue that he did not have the choice to deny the sexual advances. The environment he was in did not provide him with the freedom to choose what he wanted to do with his body. Lack of self-determination, therefore, equals a violation which renders him a victim. The host takes this to the guests and the audience, "no one in our correctional facilities, Prince, should ever feel like they have been reduced to a

thing". The host's statement and his choice of diction, "reduced to a thing" could be seen as an object of empathy for the reader with a potential to move the body of the audience as part of "fellow feeling" (Ahmed, 2014).

In addition to the discursive construction of choice, the concept of consent is central to determining whether a sexual experience was a violation. Consent has been defined as the ability to agree or disagree with any form of engagement in sexual conduct. The following extract illustrates this point:

Isaak: It was like when rape was taking place, we were actually two me and the other guy, and they called him first but he was sleeping next to me or let me say he was sitting next to me, they call him, then a guy in the shower said not that one, that one next to him, then I went into the shower, and he said I must undress and then he forced me to have sexual conduct with him.

Isaak provides a detailed narration of his first sexual violence experience. In his explanation, it is clear that sexual agency was taken away from him. He explains rape as an event that took place rather than an engagement he had control over "... when rape was taking place...". The choice of words Isaak uses to describe the incident indicates a lack of consent. In this case, it means that Isaak was not participating in this whole experience because he did not consent to have sex. Isaak explained that "he forced me to have sexual conduct with him". The perpetrator had the authority to call anyone he desired. Isaak, in this case, highlights his subject position as a subordinate – therefore, a victim. Concerning sexual violence in general, individuals' subjective positioning becomes important in determining expressions of sexual agency in sexual relationships. Thus, entitlement to, and exercising of sexual agency is subject to the issues of power where in this particular case, old male prisoners dominate new inmates. Hence, they have the authority to call on whomever they desire to have sex with. Isaak's

behavior in following what was demanded of him indicates that he was in a powerless position to negotiate consent. Therefore, describing this incident to the audience convinces them to view Isaak's experience as a violation. As such, the discourse of consent prompts the audience to affirm Isaak's victimhood.

Consequently, the negotiation and the advocacy work Isaak, the host and the guests did in the podcast elicited some supportive and positive reactions from the audience. The audience showed affirmation and recognition of Isaak as a victim. The extract below indicates some of the empathetic responses.

(Twitter comments)

Commentator 2: What a brave topic. Thanks Eusebius

Commentator 3: Whether they are violent offenders or not, it does not take away from their pain, trauma of rape and the aftermath.

Commentator 4: Thank you. 20yrs later I relive this. Nothing will be done. Us damaged people end up in society.

Commentator 5: Chilling heartbreaking story, our system broke this man into pieces.

Although prison is portrayed as a very frightening space (in the above extracts) the audience acknowledged Isaak's courage to speak out. This affirmation alone is a starting point for accepting Isaak as a victim. Comment 3 agrees with the human dignity discourse highlighted by the host in the podcast and by so doing, the audience buys into the argument that despite the crimes one might have committed, every individual is entitled to be treated with dignity. This validates the embodiment of pain for the otherwise "ungrievable" bodies

(i.e., public construction of prisoners as bad people who deserve bad treatment) within broader social contexts. Thus, since prisoners' wrongdoings are recognized, so is their pain as any other human being's. Additionally, commentators draw on the discourse of solidarity, "us damaged people" in understanding the need for collective activism in addressing victimhood concerning male sexual violence. Equally pointing acknowledging the systematic failure to address male sexual violence that the host and the guests of the show pointed out. The commentators said, "our system broke this man into pieces". There is an empathetic undertone and atmosphere surrounding the above comments where understandings of collective pain and trauma are shared. Thus, there is a circulation of emotions performing collective activism and advocacy which could lead to a collective validation of victimhood.

6.7 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, I focused on examining how discourse and affects are used in subject construction and positioning with regard to prison rape. I focused on two main themes: 1) Human rights: a humanized subject; 2) A discursive construction of multiple subject positionings – victim of the system positionality, activist and advocate positionality. Through a human rights discourse: a humanized subject, Isaak was personified and humanized for the public to acknowledge his victim worthiness without pre-judgements and bias. Thus, part of the humanizing work was for the host to construct a strong argument for the public to understand the importance of recognizing and practicing human rights such as human dignity and justice. This was one way to show the audience that Isaak deserved to be recognized as a victim because first and foremost, he is a human being. This argument drew on the South African constitution to surface various systematic failures as a basis for Isaak's victim worthiness. Thus, the audience was challenged to rethink male sexual violence in prison and acknowledge systematic failures to address male sexual violence as a societal issue – which

can lead to recognition and validation of male vulnerability. The human rights discourse underlies affective undertones as emotional tools for an empathetic public appeal. Additionally, while the victim was given a platform to negotiate victimhood, the podcast and particularly the host, Isaak, Sasha and Prince occupied different subject positionings to humanize Isaak and for Isaak to negotiate victim worthiness. First, advocate and activist positions were useful in challenging the silence and negative responses around male rape and specifically prison rape. Second, Isaak's self-positioning as a victim of the system's failure and a victim of circumstance, placed him in a positive position to alienate himself from an ex-convict to a victim position. These subject positionings, additionally, underlie the affective undertones of pain and vulnerability that are performative in inducing sympathy or empathy from the audience and underscoring the net of mutuality through which we can all be victims. Care for what happened to Isaak, that is the message of the discussion in the podcast and the basis for the renegotiation of his positionality from ex-convict to a victim-survivor of a sexual violation.

CHAPTER SEVEN:

Unmasking Education Institutional Culpability: Affective Economies of Shared Pain and Rage

7.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on male sexual violence specifically the violation of young boys. The podcast is centred around understandings of the culture that enables the violation of young boys within educational institutions. The podcast is facilitated by one of the hosts of Radio 702 radio (Eusebius). The conversation is based on the Park Town boys High school sexual violence scandal. There are three main guests on the show: Phelelani, a parent to one of the scholars who experienced the abuse; Luke, the expert who works with the youths; and Angelica, a reporter and investigator. Three callers also joined the conversation: Joy, Joanna and Shallyz. They all identify as fellow parents of some of the pupils at Park Town boys school. The chapter outlines the structure and analysis of the data and focuses on the following topics: A brief Background of Park Town Boys High School; 2. Framing the Podcast, I then discuss the two main discourses that emerged for the data corpus. These include 1. Institutional Failure, Toxic Culture and Toxic Masculinity Discourse: "We Inherit Unhealthy Cultural Norms; and 2 Solidarity Discourse: "The parent Body Needs to be Assessed Within a Real and Honest Way, We Are Not Going Away!". I close the chapter with concluding remarks.

7.2 A brief background of Park Town Boys High

Park Town Boys High was founded in 1920 and was originally known as North Western High School. The original school was based in disused wood and iron buildings which had previously been Police Barracks at the top of Canary Street in Auckland Park. Park Town Boys was predominantly white and was established during the British colonization of South Africa.

The school was originally categorized into houses and these houses had European names such as Romans, Spartans, and Trojans to mention but a few.

It was also characterized by a school motto 'Arise', and the school badge a rampant lion. Due to revolts such as the Rand Revolt in 1922, the school was evacuated and housed in Park Town Ridge which was named after the place. In 1985 the school extended to accommodate boarders. And in 1991, Parktown Boys' High School became the first government school to allow Black pupils into a mainstream 'white' school. The school has been well known for international standard water-based sports.

Parktown Boys' has a history which includes the use of 'bashers', a distinctive red and black uniform, school songs, and particularly 'Parktonian' language which has changed over the years. The school is divided from Form 1 to 1V (Matric). Park Town Boys High still upholds traditions such as orientation and initiation into the school, all "formies" (Grade 8/Form I) receive a colored button to wear on their blazer which indicates their "formie" status as well as what house they belong to for the duration of their Form I year. At the end of their second week of school, all first-year high scholars are assigned a Matric 'Old Pot' who will help and guide them through their first few months at the school. Although harmful 'initiation' is banned throughout the school, there have been numerous incidents at the school which have been widely publicized. And rape and sexual violation of the young boy by the Water polo coach is one of the widely publicized scandals at the school. Parktown Boys' High School is one of the few schools in South Africa that continues with the tradition of Cadets and Cadet practice every week that involves many pushups and exercises for younger grades. This has also led to public reports of abuse and physical harm to the pupils. Additionally, the school still hold memorial parades in remembrance of Old Parktonians and South Africans in general who

have died in various conflicts around the world. It is compulsory for all Form Is and IVs to attend.

7.3 Framing the Talk: “We ask questions here that are very important, systematic questions, institutional questions.”

In opening the conversation, the host frames it for the audience by pinpointing two central notions to explaining and understanding sexual violations within educational institutions. First, he highlights a permissive toxic culture that perpetuates the culture of abuse through a lack of responsibility and accountability in educational institutions in alleviating sexual violence. Second, he highlights the pervasive culture of silence around speaking about the sexual violation of children.

There is a visible shift of focus regarding understandings of sexual violence in this chapter as compared to the previous two chapters (chapters 5 and 6). While the previous two chapters focused on negotiations of victim worthiness where male victims of sexual violence do the negotiating work, in this chapter, victim worthiness is unquestionable. Therefore, the young boys who were victimized in this case are not part of the conversation (also because they are minors, hence they are represented by parents). They are not placed under a microscope to defend their victimhood. Rather, social culture, educational institutions, and institutional responsibility are the focal points of the discussion. There is advocacy work done to understand the complexity of the situation and the grave consequences of negligence for both the school and the learners. Several discourses are drawn upon in unveiling the toxic culture of abuse, lack of institutional responsibility and accountability. In particular, toxic masculinity culture is identified as the key instigating cause of the sexual violence occurring in South African schools. Discursive constructions of solidarity are drawn upon for collective action to

counteract prevailing toxic masculinity both in educational institutions and within the broader society.

The victim worthiness of young boys is unquestionably recognised in this conversation. Thus, children do not need to work as hard as the adult victim-survivors of the previous chapters to negotiate victimhood. The victimisation of a young body is automatically empathised with and already vulnerable due to the irresponsibility and negligence of those who should provide care and safety. Savahl (2010.p.ii) argues that within the developmentalism and socialisation theory, "children are typically perceived as immature, irrational, incompetent, asocial and cultural". This has contributed towards an assumption that children are innocent and they require guidance and protection from adults.

Underlying affective economies of pain and rage surfaced as the conversation unfolds. The pain stems from witnessing children suffer and the rage is directed towards the systematic failures of the educational system and the failures of the adults to be responsible for the minors under their care. In the discussion, affective economies of anger and rage function as tools to evoke the audience into becoming as equally angry and enraged to afford the elicitation of a collective sense of responsibility and accountability.

7.4 “We inherit unhealthy cultural norms”: Institutional Failure, Toxic culture and Toxic Masculinity Discourse

In the opening of the conversation in the podcast, the host starts the conversation by highlighting the failure of the educational system, and the impact of the toxic culture of covering up the abuse, excusing it, and the silence surrounding it. The following extracts demonstrate this point.

The host: We are going to be looking at Parktown Boys High, and asking whether or not the school is guilty of many years of covering up abuse of course the school

is in the spotlight currently because of a case involving a water polo coach who had been caught accidentally, I should add, on surveillance camera fondling a fourteen-year-old pupil's genitals. Since then the number of cases against him has been increasing.

In the above extract, the host is setting the tone by highlighting the culture of silence within the educational system concerning sexual violation. According to the host, "the school is guilty of covering up years of abuse", and therefore, it has to be held accountable for not acting on these incidents and abrogating its duty of reporting the sexual violence cases over the years. The framing of the above extract directly creates a platform to potentially evoke particular emotions. This speaks directly to Anderson's (2010) concepts of the atmosphere of emotions. As per Anderson (2010), atmosphere holds a series of opposites: the presence and absence of affects, materiality and ideality of affects, definite and indefinite of affect, and singularity and generality of affect in relation to tension. Affects are then evoked by material imagination based on the movement and lightness of air. The host in his framing is setting the tone/ the atmosphere in the hope to evoke particular affects from the targeted audience and the guests on the show.

The host: This case as we speak is way up in the court. but I'm focusing on this for a couple of reasons. There is a need for justice for the boys at Park Town Boys High School, specifically. We ask questions here that are very important, systemic questions, institutional questions about all of our schools in the country. We inherited, in my opinion, cultural norms that are very unhealthy, handed down directly, and cultivated very often, laid by the Brits when they arrived here based on some of the schools and the schooling system in

England. And lots of that have something to do with things like the brotherhood code, a conspiracy of silence, you don't speak out, and at initiation that's what happened at Park town boys.

The host, in the above extract, highlights the culture of silence and brotherhood that is practiced and is still maintained in these institutions. It is a culture that has cultivated a comfortable place for abuse. Sexual misconduct goes unreported or is permitted in the name of tradition such as initiation. According to the host, this toxic tradition enables sexual violence within these educational institutions. This understandably explains the continuation of violence because it has been passed from generation to generation. The host argues against the continuous practice of such kinds of traditions in these schools. The host is digging and bringing up history. It is this reference to the history that functions to circulate emotions for both the guests and the audience. Ahmed's (2014) affective economies speak about how emotions move backwards. She argues that histories that precede and direct bodily encounters and emotions are equally important when working with human bodies. In this case, Ahmed's explanation of affect speaks directly to the social and historical socialization of young boys at the school. The hosts highlighted, "we inherited, in my opinion, cultural norms that are very unhealthy, handed down directly, and cultivated very often, laid by the Brits". These cultural and historical constructions of unhealthy behaviours at the school are significant in the interrogation of how these systems of power tend to be problematic. And it is through this framing that the host mediates emotions within this construction of the conversation.

In addition to the interrogation of the educational system's lack of accountability, the host draws on justice to deconstruction unhealthy cultural histories.

The host: It happens in too many other schools and it has affected Park Town boys now for many years and become synonymous with abuse, which is horrible for

the school and most importantly for the boys who have been the victims at the school. The South African schooling system needs to be asked tough questions...All of our schools in South Africa particularly, but not restricted to all boys-only schools. Since we know the unhealthy institutional norms and the hidden curricula that are often part of the way in which teachers conduct these schools, I want to speak or ask tough questions today about Parktown boys. specifically, I think there is a lesson here to be learnt in the entire South African schooling system. I will invite you as you listen to my guest.

The host wants to focus on this particular school but also wants the audience to understand that the situation applies to other South African schools. The audience may not have a child enrolled at Park Town High, but that does not mean they are immune to the systemic failures of the South African educational system. The host is sensitizing the audience to the dangers of the culture of violence and institutional failure to care for and protect children. This sensitization functions as a wake-up call, a reminder to awaken the audience. In this case, the host's choice of words, "synonymous for abuse, "horrible for the school" and "...the boys who have been the victims at the school", aim to sensitise the audience about the signs of abuse concealed in the institutional culture of the school. In so doing, mental stimulation through the identification of how "horrible" the situation is, has the potential to induce a reaction from the audience. It could be a bodily reaction or action that makes them uncomfortable in remaining silent. The host's words and framing of the conversation function as an internal stimulus. Thus, at the internal level, affection happens as exposure to stimuli that the mind comes into contact with. For example, it can come through sound (i.e. words, phrases), and are then transmitted into emotions. The host is, therefore, relying on this mental stimulation to sensitize the audience. The host also draws on an activist

positionality to plead to the audience to join him in ending years of institutionalized violence, "I think there is a lesson here to be learnt in the entire South African schooling system".

These kinds of statements are functional in how they aim to evoke awareness. The following extract further exemplifies this idea:

The host This is triggering. I know for some of you. I remember we once spoke about sexual abuse in general not specifically about Park Town boys. One of the old boys who had been there in the 80s called us and was in tears and told us the trauma you carry with you into Adulthood. Many people have not spoken out. There is an incredible conspiracy of silence that is worse, and because of toxic masculinity, you are not allowed, as a boy in particular, to say I was a victim. I Am a Survivor. So, it is really a difficult conversation, but I want to create a safe space if you want to tell your story please do so. If you want to enter the conversation on the level of institutional culpability, please do so. let's have an honest conversation and a productive dialogue around this particular issue.

Thrift (2004) employed historically developed techniques to engage the unconscious of affect. Although he separates affect from emotions, he argues that the movement of stimuli triggers intensity. As such, the host's choice of diction in the above extract "This is triggering" ... "the trauma you carry" is useful in reminding the audience of how they must be feeling. This experienced feeling is a useful tool in challenging the audience to act. He proceeds to say, "I want to create a safe space". His choice of words is comforting to the audience and the guests on the show. In saying these words, particular affects are bound to be triggered – those of fear of the trauma that comes with being a victim, and those of comfort, security and care being extended by the host. The host's subject construction as someone who can provide safety is

equally performative in allowing the audience to buy into the collective activism. In the lines that follow, the host frames the conversation as difficult – a topic hardly spoken about. He then brings in toxic masculinity discourse as responsible for the silence around male sexual violence. In constructing male sexual violence as emotional and difficult, the host is emotionally preparing the audience to brace themselves for the kind of conversation they will have on the show. The host's choice of diction, "conspiracy" is useful in showing the audience the intentionality in silencing male sexual violence within educational institutions systems. He unmasks the "conspiracy" as what the educational system uses to protect the image or to preserve the historical cultures of the school., "if you want to enter the conversation on the level of the institutional culpability please do so". the host's extended invitation for the audience to also think about institutional culpability is important to highlight in a discussion about victimhood. challenging systematic covering up of abuse could open new avenues in the broadening of the notion of victimhood. For instance, previously unrecognized violated bodies such as a male body could be acknowledged and recognized as victim worthy. Therefore, unmasking institutional culpability promotes an inclusive conceptualization of sexual violence. In his intentions to provide a safe space and to deconstruct toxic masculinity, the host highlights the wish for men to have the ability to acknowledge victimhood and vulnerability, "...as a boy in particular, to say I was a victim. I Am a Survivor". Thrift argues, "through our emotion, we reach back sensually to grasp the tacit, embodied foundations of ourselves' (Thrift, 2004.p. 67). The releasing of the responses of affect renders one to become truly free, as by expressing one's emotions and self-reflecting upon them, one develops a better understanding of oneself. Thus, the host's invitation to the audience has the potential to provoke their thinking and allow for a reflection on the benefits of challenging institutional negligence – freedom to feel vulnerability, to identify and to be acknowledged. The audience is provided with an

opportunity to participate in the conversation to deconstruct these traditional and institutional silences around sexual violence. Jina et al (2020) in their research reported a significant difference in the occurrence and reporting of rape of male victims by age and that male rapes were more likely to occur in institutional settings. Jina et al (2020) went on to argue that the 2007 legal definition of rape in South Africa made it difficult for men to identify as victims of rape. The combination of this kind of definition and the institutional culpability could be seen as one of the many ways that prohibited inclusive understanding of who could identify as a sexual violence victim-survivor. However, the enactment of the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 32 of 2007 expanded the definition of rape to all forms of sexual penetration without consent, irrespective of gender. Notwithstanding the enactment of legislation. Additionally, it is almost impossible to deduce the extent of male rape in the country, firstly because of the likelihood of under-reporting by adult victims and secondly because the published annual police statistics of reported cases are not sex-disaggregated (Jina et al, 2020). Therefore, the host is inviting the audience to disrupt these institutions as one of the ways to liberate male victims of sexual violence.

The host: ... We will continue to reach out to the school. I want to call the MEC and ask what's going on. We have to accept that all schools belong to society. We have an interest and say in what happened. They cannot ignore the constitutional values and principles of the country... Society is at stake in what happens in schools. So, we will continue to engage with media partners to help hold them accountable. You have got my word.

Luke: And in this incident, that if anybody, any of those pupils or teachers knew about it, and did nothing about it they are the very reason that more boys got sexually assaulted and they are to blame...

In the extract above, the host and Luke speak to a sense of collective social responsibility to call on the broader public to question and get answers for the ways in which institutions respond to male sexual violations. They unveil systemic negligence underpinning South African institutions, thus, they highlight that for sexual violence to be taken seriously, there are important steps to be taken and the first one is to consult different stakeholders for accountability. As the host puts it, "I want to call the MEC and ask what's going on". The words indicate a determination to understand the root causes of the culture of violence within schools. The host continues to say, "So we will continue to engage as media partners to help hold them accountable. You have got my word". His zeal and motivation to reach the bottom of the story and to hold the school accountable are performative for the audience as they are being motivated to challenge the toxicity of the school, and not only in this particular educational school. Luke agrees with the host, arguing that the school and those who knew about the incidents and kept quiet must be held accountable. Since emotions do things, Ahmed (2004, p. 119) argues that "...they [emotions] work, in concrete and particular ways, to mediate the relationship between the psychic and the social, and the individual and the collective". Thus, Luke's statement and choice of words, "those pupils or teachers knew about it, and did nothing about it they are the very reason that more boys got sexually assaulted and they are to blame..." are performative in evoking feelings of guilt for those who "did nothing" and has a potential to emotionally trigger the audience to act so not to be blamed for any future suffering of victims. Thus, emotionally stimulating the guest on the show and the audience to take action. Ahmed (2004) argued that affects circulate between objects and signs in ways that punish or reward. Luke is using affective economies of blame and guilt to remind the audience of the consequences of doing nothing in the suffering of others.

As already mentioned previously, a few of the parents who have children at Park Town high participated in the discussion. As the parents of the victims, they can impress upon the audience the gravity of the situation. The audience is affectively engaged and roused from its apathy or indifference through their testimony and real-life experiences as they detail the school and systemic neglect. The audience is called to a duty to care:

The host: OK Phelelani... it's every parent's worst nightmare to be the danger of the appraiser in a society where there is a lot of shaming and self-stigmatization of real survivors when one has been victimized. Tell us your story.

Phelelani: The boy is currently going through a lot we are getting him the necessary help so that he can be able to cope with the exams that are upcoming because he is currently doing grade 12 and this thing started years ago, but we could only pick it up two years ago when he was doing grade 10 and we tried to get through him although it was extremely difficult ultimately we ended up talking...

The host: how did it end up coming to light?

Phelelani: the behavior we saw, the unbecoming behavior and it was not easy to accept because you know, there is no parent who wants to feel that reality that this is what is happening and I think one of the things that made it difficult is the fact that he is staying at school...

The host: What kind of behavior out of the ordinary that makes you or mum or other relatives to say ok something is wrong with our boy?

Phelelani: He would be alone, he wanted to spend time alone, he would keep to himself and we started realizing that he is now using, and when we started telling and talking to him he would bottle up. He did not want to talk to other kids, even if his friends...

The host: at that point what does one do? did you speak directly to your son? did you have professional help? how did the particular stand come up? how did you confirm your fears that maybe something else is going on here whatever it might be that is driving the anti-social behavior?

Phelelani: I went to speak to him and later on the family came around and the mother of the child had contacted me to say, look it is unbecoming behavior... and then they were all other parents at school then we realize...he's not the only one it's a number of them... We went to the school... there were parents who have been investigating this ordeal because it has been happening for years. It is a culture at that school. And the biggest problem is that when he was doing grade eight they went to the initiation...from there we went to a point where we went to the school. unfortunately, that school tried to cover it up and try to romanticize... they said NO maybe he is the only one. I found two other parents ...that's when we picked up that this is a problem and we need to deal with this decisively.

In the above conversation, Phelelani highlights the negligence of the school despite that other parents were experiencing the same situation – having their children violated, "Unfortunately, that school, they tried to cover it up and try to romanticize... they said NO maybe he is the only one". This alone is an indication that the school was not able to take

accountability and responsibility for the situation. In addition to having to deal with the agony of seeing his child suffer, Phelelani must also deal with the behavioral issues that developed following the sexual assault on his child, "the behavior we saw, the unbecoming behavior... He would be alone, he wanted to spend time alone, he would keep to himself and we started realizing that he is now using". Phelelani's shared narrative of his son's behavior is useful in providing evidence of the institutional failures to care for the children. Drawing on Ahmed (2004) conception of affective economies, Phelelani's shared experience of witnessing the suffering of his son evoke loss and suffering which in turn could be useful in circulating emotions to those listening to his narrative. Affective economies of care and love are useful and could function to "move" the guests and the audience in taking action. It almost seems like the message to the parents is that if they truly care for their children, they would question the long-standing initiation customs, the educational system, and the authorities to put an end to the culture of sexual violence and safeguard their children from going through the same ordeal Phelelani's son experienced. In Phelelani's account, cues of suffering and caring, such as "the conduct we saw" and "when we started...talking to him he would bottle up" could potentially compel the listener to be alarmed enough to stop child sexual abuse and challenge institutional culpability.

7.5 Solidarity Discourse: "The parent body needs to be assessed in a real and honest way we are not going away!"

The host asked the other guests to provide their own experiences of working with the school around the sexual violence issue. One of them is Angelic, who is an expert with experience in investigating and reporting social injustice issues. Like Luke and the host, Angelique speaks on the failure of the educational system in pursuing justice for the violated boys:

The host: Well we are delighted to have you here Angelic. It's not the kind of story we enjoy as journalists or broadcast to unpack because it goes fundamentally not just to the broadcast part of human life, human rights, and rights of children, and the inherent dignity...take us back to the story as you had investigated...

Angelique: ... I was the editorial reporter at the time and one evening, I got a call from a mother, a very disturbed mother, that her son had gone through a horror kind of initiation at the school and she wanted to speak to me but she wasn't sure whether she should what I am concerned with the initiation that happened at school, is that every year, going back to generations, physical abuse was taking place... I received threats to the phone I was told I was harming the children that had gone through the initiation ...I know there was a time I was followed going home there were really strange things that were taking place because I was looking at something that they didn't want uncovered people want it to come out ...

The host: Wow!

Angelique: ... To think that when his parent questioned the kind of physical abuse, they were put down...I had other parents coming forward or grown-up men rather, say that when they were children at school they had suffered sexual abuse which was part of all this initiation ...

What Angelic reports in the above extract supports what Phelelani has indicated in his story – the cover-up of the incidents by the school. Both Phelelani and Angelique in the above extracts are taking up a dual positionality in their narratives. While Phelelani is positioning himself as a caring and bothered parent, Angelique is positioned as a professional (an investigator), and at the same time, they are both self-positioning as witnesses of the victim's sufferings. These positionalities are significant in highlighting the pain that the young boys experienced. Phelelani described the "unbecoming behavior" of his son while Angelique described, "a very disturbed mother". Thus, through witnessing positionalities, the audience is sensitized to the pain and hurt experienced by the victims. The similarities in the shared experiences relate to Wetherell's (2012) argument that affective flows are deposited through practices into affective assemblages that animate both individual persons and quite larger groups. In this case, it is through what the witnesses (Phelelani and Angelique) share that the experiences of the victims are shared with the audience and guests on the show. It is in the sharing of these affects, of pain and hurt, that the affective assemblages can animate the audience and the guests. These shared narratives induce an affective alignment (Ahmed, 2004) between the parents, the host, and even possibly the audience who are against the lack of action by the school to address the issue head-on rather than cover it up. This alignment could evoke feelings of rage or anger over the cover-up and negligence as a clear indication of culpability by the school in ostensibly perpetuating the violence. This is something that can anger the audience and questions where the responsibility of the school lies – with the learner's safety or

the reputation of the school. And the above extracts have shown that it is the latter. With this kind of information, the audience is left with a lot to ponder and is given an opportunity also decide where their responsibility lie – as parents and as responsible citizens. Here is another account by another parent:

The host: WOW, Joy good morning to you and thank you for calling In.

Joy: Yes, good morning.

The host: good morning Joy go ahead and talk to us.

Joy: Abuse at Parktown boys has been going on for many years. I was reported to have been working with the department in 2006 and so many times I've been told by the department that I'm trying to destroy the school. my son also reported to the department over the years and got nowhere Angelique I don't know if you remember interviewing my son.

Angelique: I do, yes.

Joy: So from there is a culture of silence and the teacher's cover-up and needs to be held accountable.

The host: that is absolutely shocking Joy how has that affected your son and your family dynamic?

Joy: Sorry?

The host: how was your son affected?

Joy: how was my son affected? have checked it you never recover it, and my son took his life in December, and I put it down to the treatment he got from the Park

Town boys because we never recovered after what he went through and his experience at that school.

The host: yeah I'm deeply, deeply sorry to hear that for what he went through and for what you went through I don't even know what to say.

Joy: They are boys on the internet where another mother also heard that it said that she found her son was assaulted that's what I wish that other people come forward to speak out and say it's happened to me too.

The host: My heart goes to you Joy and thank you for sharing your story with us.

Joy: Thank you.

Joy opens the conversation by highlighting that the school has been experiencing many years of abuse. She starts her response by digging up the history. Ahmed (2004) would argue that the movement of affect or emotions backward enables affects to materialize and travel to attach to bodies. Thus, the years from 2006 to the present are objects of the pain and suffering experienced by the young boys at Park Town High. These objects of pain seem to have remained unchanged due to institutional cover-up of the violence. Thus, the relationship between the current situation and the history of abuse at the school is affectively functional in surfacing subjectivity – the history of the school surfaces pain (Ahmed, 2004;2014). Joy's experience with school is very similar to Angelique's experience. What is even more moving and very likely impactful from the perspective of the audience that is listening is that her son eventually committed suicide. Joy wants the audience to understand the seriousness of the issue and that this could happen to anyone's child. The narrative gestures to the shared anguish and pain of the parents of the victims, but there is also anger because the school did nothing to prevent Joy's son's needless death. The anguish of seeing problems being reported to no avail

is tied to the grief and sadness of losing a child, as well as anger over the school's incapacity and desire to handle this issue. This is the consequence that the podcast's empathetic audience will most likely experience as a result of Joy's tale being told. If the narrative manages to generate a "stickiness" with some of the audience, as Ahmed (2014) would put it, it will depend on how well it can make them feel Joy's loss of a child. Additionally, the appearance of this audience depends on the appearance of others (uncaring school and educational officials) who are detested for their disregard for Joy's suffering as a result of their incompetence and cover-ups. Ahmed argues that pain is shaped by negative contact with others, it injures the body, and it moves bodies. Joy's negative experience of her son's death is vividly affected, "injured" and is stuck with her. It is her sharing of this loss and pain that has the potential to surface affective alignment among the audience and other guests. Thus, Ahmed's (2014) argument that pain moves bodies, is essential in understanding how the pain of losing a child can be used to move the audience. Ahmed (2014) posits the notion of the 'stickiness' of emotions. Thus, as emotions circulate, they can stick to bodies or objects. For instance, as Joy, Phelelani and Angelique draw on affective economies of pain and loss, these affects circulate amongst the audience and the guests, and there is a potential for them to "stick", "attach" or "move" the audience (Ahmed, 2004). However, this stickiness is also temporal (Ahmed, 2014). A possible argument could be that in some cases the temporality of emotions can be indefinite. Joy (in the above extract) illustrates the indefinite temporal stickiness of the emotionality of pain "you never recover it". Joy speaks from witnessing her son committing suicide in the aftermath of sexual violence, and pain. And, she also speaks from her own experience of feeling the pain of losing her son, "we never recovered". Thus, her son's experience became her object of pain. In her work, 'Happy Objects', Ahmed (2010) writes about how 'family' circulates as a happy object — an object that is supposed to deliver happiness to any subjects who attach to it. Savcı (2013) contest this

"happy" objectifying of family questioning what happens if the family fails to provide happiness to its members. Savci's questioning is significant in highlighting how an object has the potential to evoke pleasant/unpleasant dichotomy in relation to affect. Therefore, the opposite is equally true to what Ahmed argues. In this chapter, and as evidenced in the previous extracts thus far, the educational institution is portrayed as an object of pain and suffering. And everyone who is part of the school, in this podcast, seems to be experiencing the pain one way or the other. Thus, affect is sticky, Ahmed (2010) argues, and what makes such stickiness possible is the fact that affect circulates between objects, instead of residing in people as common sense would have it (Savci, 2013). As a result, affect "sustains or preserves the connection between ideas, values, and objects" (Ahmed, 2010, p. 29). And it is through this shared suffering of pain, and circulation that anger or rage comes to be experienced. For example, as parents, as hosts and as the audience, one can resonate with the pain of losing a beloved one. The level of acknowledging the shared pain, therefore, can be shown through collective action. Thus, emotionally stimulating the audience to come together and fight the social injustices happening in educational institutions. In response to Joy, the host says, "I'm deeply, deeply sorry to hear that for what he went through and for what you went through. I don't even know what to say". The expression of empathy and the recognition of the pain Joy suffers is not only experienced by the host, rather the audience could resonate. In his work, 'The theory of moral sentiment', Smith (2000) described empathy and sympathy as a "fellow feeling" where one feels with others and is affected by how others feel. In the case of pain or sadness, one would feel pain or sadness when another is feeling pain or sadness. However, for this to be possible, Smith argues that empathy or sympathy is explicitly conditional. Thus, one enters into another's pain if one agrees with it, in the sense that one thinks that the pain or sadness is appropriate and is appropriately expressed. So, for Smith (2010, p. 14), to be affected

empathetically or sympathetically is depended on whether emotions, "appear to this last, just and proper, and suitable to their objects". Therefore, based on Smith's argument, the audience and the guests on the show would only become empathetic if they agree with the pain that Joy or Phelelani shared. Thus, this speaks directly to the potentiality of affects. Massumi (2012) argues that affect is the belief in the potentiality of the world, and the embodiment of such potentiality, this could be physically felt by the body, and acted upon. As such, for the audience to take action in challenging the educational system, the host and the parents (those who have shared their experiences) rely on the potentiality of how their narratives move the audience.

After joy's shared experience, a caller who also identified as a parent of one of the pupils at the school joins the conversation. In her story, Joanne challenges the status quo of the school. She demands answers from the school regarding the perpetuation of the violation of children. The following conversation between the host and Joanne illustrates her concerns:

The host: Joanne good morning to you and thank you for calling in.

Joanne: Morning, thank you for having me.

The host: Go ahead, Joanne.

Joanne: It's been very interesting listening to you and taking all of this. I'm one of the mothers as well. The mothers that went to the school to check up on our boys, and now we have come to understand that this is not the safest place in South Africa right now. Our issue is that they are on duty while our kids are being abused... some say the new headmaster has processed a letter this morning that was sent to us today. CBG has not met with any of the parents. So, the issue here is not only everything discussed here, but men covering up for each

other and turning right at the truth. The parent body needs to be assessed within a real and honest way we are not going away!

The host Yes!

Joanne: We don't trust your bosses! we don't trust your sports team! there's a grade 10th class coming up in a few weeks (Initiation Camp), we did not talk to people that are going with our boys, so the mothers will go with police cars and go with the CBG.

The host: Good!

Joanne: We don't trust your team coaches and you have proven, he has shown to be faulty, so we also talking about not only meeting CBG but lying saying that this is not happening, initiation is not happening, it is happening! They are assaulting children, and we want Park Town boys to acknowledge what happens to our kids and ask for forgiveness. So, we won't play games anymore! don't tell me that something is Happening when you know for a fact that nothing is changing on the ground!

The host: Absolutely! absolutely! I give my full support on that.

In the above conversation, Joanne starts the conversation by acknowledging the shared stories by other parents, "I am one of the mothers as well". This alone is an indication that as she was listening, she was moved to join the conversation by the other parents' experiences. Witnessing, shared trauma and pain experiences, thus, are performative in drawing in the audience. Joanna takes the conversation to another level. Joanne transitions her positionality from being a victim to an advocate who demands answers for her suffering and that of her child

when she goes from being a listener to a caller on the show. The conversation's atmosphere suggests an angered topic, and it is this rage that is motivating her, "The parent body needs to be assessed within a real and honest way we are not going away!". She continues, "we don't trust your bosses! we don't trust your sports team!... We don't trust your team coaches and you have proven, he has shown to be faulty". As much as the sorrow of the other parents shapes Joanne's, her pain also influences the pain of other parents, the audience, and the host to support her, "Yes...Good... Absolutely! absolutely! I give my full support on that". As Ahmed (2004) would argue, what moves us to feel also connects us to others. It is the parents' pain and rage that materialize this particular collective emerging from the discussion in the podcast. Moreover, their anguish and rage are not only based on personal perceptions but rather a result of past experiences, such as seeing their children suffer damage and dealing with the school's ongoing carelessness for years.

7.6 Discursive Constructions of White Rage, White Nostalgia and White Fragility

Anderson (2016) conceptualized white rage as a response from white supremacy to push back on the progress that black people make towards closing up racial divides. She argues that white rage is perpetuated and legitimized through policies and cultures that cover up or that fail to acknowledge history and past wrongs. White rage was exhibited in the conversation below:

The host: good morning Shallyz go ahead.

Shallyz: Good morning. I am a parent at Parktown Boys High School... I have listened to the parents that have spoken and I understand and I do empathize with those parents whose voices were involved in what happened before we cannot change the past, unfortunately, and I can assure you that it's been a new generation of parents we are interested in this to return the Pride of the school. We are interested in moving the school, for that, the water polo coach is no longer at the school and they have Mark Williams...The CBG communicated with us. I don't agree with the fact that they say he was incorrectly constituted. There is nothing wrong with how the CBG was constituted. The school has gathered a site now where boys can report if anything is going on. There are cameras in classrooms. No initiation took place with my son, my son does not go to initiation camp. We are really doing everything we can as parents to do away with what happened at Parktown boys.

The host: But, Shallyz just hang on for one second. I want to engage with Phelelani here...Phelelani what do you say to Shallyz?

In the above exchange, Shallyz's reaction and responses to the sexual violence and negligence issue speak to what Anderson (2016) described as white rage. Anderson (2016) posits that white rage is activated when the suppressed people (i.e. the parents, and the host) refuse to continue accepting suppression, when they question, confront and challenge oppressive policies and toxic cultures, and when they demand answers and accountability. Up to now, the hosts, guests on the show and parents have been questioning the schools' culpability, and in so doing, they surface why rage that Shallyz embodies. The educational institution (i.e. Park Town High) is one of the representative entities that embody suppressive cultural ideologies of the past histories of colonialism in South Africa – a history characterized by racial divide. The disruption work that the host is doing, therefore, anger white supremacy pushing for the defense and preservation of such traditions and cultures (Anderson, 2016). Shallyz sees the danger of unmasking the school, and she steps into a cover-up, "it's been a new generation of parents we are interested in returning the Pride of the school... There is nothing wrong with how the CBG was constituted". Thus, the "new generation" she refers to fails to acknowledge the pain and hurt caused by the school for many years by covering-up abuse. Therefore, the defense to keep the 'pride' of the school is one way to protect policies that blindside issues affecting learners and society at large.

Phelelani: Shallyz, I understand what you are saying but ...I was in a meeting on the 4th of April...director Dave Dennison said I want to know how this act came into being and one other District official said I was part of the CBG where the election took place and he said they did not reach a Quorum at the first meeting...

The host: Shallyz...my question is if the mum says to me that some of the people who are some of the alleged perpetrators, or the ones that were silent are still

around at the school...This is the same as Pope was doing in Ireland. They need to say, we are sorry that institutionally we let you down then, I think the school is not serious about reckoning with its past and its present... I've got the letter in front of me there is nothing in this letter. it is ridiculous! as Adam Catzavelos's non-apology to Black people! there is nothing, there is nothing in this letter that says we have let you down, that acknowledges the past, that says we can't change the past, but we are aware of the critical part of failing you, institutionally we ought to have known and some of us probably did not know what was going on, there isn't that level of honesty in this letter. This letter is pathetic!

Shallyz: your opinion!

The host: NO. that's a fact! what part of this letter that acknowledges institutional culpability, can you quote?

Shallyz: with due respect, you are reading what you want to read into the letter.

The host: NO, NO, NO. You have got the letter in front of you for God's sake! Quote from it to me, which part of it acknowledges institutional failings? the floor is yours!

Shallyz: I am not quite sure what you mean by institutional failure.

The host: It's very simple! we let your kids down, some of them were left due to our lack of duty of care some of them were bleeding some of them were sexually assaulted! Can you quote from this letter the word that says we are institutionally irresponsible? YES, or NO you got it in front of you!

Shallyz: The letter does not say we are institutionally culpable of course it does not say that.

The host: Of course, it does not say that because they can't recall their past and you know why? they aren't saying that precisely because male leadership is incapable of acknowledging its role in the making of the men that are broken, and I don't know why you are supporting it.

Shallyz: I'm not supporting The Breaking of men don't put words in my mouth

As the conversation continues, white nostalgia surfaced. In the podcast, while institutional negligence and failure, frustration and anger are expressed towards public misunderstandings and support of institutional negligence, and while most speakers, including the host and some parents, showcased a collective disagreement on institutional response, other parents (Shallyz in the above extract) reciprocated with affective economies of rage and anger. Adamkiewicz (2016) defines white nostalgia as the denial of history, an attempt to escape issues of abuse and rejecting the harm caused. He further explained that white nostalgia is characterized by the refusal to engage in critical discussions of the past, distorts history, and it sells history without abuse. This surfaced in shallyz response, "whatever happened in 2015... we need to look forward and move the school forward". White nostalgia also performs memory that distances itself from the emotional legacies of abuse. Thus, white nostalgia only mentions history as a side effect. This speaks to Shallyz's discursive construction of the story, "no initiation took place with my son, my son does not go into initiation camp", and when she said, "I am not quite sure what you mean by institutional failure..."

The emotional intensity in the exchange between the host and Shallyz continues to unveil further issues relating to white Fragility surfaces through underlying angry tones from both speakers as the argument unfolds:

The host: You don't have to say it what you are doing is what Angelique was saying earlier sometimes mums through their silences enable them to create men who are broken that's exactly what you are exhibiting it's ridiculous!

Shallyz: Excuse me! you need to exercise some bit of more caution here. You are accusing me of something that I'm not guilty of I will not wear that hat!

The host: OK shallyz... which part of it really warms your heart and the school can acknowledge its role in the past injustices.

Shallyz: ... So with all the thoughts of the past and whatever happened in 2015, that's great we need to look forward and move the school forward. Going on and on about what happened in the past and trying to fix it. Well, quick fix is not going to help anybody.

Eusebius: Wow! I wish I was allowed to swear without being thrown to the abysses. how can I trust an institution to look forward to while it cannot recall with its past and I am sorry but they are men that are complicity, and there are mums who are complicity, and there are even middle-class Black and White parents and that's why we have such incredibly toxic men to be sent out in the world and we are surprised at what kind of South Africa will leave in?

The host emphasizes the inability of institutions to recognize the abuse, the failure to protect children within the institution, as well as the inability to acknowledge this failure. He

sees the institutional response to sexual abuse as ridiculous and compared such a failure to some events in the past "it is ridiculous! as Adam Catzavelos's non-apology to black people⁸!"⁹ or "what the pope did in Ireland". These events are horrible and indicative of unaccountability. This comparison constructs educational institutions and those in support of its culpability as equally insensitive and self-serving in the conspiracy to cover up injustices. Thus, the host unveils how society perpetuates social injustice to serve personal interests and gains from a repressive institution. For instance, by maintaining the toxic traditions of the school. It is this self-serving and downplaying of institutional culpability that enrages the host. Angry words and undertones such as "ridiculous!", "pathetic!" or "for God's sake!" explains affective economies of rage and anger motivating the host to keep unmasking and disrupting the cover-up. In turn, through affective economies of rage, the host is triggering white fragility which Shallyz embodies. As DiAngelo (2011, p. 57) would argue, white fragility is a state, "in which even a minimum amount of racial stress becomes intolerable". Through the exchange between the host and Shallyz, a range of defensive moves such as displays of argumentative behaviors and anger are being surfaced in Shallyz (DiAngelo, 2011). The host's disruption and challenge of institutional culpability function as a stressor to white fragility. As such, the fear of losing the benefits and comfort that come with whiteness pushes Shallyz to become defensive of the school. Thus, in responding to the host, she constantly covers up the school's culpability and acts as if all is OK. She says, "we are interested in returning the Pride of the school..." Given

⁸ This refers to Adam Catzavelos's hate speech case, where he recorded a 22 minutes' video at the Greek beach calling all the South African Black people with a "K" word. He was later brought before the court and he was required to offer an apology letter and a fine of R150000 as part of his persecution. Public reaction was diverse and split. Some urged that bygones be bygones, while others were extremely unhappy and regarded his apology as self-serving and not enough to atone for his crime (Sibanda, 2019).

⁹ The Pope addressed approximately 45,000 pilgrims who visited the shrine and held a prayer service inside the shrine's chapel, where he prayed and sought forgiveness for the sex abuse scandals. According to The Guardian (2018, n.d), "The pope's plea came as a retired Vatican diplomat demanded Francis's resignation, claiming he had failed to act on abuse allegations against a prominent figure in the church hierarchy".

the history of the school, the pride Shallyz refers to speaks directly to the traditions and privileges that the elite school members historically experienced and benefited from. She continues, "we are interested in moving the school, for that, the water polo coach is no longer at the school". This insinuates that as long as the person who committed the crime is no longer at the school, things should go back to "normal". The normalcy that speaks to white supremacy. She proceeds to insinuate that everyone should move on including the victims. She says, "... now the boys can report if anything is going on. There are cameras in classrooms. No initiation took place with my son, my son does not go into initiation camp". Therefore, everyone should move forward. DiAngelo (2011; 2022) argues that even though one may not identify as a racist, white fragility contributes toward continuous racism as people become defensive. Instead of addressing the issues of racism, they sit in silence or defend their privileges. According to DiAngelo, there are factors that "inculcate" white fragility such as segregation, entitlement to racial comfort and so forth. The exchange above is a clear achievement for the host in unmasking the main reasons the schools and those supporting it are covering up sexual violence – it is to protect the image of the school and its toxic traditions. White fragility has been argued to be a product of a lack of racial stamina, a term defined by DiAngelo (2011) as a lack of cognitive and affective skills for constructive engagement across racial divides. As such, Bourdieu's (1993) conception of the habitus posits that affects are assembled into social practices. Bourdieu says that subjects are then socialized from different fields be it society, educational, political or religious institutions. He argues that what is socialized to subjects through capital and across fields become deposited into the subjects and the dispossessions are then viewed as inherent determinants of how the subject thinks, behaves and sees the world. Therefore, white fragility is a product of the habitus. Thus, a challenge to this habitus can shake the equilibrium within the habitus. Therefore, part of Shallyz's resistance is a defence of a

(racial) and perhaps elite history. Part of her anger is induced by the disruption of this socializing and enculturating institutional history that is in danger of being eroded because of the sexual violence scandal. In this case, white habitus (and its institutional protection) trumps sexual rights. Crofts (2016 p. 80) argues, “Institutions have a responsibility to appropriately respond to child sex abuse, but many have failed to respond to reports, or if they have, have not done so effectively”.

Additionally, the host draws on the dominant discourse of patriarchy and argues that patriarchy fails to acknowledge that men can be victims of violation and that men can be prone to sexual violence. As a result, he brings in masculinity toxicity and challenges the adequacy of its leadership. Therefore, patriarchal society and hegemonic masculinity, as per Bourdieu's (1993) conception of habitus, have long been the field of depositions for men through ideologies that socialize male subjectivity.

7.7. Concluding Remarks

Affective economies of pain, rage and anger underlying discursive constructions of toxic masculinity and institutional culpability surfaced in the podcast. Ahmed's (2004) conception of the movement, attachment and stickiness of affect was useful in understanding how the host, the guests on the show and the audience were moved and aligned to question and disrupt years of educational institutions' cover-up of abuse, and the lack of accountability. Affective assemblages of the listening bodies evoked some of the parents to speak out. The ability of the body to affect other bodies indicated how emotions move across and between objects and subjects to produce particular figures. In this case, enraged and angered figures. For instance, it is through the rage that other parents such as Joy were moved to call in. This embodied rage motivated Joy to transition from the powerless position of being the mother of a victim to the powerful position of being an activist confident enough to confront and demand answers from

the school. The movement and materialization of affect powerfully aligned Joy's, Phelelani's, Angelique's and the host's pained, angered and enraged bodies (Ahmed, 2004). Although above mentioned emoted bodies and subjects surfaced, other forms of subjectivity were equally surfaced by the circulation of this pain, anger and rage. The host's and other parents' rage against the school, became Shallyz's object of rage. Shallyz's rage could be read as a defensive rage motivated by the fear of the consequences of institutional disruption that comes with addressing the sexual violence scandal. Thus, her discursive construction of the sexual violence scandal at the school is characterized by white rage (Anderson, 2016), white nostalgia (Adamkiecz, 2016) and white fragility. DiAngelo's (2011) conception of white fragility speaks to what she defines as the cognitive and affective inability of white people to cope with many racial stressors. Thus, it is this white fragility that was triggered and embodied through defensive anger, rage and a façade. Shallyz's emphasis that all is OK at the school is triggered by her fragility and she was quick to protect the history, quoting her words, "the pride of the school", and its toxic tradition (which are beneficial to the elite i.e. white supremacy). This according to DiAngelo (2011; 2022) is one of the ways to maintain the equilibrium. The expression of white fragility proved to be functional in exposing the school. Thus, it is through the expression of white fragility that the host stood a chance to unveil to the audience, and the guests on the show the very reasons institutional culpability and toxic masculinity work so hard to ignore, to remain silent, and to cover up toxic traditions and toxic cultural practices – because they are self-serving, and they are afraid of the disruption associated with the acknowledgement of the sexual violence scandal and other abuses at the school.

CHAPTER EIGHT:

Findings Discussion and Conclusion

8.1. Introduction

The main aim of this study was to investigate, using radio talks, how society responds to male sexual violence and specifically the discursive constructions and affective engagements in conversation concerning male sexual violence. The broader study was about the affective economies underlying societal responses to male sexual violence. The research questions were: 1) What discursive work is performed in broader societal responses to male sexual violation? 2) What affective economies underlie discursive constructions of men's experiences of rape and sexual violence? 3) How is male sexual citizenship governed via discursive and affective tropes? In the following discussion, I provide the main arguments of the results by addressing research questions as they are outlined in the methodology chapter. This chapter discusses the implications of the results in Chapters 5, 6, and 7. First, the main findings and implemented analysis will be discussed about the possible explanation of the findings with their convergence or divergence with previous literature. Next, the theoretical and research reflexivity of the study will be reviewed and suggestions for future directions within research will be made, and lastly, concluding remarks are provided.

8.2 Discursive work performed in broader societal responses to male sexual violation.

Across three analysis chapters, several discursive works are performed in relation to male sexual violence. In chapters 5, 6 and 7, the hosts start each podcast with particular ways of framing the conversation. Across the analysis chapters, dominant discourses emerged such as human rights discourses, advocacy and activism discourse, institutional failure, toxic

culture, toxic masculinity discourse, and solidarity discourse. These discursive constructions are useful in understanding how sexual violence is conceptualized within social structures. The varied definitions of sexual violence foreground the identification with a victimhood positionality parallel to sexual violence. Highlighted dominant understandings of sexual violence draw on the idea that men are generally not perceived as victims of sexual violence, especially where sexually violent experiences are perpetrated by women (Kramer, 2014). This poses a difficulty in understanding who qualifies to identify as a victim of sexual violence. Across three analysis chapters (5,6 and 7) each host opens the conversation by discursively constructing a foundation for each victim-survivor to negotiate for the victimhood identity. For instance, chapter 5 highlights the negotiation of victim worthiness. The host and the victim-survivors (Toki, Reece, Derik and Okuhle) discursively undertake different framings to create different subject positionalities useful in constructing a victim-worthy subject. Positionalities such as those of experts in the field of male sexual violence(Reece) and others occupying more vulnerable positions (Okuhle) are performative discursive work of constructing particular forms of being a victim and a vulnerable subject concerning male sexual violence. Additionally, the discursive construction of the role of psychoeducation (educating the audience about different ways in which sexual violence is understood) was equally useful in conscious raising regarding the different ways men could become victims of sexual violence. These constructions are also important in debunking traditional social understandings of who a "real victim" should be. For example, Reece as an activist, shared his knowledge and experience to educate both the audience and the other victim-survivors on the show to understand the complexity of male sexual violation in relation to social institutions such as hegemonic masculinity, the legal justice system and the religious institution. Therefore, discursive constructions relating to male sexual violence focus on the notion of reconstructing

male sexual violence and negotiating victimhood. Within discursive constructions of toxic masculinity, the victims and the host of the podcasts were aware that other ways and forms of identifying as a victim become prohibited. As such, the disruption of such dominant discourses is essential in creating a platform for men who are sexually violated to negotiate and take up victimhood identities. Thus, within the podcasts, the hosts and other guests take up and confer particular positionalities as a channel to the disruption of broader hegemonic toxic masculinity. The effort is to surface new subjectivities. For example, men can identify as victims of sexual violence – a concept that is traditionally and *patriarchally* denied. In addition, validating the experience requires the need to showcase different ways in which the victim identity subjectivity can be affirmed by both the victim-survivors and the broader society. One of the ways is redefining and reconstructing what it means to be a victim of sexual violence within the intersectionality of gender, sexuality and class.

Discursive constructions of toxic masculinity concerning male sexual violence were also taken up within chapter 7. In this chapter, discursive constructions of toxic masculinity are linked to institutional failures – the cover-up of sexual violence and abuse, and the lack of acknowledgement of these abuses and violations. Discursive construction within the podcast is employed to disrupt hegemonic masculinity and the toxic culture that allows for the perpetuation of sexual violence and other types of abuses within the school. For example, the dominant discourses of activism and advocacy are useful in defying the inheritance of dominant and toxic cultures, and toxic traditions such as initiation camps. The disruption of these toxic cultures allows for a surfacing of new subjectivity such as an acknowledgement of male sexual violence within the school.

Hegemonic ideals of masculinity permit particular forms of toxicity that contribute towards misunderstandings of sexual violence. As showcased across the data corpus,

discourses such as advocacy were used as a discursive tool to advocate for the victims. The hosts take up this positionality against social structures that inhibit the surfacing of male victimhood in relation to sexual violence. It is through this advocacy work that the audience is sensitized to understand the idea that male sexual violence is a neglected social justice issue, as such, people such as radio personalities and journalists, work to bring this issue to the public's awareness. In so doing, new victimized bodies are also surfaced as a way of acknowledging and validating these experiences. For example, the young boys that were victimized are given space to take up victim identities or survivor identities. Therefore, drawing on the dominant discourse of toxic masculinity, and toxic culture was useful in the podcasts as they are functional in the disruption and decolonization of a traditional understanding of what qualifies victim worthiness.

In addition, highlighted discursive constructions of the legal justice system were also valuable in the construction of victimhood. This speaks broadly on how the legal justice institution has defined sexual violence and victimhood. These legal definitions are useful in the qualification of victim worthiness. The hosts in all the podcasts and the guests on the show discursively construct how the legal institution and criminal justice should seek to expand or have sought to expand its definitions in the contestation of what qualifies a sexual incident as a violation. Traditional definitions of sexual violence i.e. the South African Sexual Offense Act of 1957, posed a challenge for other bodies such as the male body to acknowledge victimhood and vulnerability. The podcasts also tapped into the South African Sexual Offense Amendment Act 13 of 2021 to showcase the complexity attached to the conceptualization of sexual violence. For instance, they draw on the legal notions of statutory rape. Thus, this is showcased in Toki's story. There are highlighted and questionable discursive constructions around the legal implications of a grown man, being violated by a 16-year-old girl. On one hand, the girl

is equally a victim in the story, and on the other hand, the male victimhood could be questionable or requires comprehensive speculation to be affirmed. Thus, male bodies are required to extensively negotiate victim worthiness within the broader social and legal construction of what it means to be sexually violated as a man. Following the legal definition and complexity of victimhood, it shows that there is a complexity that comes with a female sexually perpetrated sexual violence. Debates such as the foregrounding of penetration and body betrayal are crucial to male sexual violence as one seeks to self-position as a victim. Dominant discourse of consent plays a pivotal role in the contestation of the concept of victimhood. The complexity of what consent looks like and what it should look like complicates the ways in which one concludes victim worthiness. For example, in the prison rape podcast, Isaak narrates how the situation forced him to give in to sexual conduct which he later labels as rape. Thus, coercive sex and the parameters through which consent is given are context depended. For example, giving in because of fear or because of the circumstance. The prison environment is one example of the context through which coercive sex is rife where a prisoner could "agree" to sex for protection. Isaac speaks about how he was forced to have sex and how he was denied the chance to agree or disagree with the sex. Therefore, consent or lack thereof was constructed as one of the dominant discourses in negotiating victimhood.

Other discursive constructions such as the rape of a gay man (Toki) were also given palatable dominant discourses such as corrective rape to accommodate other bodied falling within this category of the victimhood identity. Within the prison context, the discursive construction of the legal system is apparent in the relation to how the legal fraternity (i.e. the lawyer in Isaak's story) failed to protect and acknowledge male sexual violence. Isaak also connects this failure across the criminal justice institution – and the legal system because he reported the case to the lawyer, and the correctional service system concerning how the prison

conditions permitted the violation of his body, and lastly, he also refers to the system concerning the care workers (the social worker). Thus, the discursive construction of victimhood within this context is associated with the failure of these systems. On a general note, dominant discourses of institutional failure were highlighted across the podcast – the failure of the legal system, the failure of the educational system, and the failure of the correctional services.

Furthermore, another dominant discursive work apparent across the podcast is the toxic religion discourse. The host and the guests on the show (in chapter 5) drew on the toxicity of religion to demonstrate particular ways in which religion tends to define gender roles and expectations for both men and women within and outside the church. Religious ideologies as evidenced by Toki's story, prohibit new ways of being (a victim of sexual violence, and or vulnerable), The constructions of toxic religion provide the audience with particular understandings of who could be seen as a victim within such a context. Part of drawing on toxic musicality discourses is similar to the previous discourse discussed in the above paragraphs. The discursive constructions are intended to disrupt and deconstruct dominant understandings that limit the surfacing of new subjects. This results in the accommodation of other subjects and victimhood.

Discursive constructions of solidarity were also drawn upon as another way of challenging and disrupting dominant toxic masculinity and toxic culture, especially across South African educational institutions. These constructions were also useful in understanding how the parents needed to get together and question the school's lack of responsibility and acknowledgement of the abuse. Solidarity and the spirit of joining forces is a well-known societal phenomenon usually use to defend the rights of those who are suppressed. Therefore, solidarity and activism are dominant social constructs that were discursively drawn upon in the

podcasts – to challenge systematic failures of the prison systems and educational institutions. Thus, some of the hosts speak about giving meaning to the constitution (South African constitution) which upholds the notions of human rights and for every person to be treated with dignity.

Justification validation and recognition were also useful in the podcast regarding how the victim-survivors work to foreground victimhood. Each guest on the show was given a space to share their stories. It is in this sharing of stories that they embark on a process of describing the details of the sexual violence incident. In these descriptions, discursive constructions of experiences such as being threatened with a dangerous weapon (i.e. Okuhle's story), or being groomed (i.e. Derik's story) are performative in the justification and validation of victim worthiness. It is in/through this justification and validation that they can provide "evidence" to the audience that their experiences qualify as a violation, hence, an acknowledgement should be afforded. The recognition and affirmation from society are essential in the ownership of victim-survivor identity as well as a journey to healing.

8.3 Affective Economies Underlying Discursive Constructions of Men's Experiences of Rape and Sexual Violence.

Across the three chapters, affective economies underlying discursive constructions of societal response to male sexual violence were apparent. In negotiating their victim worthiness, victim-survivors shared their stories of rape and sexual violence. In the sharing of these stories, they spoke about the pain they experienced. Affective economies of sympathy and empathy were useful in how the hosts and the guests on the show were constructing talk. Discursive constructions of toxic masculinity, legal discourse or discursive constructions of religion were performative in their surfacing of empathy and sympathy from the audience which then according to Ahmed (2004; 2014) move and circulate to attach to bodies and therefore, move bodies into action. For instance, through sympathizing and empathizing with victims' experiences of rape and sexual violence the audience is evoked to resonate and validate the sexual violence experience which then qualifies victim worthiness.

The ability of the victim-survivors to speak out and share their sexual violence experiences indicated the expression of bravery. The indication of such brevity appealed to both the audience and the hosts. It is through the performativity of brevity that the audience gets to be attuned to feel for the victim-survivors. I drew on theories writing on affect such as Anderson (2010), Wetherell (2012), and Ahmed (2014) to mention but a few, to argue that affects are useful and performative in how they connect bodies as well as in the ways in which they materialize. It is in the materialization of these effects that the audience, the host, and the victims are aligned in the understanding and acknowledgement of victim worthiness. For instance, when Isaac shared the pain he felt through the mistreatment he received while in prison, his pain materializes into an object of empathy for the audience and potentially moved the audience to sympathize and empathize with him. Ahmed (2014) talks about the affective

assemblage of bodies and affective entanglements as a way through which bodies can affect other bodies. Additionally, other ways in which pain materialize is through the shared stories of the sexual violence of the young boys at Park Town High school. For instance, one of the parents, Joy, shared that her son committed suicide because of the abuse. Thus, after listening to these stories, other parents called in and shared their own experiences. Therefore, affective economies of pain, rage, empathy and sympathy underpin these discursive constructions. As Wetherell (2012) argues that discourse and affects are always intertwined and through the construction of new knowledge and the use of affective technologies, new subjects are constructed – powerful subjects such as Joy that can stand for themselves, that can question and disrupt hegemonic ideologies within society. Thus, affects are performative in the ways in which they occupy space, move, circulate and attach to bodies. Ahmed's (2004) conception of the movement, attachment and stickiness of affect was useful in understanding how the host, the guests on the show and the audience were emotionally motivated to question and disrupt years of educational institutions' cover-up of abuse, and its lack of accountability. The ability of the body to affect other bodies indicated the ways in which emotions move across and between objects and subjects to produce particular figures. In this case, enraged and angered figures. This embodied rage motivated Joy to transition from occupying a victim position to embracing the activist position with confidence to confront and demand answers from the school. The movement and materialization of affect powerfully aligned Joy's, Phelelani's, Angelique's and the host's pained, angered and enraged bodies (Ahmed, 2004). In the circulation of pain, anger and rage, not only did the circulation surface strong and confident subjects, but they were also useful in surfacing and unmasking the toxic institutions and ideologies about sexual violence against men.

In addition, the host's and other parents' rage against the school became Shallyz's object of rage. Shallyz's embodiment of rage could be read as a representational figure for the toxic culture. Her rage could be read as a defensive rage motivated by the fear of the consequences of institutional disruption that comes with unveiling institutional toxicity and failure to address sexual violence scandals. White fragility was defined as the cognitive and affective inability of white people to cope with several racial stressors (DiAngelo, 2011). Once triggered, white fragility could be embodied through defensive anger, rage and a façade. Thus, Shallyz's embodiment of rage and defensive behavior represents how school institutions, hegemonic masculinity and religious institutions (drawing from data) shield and defended self-serving ideologies. Part of their self-serving actions is apparent from Shallyz's emphasis that everything was in good order at the school. The triggered white fragility surfaced and protect by Shallyz's quick reaction to protect the history of the school, and its toxic tradition (DiAngelo, 2011; 2022). Thus, it is through the expression of white fragility that the host stood a chance to unveil to the audience, and the guests on the show the very reasons institutional culpability and toxic masculinity ignore, remain silent, covers-up toxic traditions and toxic cultural practices – because they are self-serving, and they are afraid of the disruption associated with the sexual violence scandal and other abuses at the school.

8.4 Male Sexual Citizenship via Discursive and Affective Tropes

Discursive constructions of sexual violence within society can deny other forms of sexual citizenship. The initial construction of the question around how male sexual citizenship is "governed" via discursive and affective tropes was based on the assumption that discourses and emotions used in the data have the potential to inhibit particular forms of being. With this in mind, the data indicated the opposite. As such, in this study, and across the podcasts, victim-survivors and the hosts indicated an awareness of how traditional notions of sexual violence

make it difficult for men to take up victim-survivor identities. It is through this awareness that discursive constructions of toxic masculinity, toxic religion, legal discourses, and institutional failures surfaced in particular subjects. For instance, the hosts across data, interrogated and challenged traditional understandings and perceptions of men and sexual violence. Thus, by taking up different positions such as activists, advocates, experts, victims and survivors, both the hosts and the victim-survivors, challenged limiting constructions of what it means to be a man in the face of sexual violence and vulnerability. It is through these discourses that male sexual citizenship was advocated and surfaced. Therefore, part of disrupting toxic masculinity was directed towards the (re)construction of male sexual violence and the surfacing of subjects free from the bondage of societal expectations that are limiting the exercise of inclusive sexual citizenship. The notion of citizenship also speaks to the ideas of identity (Joppke, 2007). As such, victim-survivors negotiated their identities as male victims of sexual violence. This self-identity acknowledgement alludes to the idea of embracing sexual citizenship as a sexual and vulnerable man. Issues of justification, validation and recognition are significant in sexual citizenship (Richardson, 2000). This study indicated that the action to advocate for male sexual violence (by the hosts), the unmasking of institutional culpability, and the speaking out and negotiation by the victims-survivors, were aiming for the recognition of male sexual violence. In so doing, advocating for male sexual citizenship where man is given the power and freedom to speak out, and to express vulnerability in the face of sexual violence. Additionally, affective economies of pain, anger, rage, sympathy and empathy were performative in surfacing the audience into an affirmative and empathetic audience. For instance, it is through pain and rage that the hosts and the guests were motivated to challenge and expose institutional failure and complacency (i.e. the prison, correctional services, and educational system) into silencing male sexual violence. Other emotions such as sympathy and empathy were also functional in

surfacing an audience that feels for others, hence, allowing the audience to acknowledge and recognize male sexual violence. Therefore, discursive and affective tropes, in this study, prompted male sexual citizenship.

8.5 Reflexivity

Reflexivity is one of the criteria for evaluating the quality of quantitative research and is part and parcel of an approach to knowledge and knowledge generation that "assumes the independence of the knower and the known" (Henwood & Pidgeon, 1992, p.105). Within a reflexivity paradigm, understanding one's influence of a study as a research and subjectively alienating oneself from the research could be constructed as 'contaminants' of the truth. However, in critical qualitative research, such a position is difficult to maintain (Henwood & Pidgeon, 1992). Critical research instead assumes that "the knower (i.e. research) is part of the matrix of what is known" (Wilkinson, 1986, p.13 as cited in Macleod, 2002, p.19). Starting from this position, when reporting on the research process and the findings of the research, one should seek not to 'sanitise' the research process by removing all traces of the researcher's involvement and the consequences of this involvement, but to "mak[e] visible what is usually overlooked in research" (Parker, 2005, p. 30). Therefore, reflexivity involves an interrogation of, "the ways in which the researcher and the research process have shaped the collected data, including the role of prior assumptions and experience" (Mays & Pope, 2000, p.51). In light of this, my prior knowledge on the subject of sexual violence obtained from my master's research shaded my prior understanding of the issue of sexual violence. As such, I came into the study with prior information on how male sexual violence has not been getting the same attention as sexual violence against women. This relates to some of the gaps I identified in my master's research. Having this knowledge was influential in the undertaking, and pursuit of this study.

Thus, I was motivated to research how sexual violence against men is constructed within mainstream society. Macleod (2002) argued that a reflexivity process extends to an examination of the relationship that exists between the researcher and those involved in the research. As such, although I did not have any personal or direct relationships with the hosts, victims-survivors, and guests on the show, researching male sexual violence as a cisgender woman had implications on how I view and interpret data. For example, discussing issues of toxic masculinity, male rape and sexual violence was influenced by my perceptions of masculinity ideologies as a woman raised within a patriarchal society. I was aware of societal expectations of men, and this knowledge was significant in understanding, and empathizing with male victims-survivors of sexual violence; having been a victim of patriarchy as a woman. In as much as I could resonate with the victim-survivors, I also had to read and make sense of the data from the discursive constructions of their sexual violence experiences. Reflecting on the process of how the research was conducted makes it possible to speak about how I attempted to conduct, and subsequently report on research in ways that highlight my subject positioning as a researcher, and how my values and beliefs could have influenced the decisions I made during the research process.

The choice to use a qualitative was informed by my previous experience in qualitative research. Thus, I felt confident in conducting qualitative research as I had acquired qualitative research skills with my master's research. This methodology was suitable for the study as it is rooted within the phenomenology and subjectivism ontology and epistemology that believe that social and cultural contexts are fundamental in reality construction. Qualitative methodology was useful in understanding how men make sense of their sexual violence experiences. The choice to use discourse analysis and affect theory was significant in responding to the aim of the study. Qualitative methods can undoubtedly add depth and

understanding to how the researcher makes sense of the data. However, I have also found that it is really difficult to use qualitative data collection techniques well, and meaningfully. It is not only a matter of collecting subjective and textual data, but also providing meaningful interpretations.

The process of data collection and transcription was a bit challenging as I had no idea if I would get enough data on male sexual violence. During the proposal stage, it was clear that accessing narratives and societal responses to sexual violence would be a challenge because of the nature in which male sexual violence is overlooked. Additionally, research has shown that male sexual violence is underreported, and as such expecting to find existing data on male victim-survivors publicly speaking out about their experience was a stretch. As such, I started by using keyword searches online, such as male rape, and men who were raped, to mention but a few. I would get referred to links that address male sexual violence in the military and most of these were outside South Africa. I also searched using the Radio station names, and I stumbled across a podcast about prison rape from one of the radio stations. I became hopeful that there could be more of these. However, the station had only aired one podcast that met the inclusion criteria of the study. Hence, I continued with the search using different radio stations. Unfortunately, most of the radio stations did not have much online presence, a few that did only had minimal virtual interaction apart from the name of the radio and geographical details. I was stuck. In the hope of not wanting to give up, I also made use of my network asking if they have heard or watched any videos or podcasts about male rape. I was referred to a link on YouTube that had a podcast about male sexual violence. I started to watch and listen to the podcast with the study inclusion criterion in mind. Fortunately, the podcast met the criteria and was downloaded and transcribed it. I followed up and realized that there was part two of the story, which I also downloaded and transcribed. Eventually, I managed to collect a total of four

podcasts. Following the commentary section of this podcast was useful in expanding the data corpus.

Additionally, transcribing data was also another daunting experience. I had to look and search for data transcription software to minimize the task of manually transcribing data. As such, I was referred to Ottai ai software which uses artificial intelligence to provide real-time transcription of audio and video. Although this was helpful, manual editing of the transcript was necessary in eliminating any mistakes in case the software did not fully grasp the accents of the speakers. Manual editing was also useful in assigning names to the speakers.

Lastly, reflecting on moments of discomfort in the process of conducting this study speaks to the times I felt I was not making progress. After the proposal was accepted and ethical clearance, I had to commence data collection. This took more time than anticipated because there was minimal data relating to male sexual violence in South Africa that met the criteria of the study. For example, the accessed podcasts were relatively new (published between 2019-2020) given that I commenced my study in 2019. Additionally, there were also "failures", as I wrote and rewrote each chapter, drafts upon drafts. However, I do not entirely see these moments as "failures" but rather as a process of refining my study as I worked towards making sense of the study from methodology, theory, and analysis of the findings.

8.6 Limitations and recommendations for future research

Limitations refer to instances that hamper or alter the research process. The following limitations were present in this study. Firstly, the data were collected using online platforms (i.e. radio talk shows), meaning that participants should have access to these resources and access to either platform to comment on the podcast media platforms. However, although this could be the case, it is also about the typical audiences of Radio 702 and the other podcasts rather than technology. In light of this study, the type of audience did not seem to be a significant factor in researching societal responses and discursive constructions of male sexual violence. There are a few challenges related to using social media data in research. One of the challenges is participation inequality. Participation inequality means that a small percentage of individuals produce most of the content (Tenkanen et al., 2017). Examples of participation inequalities in this study included the following: people might not have access to social media, the internet or data and, therefore, did not share their response to male sexual violence on Twitter and Facebook. Additionally, not everyone listens to the radio and has access to follow the podcast online. Thus creating limited social responses for the study as the focus was only on comments that were posted online or people who were involved in the podcasts. Additionally, individuals' language may have resulted in participation inequality as this study used posts or comments in English. However, concerning the highlighted possible limitations, my study engaged in three thematic strands: the narratives of rape, the talk of radio podcasts and the audience engagement. As such, analytic claims could not be made on the demography of this audience, or that it should be a significant concern. It would be useful for future studies to look into different sources of data collection such as a focus group and interviews to have a direct interaction as well as prompt the conversation about male sexual violence. The sources of data collection may surface different discursive constructions of male sexual violence.

8.7 Concluding Remarks

This chapter concluded the research by highlighting the main findings of the study. Thus, three main research questions were outlined and responded to. Discursive constructions of male sexual violence were useful in understanding how hegemonic masculinity and traditional cultures are obstacles in the constructions and acknowledgement of male sexual violence. The podcast was a useful tool for conscious raising. They were functional in challenging and questioning these societal ideologies. Affective economies of pain, anger, rage, sympathy and empathy surfaced within data and were equally full in surfacing new subjects – male victims of sexual violence. It was argued that the surfacing of these affects potentially aligns bodies into action – i.e. speaking out about experiences of sexual violence (i.e. victim-survivors) and disrupting traditional and toxic institutions that prohibit the understanding and validation of male sexual violence. Additionally, I highlighted the limitations of this study and made recommendations for future research

REFERENCES

- Adamkiewicz, E. A. (2016). White Nostalgia: The Absence of Slavery and the Commodification of White Plantation Nostalgia. *Aspeers*, (9).
- Adar, J., & Stevens, M. (2000). Women's health. *South African health review*, 411-428.
- Ahmed, S. (2004). Affective economies. *Social Text*, 22(2), 117–139. https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-22-2_79-117
- Ahmed, S. (2010). The promise of happiness. In *The Promise of Happiness*. Duke University Press.
- Ahmed, S. (2014). *Cultural politics of emotion*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Ahrens, C. E. (2006). Being silenced: The impact of negative social reactions on the disclosure of rape. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 38(3-4), 31-34. doi: 10.1007/s10464-006-9069-9.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1980). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Anderson, B. (2007). Hope for nanotechnology: anticipatory knowledge and the governance of affect. *Area*, 39(2), 156-165ibg. /doi/abs/10.1111/j.1475-4762.2007.00743.x
- Anderson, B. (2012). Affect and biopower: towards a politics of life. *Transactions of the institute of British geographers*, 37(1), 28-43. doi/abs/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2011.00441.x

- Anderson, C. (2014). Ferguson isn't about black rage against cops. It's white rage against progress. *The Washington Post*, 29.
- Anderson, C. (2016). *White rage: The unspoken truth of our racial divide*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- Anderson, R. E., Cahill, S. P., & Delahanty, D. L. (2018). The psychometric properties of the Sexual Experiences Survey–Short Form Victimization (SES-SFV) and characteristics of sexual victimization experiences in college men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 19(1), 25. doi.org/10.1037/a0033376.
- Apperley, H. (2015). Hidden victims: a call to action on sexual violence against men in conflict, *Medicine, Conflict and Survival*, 31:2, 92-99, DOI: 10.1080/13623699.2015.1060575
- Armstrong, E. A., Gleckman-Krut, M., & Johnson, L. (2018). Silence, power, and inequality: An intersectional approach to sexual violence. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 44, 99-122.
- Arttime, T. M., McCallum, E. B., & Peterson, Z. D. (2014). Men's acknowledgment of their sexual victimization experiences. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 15(3), 313.
- Athanasίου, A., Hantzaroula, P., & Yannakopoulos, K. (2008). Towards a new epistemology: The 'affective turn'. *Historein*, 8, 5–16.
- Australian Centre for the Study of Sexual Assault. (2006). Male survivors of sexual assault. *Australian Institute of Family Studies*. Melbourne.
- Baker, H. (2009). 'Potentially violent men?': teenage boys, access to refuges and constructions of men, masculinity and violence. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 31(4), 435-450. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09649060903430298>.

- Barker, G., & Ricardo, C. (2005). *Young men and the construction of masculinity in sub-Saharan Africa: Implications for HIV/AIDS, conflict, and violence* (p. 27). Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Bartholomaeus, C. (2013). Colluding with or challenging hegemonic masculinity? Examining primary school boys' plural gender practices. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 28(77), 279-293.
- Basile, K. C., Espelage, D. L., Rivers, I., McMahon, P. M., & Simon, T. R. (2009). The theoretical and empirical links between bullying behaviour and male sexual violence perpetration. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 14(5), 336-347.
- Bauer, M. W., & Gaskell, G. (Eds.). (2000). *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound: A practical handbook for social research*. Sage.
- Baxter, M. (2013). Consuming Others: *The Social Production of Rapable Bodies and Rapist Mentalities*.
- Bell, D., & Binnie, J. (2006). Geographies of sexual citizenship. *Political Geography*, 25(8), 869–873. doi: 10.1016/j.polgeo.2006.09.002.
- Bello, P. O., & Matshaba, T. D. (2022). The Effects of Procedural Justice on Obligation to Obey, and Compliance among Incarcerated Offenders in South Africa. *The Prison Journal*, 102(6), 673-693.
- Beres, M. A., Senn, C. Y., & McCaw, J. (2014). Navigating ambivalence: How heterosexual young adults make sense of desire differences. *Journal of Sex Research*, 51(7), 765–776. doi:10.1080/00224499.2013.792327
- Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative research*, 15(2), 219-234.

- Berlant, L. (1997). The queen of America goes to Washington City. In *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City*. Duke University Press.
- Beuchler, S. M. (1990). Women's movements in the United States. *London: Rutgers*.
- Beynon, J. (2002). *Masculinities and culture*. Open University Press. U.S.A
- Bless, C., & Higson-Smith, C. (2000). *Fundamentals of social research methods: An African perspective*. Cape Town: Juta Education (Pty) Ltd.
- Boonzaier, F. (2008). 'If the man says you must sit, then you must sit', the relational construction of women abuse: Gender, subjectivity and violence. *Feminism & Psychology*, 18(2), 183–206. Doi: 10.1177/0959353507088266
- Boonzaier, F., & de La Rey, C. (2003). 'He's a man, and I'm a woman': Cultural constructions of masculinity and femininity in South African women's narratives of violence. *Violence Against Women*, 9(8), 1003–1029.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology in question* (Vol. 18). Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. (2018). Structures, habitus, practices. In *Rethinking the Subject* (pp. 31-45). Routledge.
- Bowman, B., Stevens, G., Eagle, G., Langa, M., Kramer, S., Kiguwa, P., & Nduna, M. (2015). The second wave of violence scholarship: South African synergies with a global research agenda. *Social Science & Medicine*, 146, 243-248.
- Bray, P. (2019). Grief, loss and critical autoethnography: the father's tale. *Innovations in Narrative and Metaphor: Methodologies and Practices*, 203-219.

- British Psychological Society. (2013). *Ethics guidelines for internet-mediated research*.
Leicester: Author. [www.bps.org.uk/publications/policy-andguidelines/
research-guidelines-policy documents/ research-guidelines-poli](http://www.bps.org.uk/publications/policy-andguidelines/research-guidelines-policydocuments/research-guidelines-poli)
- Brown, M. (2006). Sexual citizenship, political obligation and disease ecology in gay Seattle. *Political Geography*, 25(8), 874–898. doi: 10.1016/j.polgeo.2006.05.004
- Bruner, J. (1991). The narrative construction of reality. *Critical inquiry*, 18(1), 1-21.
- Brunner, L. K., & Dever, M. (2014). Work, bodies and boundaries: Talking sexual harassment in the new economy. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 21(5), 459-471.
- Bryant-Davis, T., Ullman, S. E., Tsong, Y., & Gobin, R. (2011). Surviving the storm: The role of social support and religious coping in sexual assault recovery of African American women. *Violence against women*, 17(12), 1601-1618.
- Buiten, D., & Naidoo, K. (2013). Constructions and representations of masculinity in South Africa's tabloid press: Reflections on discursive tensions in the Sunday Sun. *Communication: South African Journal for Communication Theory and Research*, 39(2), 194-209. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02500167.2013.791333>
- Butler, J (1999) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, London, New York: Routledge
- Butler, J. (2004). *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London: Verso.
- Campbell, R., Wasco, S. M., Ahrens, C. E., Sefl, T., & Barnes, H. E. (2001). Preventing the ‘second rape’: Rape survivors’ experiences with community service providers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16(12), 1239–1259. doi:10.1177/088626001016 012002

- Center for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation. (2001).
<https://www.csvr.org.za/publications/>
- Chapleau, K. M., Oswald, D. L., & Russell, B. L. (2008). Male rape myths: The role of gender, violence, and sexism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23(5), 600-615.
doi:10.1177/0886260507313529
- Chitiki, E. (2018). *Participation in the anti-sexual violence silent protest: a sexual citizenship perspective*. (Master's Thesis, Rhodes University)
- Christie N (1986) The Ideal Victim. In: Fattah EA (ed.) *From Crime Policy to Victim Policy*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 17–30.
- Chynoweth, S, K. Freccero, J. & Touquet C. (2017). Sexual violence against men and boys in conflict and forced displacement: implications for the health sector, *Reproductive Health Matters*, 25:51, 90-94, DOI: 10.1080/09688080.2017.1401895
- Cisney, V., & Morar, N. (2015). Why biopower?. *Biopower*, 1-25.
- Coetzee, A., & Du Toit, L. (2018). Facing the sexual demon of colonial power: Decolonising sexual violence in South Africa. *European journal of women's studies*, 25(2), 214-227.
- Colpitts, E. (2019). Engaging men and boys to prevent gender-based violence in South Africa: possibilities, tensions and debates. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, 40(3), 423-439.
- Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: rethinking the concept. *Gender Society*, 19, 829-859. doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639.

- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: rethinking the concept. *Gender Society*, 19, 829-859. doi.org/10.1177%2F0891243205278639.
- Correction1. (2013). *South African Prisons*. <https://www.corrections1.com/corrections-international/videos/gang-violence-kills-16-in-venezuelan-prison-lgvmSxsvdc2dg4JL/>
- Crenshaw, K. W. (2013). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. In *The public nature of private violence* (pp. 93-118). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. (1998). W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*, 2. Washington, DC: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). Mapping the field of mixed methods research. *Journal of mixed methods research*, 3(2), 95-108.
- Crofts, P. (2016). Legal irresponsibility and institutional responses to child sex abuse. *Law in Context*, 34(2), 79-99.
- Crome, S. (2006). ACSSA Wrap.
- Cropley, A. (2015). Introduction to qualitative research methods. *Hamburg, Germany*.
- Curl, M., & Robinson, D. (1994). Hand-held Computers in Clinical Audit:: A Comparison with Established Paper and Pencil Methods. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 7(3), 16-20.
- da Silva, A. B. (2008). *Master Thesis in Mental Health Care* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Agder Norway).
- Daly, K. (2014). Reconceptualizing sexual victimization and justice. *Justice for victims: Perspectives on rights, transition and reconciliation*, 1, 378-95.

- Dartnall, E., & Jewkes, R. (2013). Sexual violence against women: the scope of the problem. *Best practice & research Clinical obstetrics & gynaecology*, 27(1), 3-13.
- Dartnall, E., & Jewkes, R. (2013). Sexual violence against women: the scope of the problem. *Best practice & research Clinical obstetrics & gynaecology*, 27(1), 3-13.
- Davies, M. (2002). Male sexual assault victims: A selective review of the literature and implications for support services. *Aggression and violent behavior*, 7(3), 203-214.
- Davies, M. (2002). Male sexual assault victims: A selective review of the literature and implications for support services. *Aggression & Violent Behavior*, 7(3), 203–214.
doi:10.1016/S1359-1789(00)00043-4
- Davies, M., Gilston, J., & Rogers, P. (2012). Examining the relationship between male rape myth acceptance, female rape myth acceptance, victim blame, homophobia, gender roles, and ambivalent sexism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(14), 2807–2823.
doi:10.1177/0886260512438281
- de Oliveira Pimenta, S. M., & Natividade, C. (2013). The semiotic construction of masculinity and affect: A multimodal analysis of media texts. *Ilha do Desterro: A Journal of English Language, Literatures in English and Cultural Studies*, (64), 173-198.
- De Spinoza, B. (1994). *A Spinoza reader: The ethics and other works*. Princeton University Press.
- Deacon, D., Pickering, M., Golding, P., and Murdock, G. (1999). *Researching communications: A practical guide to methods in media and cultural analysis*. London: Edward Arnold.
- DeGue, S., & DiLillo, D. (2004). Understanding perpetrators of nonphysical sexual coercion: Characteristics of those who cross the line. *Violence and victims*, 19(6), 673-688.

- Del Zotto, A., and A. Jones. 2002. "Male-on-Male Sexual Violence in Wartime: Human Rights' Last Taboo?" Unpublished paper presented at the Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, New Orleans, March 23–27
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition* (trans.P. Patton). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition* (trans.P.Patton). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1972). *Capitalisme et schizophrénie : L'anti-oedipe* (Vol. 1). Les éditions de Minuit.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1972). *Capitalisme et schizophrénie: L'anti-oedipe* (Vol. 1). Les éditions de Minuit.
- Dey, I. (1993). *Qualitative Data Analysis : A user-friendly guide for social scientists*. London : Routledge.
- Di Silvio, L. (2011). Correcting Corrective Rape: Carmichele and Developing South Africa's Affirmative Obligation to Prevent Violence against Women. *Georgetown Law Journal*, 99(5), 1469-1516
- DiAngelo, R. (2011). White fragility. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 3(3), 54-70.
- DiAngelo, R. (2022). *White Fragility (Adapted for Young Adults): Why Understanding Racism Can Be So Hard for White People (Adapted for Young Adults)*. Beacon Press.
- Doevenspeck, M. (2011). Constructing the border from below: Narratives from the Congolese–Rwandan state boundary. *Political Geography*, 30(3), 129-142.

- Donnelly, D. A., & Kenyon, S. (1996). "Honey, We Don't Do Men" Gender Stereotypes and the Provision of Services to Sexually Assaulted Males. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 11(3), 441-448.
- Drid, T. (2010). Discourse Analysis: Key concepts and perspectives. *Ouargla, Argelia*.
- Drid, T. (2010). Discourse Analysis: Key concepts and perspectives. *Ouargla, Argelia*.
- Du Mont, J., Miller, K.-L., & Myhr, T. (2003). The role of 'real rape' and 'real victim' stereotypes in the police reporting practices of sexually assaulted women. *Violence Against Women*, 9(4), 466–486. doi:10.1177/1077801202250960.
- Du Plooy-Cilliers , F., Davis , C. and Bezuidenhout , R.-M. (2014). *Research Matters*. Cape Town: Juta & Company Ltd
- Dunkle, K. L., Jewkes, R. K., Murdock, D. W., Sikweyiya, Y., & Morrell, R. (2013). Prevalence of consensual male–male sex and sexual violence, and associations with HIV in South Africa: A population-based cross-sectional study. *PLoS medicine*, 10(6), e1001472.
- Edström, J., & Dolan, C. (2019). Breaking the spell of silence: Collective healing as activism amongst refugee male survivors of sexual violence in Uganda. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 32(2), 175-196.
- Edwards, D. and Potter, J., (2001). Discursive psychology. IN: McHoul, A.W. and Rapley, M. (eds.) *How to analyse talk in institutional settings: a casebook of methods*. London: Continuum, pp. 12 - 24.
- Egan, G. (2013). *The skilled helper: A problem-management and opportunity-development approach to helping*. Cengage Learning.

- Elliott, K. (2016). *Caring masculinities: Theorizing an emerging concept. Men and masculinities*, 19(3), 240-259.
- Englund, L. (2022). Against Color-Blindness: Anglo-American Trajectories of Racism in Why I'm No Longer Talking to White People About Race and White Rage. *Journal of Black Studies*, 53(8), 824-844.
- Fawcett, J., & Buhle Jr, E. L. (1995). Using the Internet for data collection. An innovative electronic strategy. *Computers in nursing*, 13(6), 273-279.
- Felson, R. B., & Parè, P. P. (2005). The reporting of domestic violence and sexual assault by nonstrangers to the police. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 597-610.
- Ferrales, G., Nyseth Brehm, H., & McElrath, S. (2016). Gender-based violence against men and boys in Darfur: The gender-genocide nexus. *Gender & Society*, 30(4), 565-589.
- Filmer, P. (1972). On Harold Garfinkel's Ethnomethodology. *New directions in sociological theory*, 203-21.
- Fink, D. E., & Diamond, S. E. (2018). Morality Clauses in the Age of# MeToo and Time's up. *Comm. Law.*, 34, 4.
- Finkel, E. J., & Eckhardt, C. I. (2013). *Intimate partner violence*.
- Fisher, B. S., Daigle, L. E., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2003). Reporting sexual victimization to the police and others: Results from a national-level study of college women. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 30(1), 6–38. doi:10.1177/0093854802239161
- Flynn, A. (2015). Sexual violence and innovative responses to justice: Interrupting the 'recognisable' narrative. *Rape justice: Beyond the criminal law*, 92-111.

- Foster, G. (2005). *Male rape and the government of bodies: An unnatural history of the present*. Brisbane: School of Social Work, University of Queensland.
- Foster, T. (2011). The sexual abuse of Black men under American slavery. *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 20(3), 445-464.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/ knowledge; selected interviews and other writings 1972 – 1977*, Translated by C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham & K. Soper, US: The Harvester Press
- Foucault, M. (1991). *Discipline and punish: the birth of a prison*, translated by A. Sheridan, London: Penguin.
- Fouka, G., & Mantzorou, M. (2011). What are the major ethical issues in conducting research? Is there a conflict between the research ethics and the nature of nursing?. *Health science journal*, 5(1), 3.
- Frank, A. J., & Wilson, E. A. (2020). *A Silvan Tomkins handbook: Foundations for affect theory*. U of Minnesota Press.
- Funk, R. E. (1993). *Stopping rape: A challenge for men*. Philadelphia: New Society.
- Gear, S., & Ngubeni, K. (2002). *Daai ding: Sex, sexual violence and coercion in men's prisons*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.
- Gear, S. (2007). Behind the bars of masculinity: Male rape and homophobia in and about South African men's prisons. *Sexualities*, 10(2), 209-227.
- Gear, S., & Ngubeni, K. (2003). Your brother, my wife: sex and gender behind bars. *South African Crime Quarterly*, (4).
- Giddens, A. (1984). *Elements of the theory of structuration*. Routledge.

- Gill, R. (1996). Discourse analysis: practical implementation. *Handbook of qualitative research methods for psychology and the social sciences*, 141-158.
- Goodman, S. (2017). How to conduct a psychological discourse analysis? *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines*, 9 (2),142-153.
- Gould, D. B. (2009). *Moving politics: Emotion and ACT UP's fight against AIDS*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gouws, A. (2018). # EndRapeCulture campaign in South Africa: Resisting sexual violence through protest and the politics of experience. *Politikon*, 45(1), 3-15.
- Gqola, P. D. (2015). *Rape: A South African nightmare*. Johannesburg: Jacana.
- Griffero, T. (2016). *Atmospheres: Aesthetics of emotional spaces*. Routledge.
- Grosser, K., & Tyler, M. (2021). Sexual harassment, sexual violence and CSR: Radical feminist theory and a human rights perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-16.
- Harding, J., & Pribram, E. D. (2002.) "The Power of Feeling: Locating Emotions in Culture." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 5 (4): 407–426. doi:10.1177/1364942002005004294.
- Hardt, M. (1999) 'Affective labor', *Boundary 2*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 89–100
- Hargie, O. (2021). *Skilled interpersonal communication: Research, theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Harris, Z. S. (1981). *Discourse analysis: In papers on syntax* (107-142).
- Harry, J. (1990). Conceptualizing anti-gay violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5(3), 350-358.
- Hearn, J., & Morgan, D. H. J. (2014). *Men, masculinities and social theory (RLE social theory)*. Routledge.

- Helman, R. (2017). Why are all rapes not grievable? *South African Journal of Psychology*, doi: 10.1177/0081246317745775.
- Helman, R. (2018). Mapping the unrapeability of white and black womxn. *Agenda*, 32(4), 10-21.
- Henwood, K. L., & Pidgeon, N. F. (1992). Qualitative research and psychological theorizing. *British journal of psychology*, 83(1), 97-111.
- Herek, G. M., Gillis, J. R., & Cogan, J. C. (1999). Psychological sequelae of hate-crime victimization among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67(6), 945-951. doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.67.6.945.
- Hershkowitz, I., Lanes, O., & Lamb, M. E. (2007). Exploring the disclosure of child sexual abuse with alleged victims and their parents. *Child abuse & neglect*, 31(2), 111-123.
- Higgins, L. A., & Silver, B. R. (Eds.). (1991). *Rape and representation*. Columbia University Press.
- Hill, C., & Kearl, H. (2011). *Crossing the Line: Sexual Harassment at School*. American Association of University Women. 1111 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, DC 20036.
- Hirtle, J. S. P. (1996). Social constructivism. *English Journal*, 85(1), 91.
- Hollander, J. A. (2001). Vulnerability and dangerousness: The construction of gender through conversation about violence. *Gender & society*, 15(1), 83-109.
- Human Rights Watch. (2001). *No escape: Male rape in U.S. prisons*. New York: Author.
- Human Rights Watch. (2010), available at http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/relatedmaterialssouthafrica_0.pdf *inequity in health: Evidence from programme interventions*. Retrieved July 29, 2009,

- Isin, E. F., & Wood, P. K. (1999). *Citizenship and identity*. London. Sage.
- Jakupcak, M., Salters, K., Gratz, K. L., & Roemer, L. (2003). Masculinity and emotionality: An investigation of men's primary and secondary emotional responding. *Sex Roles*, 49, 111-120.
- Jankowitz, S. E. (2018). *The order of victimhood: violence, hierarchy and building peace in Northern Ireland*. Springer.
- Jewkes, R., & Abrahams, N. (2002). The epidemiology of rape and sexual coercion in South Africa: an overview. *Social Science & Medicine*, 55(7), 1231-1244.
- Jina, R., Machisa, M., Labuschagne, G., Vetten, L., Loots, L., & Jewkes, R. (2020). Unspoken victims: A national study of male rape incidents and police investigations in South Africa. *South African Medical Journal*, 110(9), 926-931.
- Johnson K, Scott J, Rughita B, et al. (2010). Association of sexual violence and human rights violations with physical and mental health in territories of the Eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo. *JAMA*.;304(5):553–562.
- Johnson, C. (2002). Heteronormative citizenship and the politics of passing. *Sexualities*, 5(3), 317–336. doi: 10.1177/1363460702005003004
- Joppke, C. (2007). Transformation of citizenship: Status, rights, identity. *Citizenship Studies*, 11(1), 37-48. doi:10.1080/13621020601099831
- Judge, M. (2017). *Blackwashing homophobia: Violence and the politics of sexuality, gender and race*. Routledge.
- Kalra, G., & Bhugra, D. (2013). Sexual violence against women: Understanding cross-cultural intersections. *Indian journal of psychiatry*, 55(3), 244-249.

- Kaufman, S., & Whitehead, K. A. (2018). Producing, ratifying, and resisting support in an online support forum. *Health*, 22(3), 223-239.
- Kelly, L. (2013). *Surviving sexual violence*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Kessler, S. J., D. J. Ashenden, R. W. Connell, and G. W. Dowsett. (1982). *Ockers and disco-maniacs*. Sydney, Australia: Inner City Education Center.
- Keygnaert I, Dialmy A, Manço A, et al. Sexual violence and sub-Saharan migrants in Morocco: a community-based participatory assessment using respondent driven sampling. *Global Health*. 2014;10(1):32.
- Koenig, L. R., Li, M., Zimmerman, L. A., Kayembe, P., Lou, C., Mafuta, E., ... & Moreau, C. (2020). Associations between agency and sexual and reproductive health communication in early adolescence: a cross-cultural, cross-sectional study. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 67(3), 416-424.
- Kopano, R. (2014) Currents against gender transformation of South African men: relocating marginality to the centre of research and theory of masculinities, *NORMA: International Journal for Masculinity Studies*, 9:1, 30-44, DOI: 10.1080/18902138.2014.892285
- Korstjens, I., & Moser, A. (2017). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 2: Context, research questions and designs. *European Journal of General Practice*, 23(1), 274-279.
- Kramer, S. (2015). Surfacing (im) possible victims: A critical review of the role of gender, sexuality and power in constructing the conditions of possibility for South African victims of female sex crimes. *Sexualities*, 18(3), 346-372.

- Kramer, S., & Bowman, B. (2011). Accounting for the 'invisibility' of the female paedophile: An expert-based perspective from South Africa. *Psychology & Sexuality*, 2(3), 244-258.
- Kramer, S., & Bowman, B. (2021). The making of male victimhood in South African Female-perpetrated Sexual Abuse. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 28(6), 829-852.
- Langa, M. (2010). Contested multiple voices of young masculinities amongst adolescent boys in Alexandra Township, South Africa. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 22(1), 1-13.
- Langa, M. (2012). Becoming a man: Exploring multiple voices of masculinity amongst a group of young adolescent boys in Alexandra Township, South Africa (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand, Faculty of Humanities).
- Langa, M. (2020). *Becoming men: Black masculinities in a South African township*. Wits University Press.
- Larson, A. (1989). Social context of human immunodeficiency virus transmission in Africa: Historical and cultural bases of east and central African sexual relations. *Reviews of Infectious Diseases*, 11(5), 716-731.
- Lee, D. (2000). Hegemonic masculinity and male feminisation: The sexual harassment of men at work. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 9(2), 141-155.
- Leuze, K., & Straub, S. (2014). Female-typical subjects and their effect on wage inequalities among higher education graduates in Germany. *European Societies*, 16(2), 275-298. doi:10.1080/14616696.2012.748929.
- Lewis, D. A. (2009). Unrecognized victims: Sexual violence against men in conflict settings under international law. *Wis. Int'l LJ*, 27, 1.

- Linder, C., Myers, J. S., Riggle, C., & Lacy, M. (2016). From margins to mainstream: Social media as a tool for campus sexual violence activism. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 9(3), 231.
- Lock, R. (2006). 10 Heterosexual femininity. *Sport, Sexualities and Queer/Theory*, 159. Routledge: New York.
- Lowe, M., & Rogers, P. (2017). The scope of male rape: A selective review of research, policy and practice. *Aggression and violent behaviour*, 35, 38-43.
- Macleod, C. (2002). Deconstructive discourse analysis: Extending the methodological conversation. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 32(1), 17-25.
- Madill, A., & Gough, B. (2008). Qualitative research and its place in psychological science. *Psychological methods*, 13(3), 254.
- Mager, A. K. (2010). *Beer, sociability, and masculinity in South Africa*. Indiana University Press.
- Makwambeni, B. (2013). *Re-appraising entertainment-education praxis and reception in subaltern spaces: the case of Tsha Tsha in South Africa* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Fort Hare).
- Makwambeni, B., & Salawu, A. (2018). Bridging theory and practice in entertainment education: An assessment of the conceptualization and design of Tsha Tsha in South Africa. *Sage Open*, 8(1), 2158244018758146.
- Manikonda, L., Beigi, G., Kambhampati, S., & Liu, H. (2018). # metoo through the lens of social media. In *Social, Cultural, and Behavioral Modeling: 11th International Conference, SBP-BRiMS 2018, Washington, DC, USA, July 10-13, 2018, Proceedings* 11 (pp. 104-110). Springer International Publishing.

- Massumi, B. (2015). *Politics of affect*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Matebese, S. (2017). #MenAre Trash: What is this Movement Really About? Critical Studies in Sexualities and Reproduction. Rhodes University.
<https://www.ru.ac.za/criticalstudies/latestnews/menaretrashwhatisthismovementreallyabout.html>
- Maxwell, J.A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Mays, N., & Pope, C. (2000). *Assessing quality in qualitative research*. *Bmj*, 320(7226), 50-52.
- McCarry, M. (2007). Masculinity studies and male violence: Critique or collusion? In *Women's Studies International Forum* (Vol. 30, No. 5, pp. 404-415). Pergamon.
- McClain, L. C., & Grossman, J. L. (2009). *Gender equality: Dimensions of women's equal citizenship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McDermott, E. (2011). The world some have won: Sexuality, class and inequality. *Sexualities*, 14(1), 63-78. doi: 10.1177/1363460710390566.
- McElvaney, R., Greene, S., & Hogan, D. (2014). To tell or not to tell? Factors influencing young people's informal disclosures of child sexual abuse. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 29(5), 928-947.
- Mfecane, S. (2016). "Ndiyindoda"[I am a man]: Theorising Xhosa masculinity. *Anthropology Southern Africa*, 39(3), 204-214.
- Mfecane, S. (2018). Towards African-centred theories of masculinity. *Social Dynamics*, 44(2), 291-305.

- Mfecane, S. (2020). Decolonising men and masculinities research in South Africa. *South African Review of Sociology*, 51(2), 1-15.
- Mkhize, G., & Njawala, L. (2016). Rethinking hegemonic masculinity and patriarchal privilege within heterosexual interpersonal relationships. *The Oriental Anthropologist*, 16(2), 379-397.
- Moodie, T. D. (1988). Migrancy and male sexuality on the South African gold mines. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 14(2), 228-256.
- Morrell, R. (2006). Fathers, fatherhood and masculinity in South Africa. *BABA: men and fatherhood in South Africa*, 13-25.
- Morrell, R., ed. (2001). *Changing men in southern Africa*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.
- Morrell, R., Jewkes, R., & Lindegger, G. (2012). Hegemonic masculinity/masculinities in South Africa: Culture, power, and gender politics. *Men and masculinities*, 15(1), 11-30.
- Mouffe, C. (1992) Feminism, citizenship and radical democratic politics. In J. Butler & J.W. Scott (Eds), *Feminists theorize the political*. New York: Routledge.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., Humphreys, T., Jozkowski, K., & Peterson, Z. (2016). The complexities of sexual consent among college students: A conceptual and empirical review. *Journal of Sex Research*, 53(4–5), 457–487. doi:10.1080/00224499.2016.1146651
- Murray, D. (2017). ‘Empowerment through empathy’ – We spoke to Tarana Burke, the woman who really started the ‘Me Too’ movement. <https://www.elle.com/uk/life-and-culture/culture/news/a39429/empowerment-through-empathy-tarana-burke-metoo/>

- Nagai M, Karunakara U, Rowley E, et al. (2010). Violence against refugees, non-refugees and host populations in southern Sudan and northern Uganda. *Glob Public Health.*;3(3):249–270.
- Nasir, N. I. S., Lee, C. D., Pea, R., & McKinney de Royston, M. (2021). Rethinking learning: What the interdisciplinary science tells us. *Educational Researcher*, 50(8), 557-565.
- Navarro, Z. (2006). *In search of a cultural interpretation of power: the contribution of Pierre Bourdieu*.
- Ndou, T. R. (2019). *The impact of the criminal law (sexual offences and related matters) amendment ACT 32 OF 2007 on the offence of rape and sentencing thereof* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria).
- Nunn, N., & Wantchekon, L. (2011). The slave trade and the origins of mistrust in Africa. *American Economic Review*, 101(7), 3221-3252.
- O'Neill, T. (2008). Gender matters in residential child care. *Research Highlights in Social Work*, 47, 93.
- O'Sullivan, L. F., & Gaines, M. E. (1998). Decision-making in college students' heterosexual dating relationships: Ambivalence about engaging in sexual activity. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships*, 15(3), 347–363. doi: 10.1177/0265407598153003
- Oden, M. E. & Clay-Warner, J. (1998). *Confronting rape and sexual assault*. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc.
- O'Donovan, D. (2006). Moving away from “failing boys” and “passive girls”: Gender meta-narratives in gender equity policies for Australian schools and why micro-narratives

- provide a better policy model. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education*, 27(4), 475-494.
- O'Leary, P., & Barber, J. (2008). Gender differences in silencing following childhood sexual abuse. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 17(2), 133-143. doi: 10.1080/10538710801916416.
- Otrofsky, R. (2003). *Affect Theory, shame and the logic of personality*. <http://www.secthoughts.com/Misc%20Essays/Shame%20and%20Personality.pdf> (accessed April 9, 2018).
- Parker, I. (1997). Discourse analysis and psychoanalysis. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 36(4), 479-495.
- Parker, I. (2005). Lacanian discourse analysis in psychology: Seven theoretical elements. *Theory & Psychology*, 15(2), 163-182.
- Pedwell, C. (2014). *Affective relations: The transnational politics of empathy* (p. 46). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Peel, M., Mahtani, A., Hinshelwood, G., & Forrest, D. (2000). The sexual abuse of men in detention in Sri Lanka. *The Lancet*, 355(9220), 2069.
- Peitzmeier, S.M., Yasin, F., Stephenson, R., Wirtz, A.L., Delegchoimbol, A., Dorjgotov, M. and Baral, S., 2015. Sexual violence against men who have sex with men and transgender women in Mongolia: A mixed-methods study of scope and consequences. *PLoS One*, 10(10), p.e0139320.
- Perry, B. (2001). *In the name of hate: Understanding hate crimes*. Psychology Press.

- Petersen, I., Bhana, A., & McKay, M. (2005). Sexual violence and youth in South Africa: The need for community-based prevention interventions. *Child abuse & neglect*, 29(11), 1233-1248.
- Phipps, A. (2021). White tears, white rage: Victimhood and (as) violence in mainstream feminism. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 24(1), 81-93.
- Phipps, A. (2021). White tears, white rage: Victimhood and (as) violence in mainstream feminism. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 24(1), 81-93.
- Potter, J. (2004). In Hardy, M & Bryman, A. *Handbook of data analysis* (pp. 607-624), London: Sage.
- Potter, J. (2012). Discourse analysis and discursive psychology. In Cooper, H. (Editor-in-Chief). *APA handbook of research methods in psychology: Vol. 2. Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological* (pp. 111-130). Washington: American Psychological Association Press.
- Probyn, E. (2005). *Blush: Faces of shame*. U of Minnesota Press.
- Pugh, B., & Becker, P. (2018). Exploring definitions and prevalence of verbal sexual coercion and its relationship to consent to unwanted sex: Implications for affirmative consent standards on college campuses. *Behavioral sciences*, 8(8), 69.
- Ratele, K. (2014). Currents against gender transformation of South African men: Relocating marginality to the centre of research and theory of masculinities. *NORMA: International Journal for Masculinity Studies*, 9(1), 30-44.
- Ratele, K. (2015). Working through resistance in engaging boys and men towards gender equality and progressive masculinities. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 17(sup2), 144-158.

- Ray, L., & McEneaney, M. J. (2014). Caring for survivors of sexual violence: A guide for primary care NPs. *Womens Healthcare*, 42-50.
- Reay, D. (2015). Habitus and the psychosocial: Bourdieu and feelings. *Cambridge Journal of education*, 45:1, 9-23.
- Reeser, T. W., & Gottzén, L. (2018). Masculinity and affect: new possibilities, new agendas. 145-157.
- Rennison, C. M., & Welchans, S. (2000). *Intimate partner violence*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Richardson, D. (2000). Constructing sexual citizenship: Theorizing sexual rights. *Critical Social Policy*, 20(1), 105–135. doi: 10.1177/026101830002000105
- Russell, W. (2007). Sexual violence against men and boys. *Forced Migration Review*, 27, 22-23.
- Salo, E. (2005). ‘Mans is ma soe’: Ganging practices in Manenberg, South Africa, and the ideologies of masculinity, gender and generational relations. *Conference proceedings: From boys to men: masculinities and risk*, University of the Western Cape, 26–27 January 2000.
- Savahl, S. (2010). *Ideological constructions of childhood* (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Western Cape).
- Savcı, E. (2013). On putting down and destroying: Affective economies of a women-only club in İstanbul. *Mapping intimacies: Relations, exchanges, affects*, 95-111.
- Savcı, E. (2013). On putting down and destroying: Affective economies of a women-only club in İstanbul. In *Mapping Intimacies* (pp. 95-111). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

- Scarce, M. (2001). *Male on male rape: The hidden toll of stigma and shame*. Cambridge, Mass: Perseus Publishing.
- Scharff, C. (2017). *Gender, subjectivity, and cultural work: The classical music profession*. Routledge.
- Schmitz, H., Müllan, R. O., & Slaby, J. (2011). Emotions outside the box—the new phenomenology of feeling and corporeality. *Phenomenology and the cognitive sciences*, 10, 241-259.
- Schulz, P. and Touquet, H., 2020. Queering explanatory frameworks for wartime sexual violence against men. *International Affairs*, 96(5), pp.1169-1187.
- Segal, L. (2015). *Why feminism? gender, psychology, politics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Seidman, I., & Pokorak, J. J. (2011). *Justice responses to sexual violence*.
- Seidman, S. (1992). *Embattled Eros: Sexual politics and ethics in contemporary America*. New York: Routledge.
- Sivakumaran, S. (2007). Sexual violence against men in armed conflict. *European Journal of International Law*, 18(2), 253-276. doi:10.1093/ejil/chm013
- Smith, A. (2005). Rape and the War against Native Women 4. Reading Native American women: critical/creative representations, 63.
- Smith, A. (2010). *The theory of moral sentiments*. Penguin.
- Sonke Gender Justice. (n.d). *Programme: Sexual violence in Prisons*.
<https://genderjustice.org.za/programme/policy-development-and-advocacy/prisons-correctional-facilities/sexual-violence-in-prisons/>

- South African Police Services (2001). *Crime situation in South Africa*.
https://www.saps.gov.za/services/crimestats_archive.php
- South African Police Services (2014). Crime situation in South Africa. Retrieved 9 March 2015, from https://www.saps.gov.za/services/crimestats_archive.php
- South African Police Services (2016). *Crime situation in South Africa*.
https://www.saps.gov.za/services/crimestats_archive.php
- South African Police Services (2021). *Crime situation in South Africa*.
https://www.saps.gov.za/services/downloads/april_june_2021_22_quarter1_presentation.pdf
- Stample, L. (2008). Male rape and human rights. *Hastings LJ*, 60,605.
- Struckman-Johnson, C., & Struckman-Johnson, D. (1992). Acceptance of male rape myths among college men and women. *Sex Roles*, 27(3–4), 85–100. doi: 10.1007/BF00290011
- Struckman-Johnson, C., Struckman-Johnson, D., Rucker, L., Bumby, K., & Donaldson, S. (1996). Sexual coercion reported by men and women in prison. *Journal of Sex Research*, 33, 67-76.
- Taylor, S. (2006). Narrative as construction and discursive resource. *Narrative inquiry*, 16(1), 94-102.
- Teddle, C., & Yu, F. (2007). Mixed methods sampling: A typology with examples. *Journal of mixed methods research*, 1(1), 77-100.

- Tenkanen, H., Di Minin, E., Heikinheimo, V., Hausmann, A., Herbst, M., Kajala, L., & Toivonen, T. (2017). Instagram, Flickr, or Twitter: Assessing the usability of social media data for visitor monitoring in protected areas. *Scientific reports*, 7(1), 17615.
- Thrift, Nigel (2004) 'Intensities of Feeling: Towards a Spatial Politics of Affect', *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography* 86(1): 57–78
- Thunberg, S., & Bruck, K. A. (2020). Young victims' positioning: Narrations of victimhood and support. *International Review of Victimology*, 26(2), 196-211.
- Tomkins, S. (1962). *Affect imagery consciousness: Volume I: The positive affects*. Springer publishing company.
- Tomkins, S. S. (1984). Affect theory. *Approaches to emotion*, 163(163-195), 31-65.
- Viljoen, S. (2008). Masculine ideals in post-apartheid South Africa: The rise of men's glossies. *Power, politics and identity in South African media*, 312-342.
- Vyas, A., & Panda, M. (2019). Reification of collective victimhood: Dalit narratives, social repositioning and transformation. *Psychology and Developing Societies*, 31(1), 106-138.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and Language*, A. Kozulin, (Ed. and Trans.), Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.
- Walker, J., Archer, J., & Davies, M. (2005). Effects of male rape on psychological functioning. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 44(3), 445–451. doi: 10.1348/014466505X52750
- Walklate, S. (2007). *Understanding criminology: Current theoretical debates*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

- Walliman, N. (2006). *Social research methods*. California: Sage.
- Ward, C. L., Artz, L., Leoschut, L., Kassanjee, R., & Burton, P. (2018). Sexual violence against children in South Africa: a nationally representative cross-sectional study of prevalence and correlates. *The Lancet Global Health*, 6(4), e460-e468.
- Weeks, J. (1998). The sexual citizen. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 15(3), 35-52. doi: 10.1177/0263276498015003003
- Welsh, S., Carr, J., MacQuarrie, B., & Huntley, A. (2006). "I'm not thinking of it as sexual harassment" understanding harassment across race and citizenship. *Gender & Society*, 20(1), 87-107.
- West, T. (1999). *Wounds of the spirit: Black women, violence, and resistance ethics*. New York: New York University Press.
- Wetherell, M. (2012). Affect and emotion. *Affect and Emotion*, 1-192.
- Wetherell, M. (2012). *Affect and emotion: a new social science understanding*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Wetherell, M. (2015). Trends in the turn to affect: A social psychological critique. *Body & Society*, 21(2), 139-166.
- Wiggins, S. & Potter, J. (2008). Discursive psychology. In C. Willig & W. Stainton-Rogers (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research in psychology* (pp.73-90). London: Sage.
- Wilkins, N., Tsao, B., Hertz, M. F., Davis, R., & Kleven, J. (2014). Connecting the dots: An overview of the links among multiple forms of violence.

- Willig, C. (2001). *Qualitative research in psychology: A practical guide to theory and method*. Buckingham: OUP.
- Willig, C. (2003). Discourse analysis. *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods*, 2, 160-186.
- Willig, C. (2008) *Discourse analysis. Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods*, 2, 160-186.
- Wooden, W. S. (2012). *Men behind bars: Sexual exploitation in prison*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- World Health Organization. (2013). *Global and regional estimates of violence against women: prevalence and health effects of intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence*. World Health Organization.
- Xaba, T. 2001. Masculinity and its malcontents: The confrontation between ‘struggle masculinity’ and ‘post-struggle masculinity’ (1990–1997). In *Changing men in southern Africa*, ed. R.
- Yodanis, C. L. (2004). Gender inequality, violence against women, and fear a cross-national test of the feminist theory of violence against women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(6), 655-675.doi: 10.1177/0886260504263868
- Young, G. A. (1990). *Domestic dispute calls: A study of the effectiveness of police training for domestic violence protocol change*. Kansas City: University of Missouri.
- Young, I. M. (2000). *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yuval-Davis, N. (1997). Women, citizenship and difference. *Feminist Review*, 57(1), 4-27.

Doi/10.1080/014177897339632.

APPENDIX A:



Psychology

School of Human & Community
Development

University of the Witwatersrand

Private Bag 3, WITS, 2050

Tel: (011) 717 4500 Fax: (011) 717
4559



online data e.g. Facebook and Twitter – Sharing your content

Sharing Your Content and Information

You own all of the content and information you post on Facebook, and you can control how it is shared through your privacy and application settings. In addition:

1. For content that is covered by intellectual property rights, like photos and videos (IP content), you specifically give us the following permission, subject to your privacy and application settings: you grant us a non-exclusive, transferable, sub-licensable, royalty-free, worldwide license to use any IP content that you post on or in connection with Facebook (IP License). This IP License ends when you delete your IP content or your account unless your content has been shared with others, and they have not deleted it.
2. When you delete IP content, it is deleted in a manner similar to emptying the recycle bin on a computer. However, you understand that removed content may persist in backup copies for a reasonable period of time (but will not be available to others).
3. When you use an application, the application may ask for your permission to access your content and information as well as content and information that others have shared with you. We require applications to respect your privacy, and your agreement with that application will control how the application can use, store, and transfer that content and information. (To learn more about Platform, including how you can control what information other people may share with applications, read our Data Policy and Platform Page.)
4. When you publish content or information using the Public setting, it means that you are allowing everyone, including people off of Facebook, to access and use that information, and to associate it with you (i.e., your name and profile picture).
5. We always appreciate your feedback or other suggestions about Facebook, but you understand that we may use your feedback or suggestions without any obligation to compensate you

.

