Faculty of Humanities
University of Cape Town

South African men and their construction of masculinities in relation to women and homosexual men: A thematic analysis

Malan van der Walt
VWLPIE002

Honours Dissertation

Supervisor: Anastasia Maw

2007

ABSTRACT

This research was aimed at investigating constructions of masculinity among young men, with a focus on the context of male homosexuality. Ten semi-structured interviews constituted the data analysis. Ten male psychology students between the ages of 18 and 25 at their first-year level at the University of Cape Town were interviewed. Thematic analysis was performed using grounded theory within a social constructivist framework. An extensive literature review suggested that one type of masculinity is constructed in most societies that relate to total cultural dominance. Many men subscribe to this hegemonic masculinity, and subordinate women and gay men who do not meet the criteria as delineated by hegemonic masculinity. The analysis yielded themes from which it was argued that men construct their masculinity through an ongoing, long-term project of managing the expression of and exerting control over their emotions, and the management of their physical appearance. Furthermore, a masculine man is not generally seen as heterosexual, and any expressions of behaviours that are considered ‘feminine’, needs to be avoided, lest one’s ‘level’ of masculinity is compromised.

Key words: masculinity; hegemonic masculinity; homosexuality; gender

INTRODUCTION

What is masculinity?

Masculinity as a field of academic inquiry is a late 20th-century development, and its distinction as a subject of critical academic thought is a consequence of the positioning of gender as a social construction by the feminist movement (Connell, 2000, 2004; Kimmel, 1987). Scientists have only been interested in employing men as indiscriminate subjects used to test hypotheses in an experimental setting, but the critical study of men's experiences of what it means to be a man is, historically speaking, very recent, (Kimmel, 1987). According to Kimmel (1987, p.279), the study of men in their masculinity was in large part brought upon by "the social construction of sexuality… and intimacy that feminist and gay scholars have developed". Men as gendered human beings only came to academic attention as a by-product of the feminist movement, and the matter-of-fact notions of what manhood became transformed into a bona fide movement in psychology.

Psychologists have been aware of perceived social roles of men which seem to be designated at birth. According to Kimmel (1987, p.12), the study of gender up to the late 20th century has been based on the sex-role paradigm, which specifies how "biological males and biological females became socialized as men and women in a particular culture". The theory has been criticized, as the so-called 'socialization' of females and males into sex-specific roles effectively prohibits thought about how femininity and masculinity is inherently relational. By positioning male sex-roles on one end of the spectrum, and female sex-roles on the other end of the spectrum, behaviours enacted by a woman or a man which do not explicitly conform to either sex is discarded as being abnormal or deviant. In addition, the sex-role paradigm has been attacked by academics for associating certain traits with either sex instead of examining the intentional and prescribed enactments of the person's gender. By defining the particular traits associated with either sex as static there is a danger of reproducing stereotypical ideas of what is considered to be appropriate sex-role behaviour. This understanding constrains research by failing to offer ways of considering the interaction and interface between these traits

which play off against each other. By creating a binary in which male and female behaviour are set up as mutually exclusive, the idea is entrenched that the behaviour of one gender should automatically be different from the other gender, in order to be known as authentically masculine or feminine (Hanke, 1998; Wester, Pionke, & Vogel, 2002).

Central to the critique of the sex-role theory, was the underlying assumption that men and women behave, feel and think the way they as a function of their sex, and these perceived differences are determined at birth and fixed throughout life (Connell, 1992, 2000, 2004; Herek, 1986; Kimmel, 1987). Typically sex-role theory proclaimed the superiority of men over women, whether the comparisons were based on intelligence, quality of character, or their fitness to perform in workplaces traditionally occupied by men.

The positioning of masculinities in gender studies has broadened the premise of the study of gender to consider the role that social constructions, such as culture, class, race, and generation, contribute to the formation of gender (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Demetrious, 2001; Haywood & Mac an Ghail, 2003). As such, diversity in masculinities (and femininities) should be recognized, because different social, cultural, generational and racial milieus construct different forms of gendered behaviour. By focusing on so-called biologically determined behaviour of the sexes, the behaviour that is observed by social scientists who advocate this theory, are at risk of presenting certain sex-related behaviour as intrinsic or inherent to the sex. As such, the sex-role theory eschewed the presence of power relations between genders, as emanations of powerful behaviour of one sex in relation to the other, is presumed to be a manifestation of biological fact.

The feminist movement deconstructed these assumptions and introduced a critical perspective on gender, arguing that science became a tool to advance sexism and justify discrimination against women and the protection of men’s interests. Feminism introduced the radical notion that gender is predominantly a social construction and that neither one of the two sexes had an innate superiority over the other designated at birth (May, Strikwerda, & Hopking, 1996). Feminist studies, therefore, have made masculinity visible as a dominant cultural norm and have presented a significant challenge to the

prevalence of masculinity as the cultural standard, which remained unquestioned and accepted for a long time (May et al., 1996). The challenges that the women's movement posed to the extant gender system were felt by many men. The women's movements and its ideology of feminism seemed to suggest to men that their enactment of their masculine selves was problematic and that change was needed (Kimmel, 1987). Social science research on gender within the last four decades has expanded and developed at a very fast rate, but the study of gender has by and large focused on the gender identities of women and girls. Ordinary women have been oppressed and marginalized socially, politically and economically, and have been introduced to alternative ideas regarding which roles they can occupy in society, and that they can have the same rights enjoyed by men.

The important contributions made by feminist thinking to understanding how gender constructs taken-for-granted privilege for men, and taken-for-granted discrimination for women, has problematised the male sex. In a gesture of alliance and solidarity with the principles of feminism, some male academics have examined ways to reposition men as agents of transforming patriarchy. Today, there is a substantial amount of literature on the subject of masculinity's positioning within the discourse of gender, and gradually, social factors have been stressed to point to the construction of masculinity, as opposed to the essentialist assumptions which dominated academic thought on the configuration of masculinity.

According to Connell (2000), the rise of feminism in the 1970s "challenged all assumptions about the gender system and raised a series of problems about men" (p.3). With the advent of gender studies, and more specifically feminist studies, men have increasingly been forced to grapple with changing ideas about masculinity and their gender identities. Experiential and phenomenological forms of knowledge about men became needed to understand how men do this. Studies on men now examine issues such as: how do we understand men and gender, what are our beliefs about masculinity, and what do we know about the development of men (Edley, 2004; Korobov, 2004; Way & Chu, 2004; Yeung, Stombler, & Wharton, 2006).

Hegemonic masculinity

Gender is constructed differently with respect to culture in different historical periods (Connell, 1992; Connell, 2000; Connell, 2004). Different masculinities do not necessarily complement and sustain one another. Rather, there are relations of hierarchy, where one form of masculinity acquires the status of being the dominant masculinity, which has dubbed in social science research as the 'hegemonic masculinity' (Connell, 2000). Hegemonic masculinity "relates to complete cultural dominance of a society as a whole" (Connell, 2005, p. 78), and relations of domination and the resultant subordination among different groups of men are formed. In order for the hegemonic form of masculinity to survive, it has to subordinate and marginalise other forms of masculinities.

The concept of hegemonic masculinity explains how men are in a powerful position in relation to women in global society, but not all men: men exercise power over women by virtue of their privileged positions in society in the economy, the job market and the political organization of society, but this dominant form of masculinity also wields power over marginalised and subordinated men who do not fit the criteria of hegemonic masculinity.

These men that become subordinated, are the objects of hostility and disdain, as they cannot or do not conform to the idealised construction of masculinity. Such disdain is inherent in the cultural construction of the idealised masculinity (Herek, 1986). Heterosexual men express hostility toward homosexual men, thereby enhancing their own heterosexual identity. Heterosexuality is an important ingredient of hegemonic masculinity, and by denouncing homosexual men, a proclamation of membership to the dominant masculinity is expressed.

How does hegemonic masculinity intersect with homosexuality?

As mentioned above, a central prescription contained in hegemonic masculinity is heterosexuality, referred to as 'compulsory heterosexuality'. According to Rich (as cited

by Konik and Stewart, 2004) heterosexuality is delineated as the only permitted sexual identity. It is useful to consider the role of patriarchy in this context. Patriarchy is defined by Haywood and Mac an Ghail (2003, p.8) as a societal system that is "situated within a structure of gendered hierarchies, in which particular social practices are used to reproduce social divisions and inequality". As the heterosexual man represents the dominant masculinity in society, power and influence is always assigned to the male heterosexual at the expense of women and gay men. Any challenges, therefore, made to compulsory heterosexuality threatens the system of patriarchy, and destabilises the political and social structures which inherently protect the interests of the heterosexual man.

Studies indicate that male heterosexuals are significantly more likely to disapprove of homosexuality than their female counterparts (Derlega, Catanzaro, & Lewis, 2001; Herek, 2001; LaMar & Kite, 1998; Ratcliffe, Lassiter, Markman, & Snyder, 2006; Thurlow, 2001). To account for this, the invocation of the concept of 'heteronormativity' is useful. According to Nielsen, Walden and Kunkel (2000, p.284), heteronormativity refers to the "taken-for-granted and simultaneously compulsory character of institutionalized heterosexuality", which serves to "underscore [the] cultural dominance [of heterosexuality]… [and its status as] the default option" for conducting and expressing one's sexuality. According to Herek (as cited by Kimmel, 1986, p.71), men with defensive and disapproving attitudes toward male homosexuality are emphatically concerned with the conduct of "what they perceive as gender-appropriate characteristics". Herek effectively establishes the link between homophobia and gender, and goes on to suggest that a hyper vigilant attention to "gender-appropriate" behaviour, as conducted by oneself and others, points to a deep-seated insecurity that one is not meeting the standards of what it means to be a man. Perceived social demands on appearing and acting as manly as possible is internalised by these men, and in order to reduce the anxiety that these exaggerated demands create, they project their own sense of inadequacy on men who ostensibly violate gender norms, i.e., the homosexual man (Herek, 1986).

There are men who indicate open and accepting attitudes toward male homosexuality. Ratcliffe et al. (2006, p.1326) found an internal motivation to respond to homosexuality without prejudice as indicative of “internalised and personally important nonprejudiced standards” (p.1326). Conversely, an external motivation to respond to homosexuality indicates the approval of homosexuality, but it is the function social pressure. Men are more likely to be externally motivated to be accepting of homosexuality in the public sphere, but these individuals might harbour anti-gay prejudices that they share within a private space.

Ratcliffe et al. (2006) theorize that, according to the gender-role approach, men who strongly adhere to socially prescribed, traditional male roles in society are likely to shun homosexuals, as they view such an orientation as an outright violation of the code of conduct for members of their sex. These men place a very high value on how their masculinity is perceived by others, and are very eager to preserve the validity of their masculinity by embracing conservative views of a man’s role and function in society. These men rely on tactics of sexual prejudice and discrimination against men in minority groups in order to preserve their threatened status quo which they perceive to be threatened (Ratcliffe et al., 2006)..

Social Dominance Theory provides a theoretical framework for Ratcliffe and colleagues’ argument. This theory postulates that certain members of a specific social group place an extremely high value on retaining their in-group’s dominant position in society. Ratcliffe et al. (2006) posit that people attached high value to retaining their dominant societal position, also displayed unfavourable attitudes towards homosexuality. These men place significant value on preserving their privileged hierarchical positions and direct their prejudice against men in minority groups, and, in this case, men of a non-heterosexual orientation. This suggests that these men’s understanding of their gender is more fixed, inflexible and threatened than their female counterparts.

Subordinated men experience a considerable range of discrimination .According to Connell (2005, p.78), homosexual men experience a wide variety of discrimination owing

to their subordinated masculinity, ranging from “political and cultural exclusions, cultural abuse (in the United States gay men have now become the main symbolic target of the religious right), legal violence (such as imprisonment under sodomy statues), street violence (ranging from intimidation to murder), economic discrimination and personal boycotts”.

Homosexual varieties of masculinities represent a very direct challenge to traditional hegemonic masculinity (Herek, 1986, 1991). According to Kimmel (2005, p.7), the “constituent elements of ‘hegemonic’ masculinity, the stuff of the construction, are sexism, racism, and homophobia”. He argues that hegemonic masculinity is constructed by the establishment of white, middle-class, heterosexual masculinity as normative, and that when men do not fit into these rigid categories, they are ‘othered’. As the sociologist Erving Goffman stated (1963. p.128) “In an important sense, there is only one complete unblushing male in America: a young, married, white, urban, northern, heterosexual, Protestant, father, of college education, fully employed, of good complexion, weight and height, and a recent record in sports.” In the face of hegemonic masculinity, gayness challenges fundamental requirements of hegemonic masculinity, leading to the comparison of homosexuality with femininity. Any linking of a man’s identity to that of a woman is a direct clash against the rules of hegemonic masculinity. Gay men, then, along with men who are non-white and non-native born, are all marginalized out of the public arena, to secure a space for men fitting the criteria of the hegemonic masculinity. As a result, the ‘others’ are demonised and declared to be falling short of the standards of measurement which determines success and failure in society (Gough & Edwards, 1998). These authors also report that men who endorse hegemonic masculinity are more likely to respond favourably to items on questionnaires containing sexist and homophobic statements.

The hegemonic masculinity which dominates over other forms of masculinity in any given society is not necessarily the most representative form, neither do the men find it easy or natural to adapt to the values and roles espoused by the ideology of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 2000; Edley, 2006). In fact, many men experience a state of tension

and anxiety when negotiating their own sense of masculinity against the dominant form of masculinity. These tensions are a result of being under constant surveillance from a young age for any signs of “feminine” behaviour by their parents, a surveillance which appears to be less obvious in relation to young girls (Kilianski, 2003).

Korobov (2004) examined the ways that men talk about issues such as sexism and homosexuality and how they try to avoid sounding prejudiced to either homosexual people or women in general, all the while trying not to compromise their masculinity in the process. Korobov found that men carefully negotiate a façade of anti-homophobia and anti-sexism in heterosexual talk among themselves, but through the use of subtle language when communicating their positions, they contradict feelings and thoughts which are held simultaneously, but are not so politically correct .

Young men seek to display and project popular notions of masculinity through constant homophobic performances in public settings (Phoenix et al., 1994). Young men in effect ‘police’ one another’s behaviour, constantly placing one another under surveillance to detect any signs of behaviour that does not conform to popular notions of masculinity, in order to differentiate themselves from girls. Attachment of ‘gayness’ by young men to their peers serve as an enforcer of their own masculinity. Young men continually reconfigure their own positions in their journeys to consolidate their own manhood through talk with one another, and many times this talk arrives at the topic of male heterosexual practices (Phoenix et al., 1994).

When men spend time with other men they continually support meanings attached to hegemonic ideals of masculinity and appositely suppress meaning associated with marginalised masculinities (Bird, 1996). This is achieved by men through spending time with one another, which is termed ‘homosocial interaction’ by Bird (1996). Through homosocial interactions, men continually reproduce notions of hegemonic masculinity, whether or not this idealized notion of masculinity corresponds with their own private sense of their masculine self. Therefore, the dominance of hegemonic masculinity is prized above revealing one’s own masculinity which may contain non-hegemonic

aspects. In this way, hegemonic masculinity is continually reproduced and change is inhibited (Bird, 1996).

Boys and young men carefully negotiate a strategic masculine positioning (Korobov, 2004). Their representations of their masculine identity is not a pre-packaged, unchanging entity, because young men display uncertainty in their own masculine selves. As a result they need to adjust their representations of masculinity in ways that not appear prejudiced or discriminatory, but at the same time, not distance themselves from hegemonic masculinity.

Queer Theory

Queer Theory provides an important interpretive framework for understanding how sexual orientations intersect with notions of gender. A cornerstone of queer theory is the argument that sexual identities are inherently unstable (Connell, 2000). One of the predominant goals of queer theory has been to "examine the ways in which … categories of desire by which we regulate our social and sexual worlds are not as fixed and immutable, not as 'natural' and self-evident, as we might like to think" (Bennett & Royle, 2004, p.192), and to "rethink sexual (and gender) nonconformity in ways that do not reproduce marginality" (Stein & Plummer, 1994, p.178).

According to Bennett and Royle (2004, p.192), French philosopher Michael Foucault argued that "our ideas of hetero- and homosexuality are a function of the 'invention' of homosexuality in the late nineteenth century". Foucault is hereby proposing that heterosexuality and homosexuality are fixed and irrevocable categories of sexuality, and that its strict demarcation of sexual behaviour into two categories only arose in the late nineteenth century.

Proponents of this theory believe that the realm of one's sexual experiences should not be contained in a mutually exclusive preference for one sex. Sex can occur between people of the same or opposite sex, at whatever stage of life, according to the individual's

preference. Queer Theory advocates the right of individuals to sexually engage with partners of the same and/or opposite sex, and to reserve the right not to label their sexual orientation (Parker, 2005). This theory suggests that it is possible that people who think of their sexualities in terms of sexual orientation categories, such as ‘gay’ and ‘straight’, impose limitations to what they may find sexually attractive. When an individual labels his sexual orientation, queer theorists argue, their sexuality is contained, and the heterosexual/homosexual dichotomy is therefore reinforced.

According to Parker (2005), pre-eminent feminist philosopher and cultural theorist Judith Butler contributed important elements to queer theory. Her work contributed to some of the mainstays of queer theory, including the belief that every person is first and foremost considered in terms of his or her gender, and, as a result, “masculinity and femininity are identity scripts that demand a choice for one or the other and obedience to them” (Parker, 2005, p.85). Queer theory proponents also argue that categorical components of identities are established from childhood through repetition of the child’s gender category by his parents, and later by the child themselves. In so doing, the child is repeatedly referred to as a ‘boy’ or a ‘girl’, and associated gendered expectations are placed upon the child. A boy is therefore expected to adhere to ‘masculine’ forms of behaviour, which are informed by the specific culture of his society, and a girl is expected to adhere to ‘feminine’ forms of behaviour. By performing the associated behaviours contained in one’s gender, performing associated behaviours of the opposite sex is forbidden by the child’s caretakers.

South African masculinities

South African society has not remained unaffected by 20th century feminism and the burgeoning work done on women, but “has become increasingly gender-sensitive” (Morrell, 1998, p.605). Gender equality was firmly stamped on the human rights agenda on the priority list of the first democratically elected government in South Africa (Reid & Walker, 2005), in an endeavour to redress the political and economic inequity that led to the institutionalised oppression of women. The new constitution heralded many legal

victories for women: marital rape became recognised as an offence, domestic violence now carried the tougher sentencing, men who do not pay child support are now legally prosecutable, women were now legally entitled to equal pay for the same work done by men, and companies became obliged to hire women as part of legislation (Morrell, 2002). Some South African men became anxious by the improved status of women, as men's dominance and privileged became undermined. Traditional perceptions and representations of masculinity in South Africa have become "disturbed and destabilised" (Reid & Walker, 2005, p.161), as women were now traversing the boundaries of power that separated the two sexes in South African society for a long.

In addition, the process of democratising South Africa created public visibility of the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered, community, hitherto unseen before in South Africa. The GLBT community demanded their inclusion as protected minorities in the constitution, and pride marches and public campaigns announced their intention to be afforded the same civil rights enjoyed by heterosexual people. Marriage between same-sex partners became legalised in 2006, dramatically altering the understanding of an age-old heterosexual social practice.

As the status of women and the GLBT community became more equal to that of heterosexual men, at least in legal terms, emphasis was put on why and how men oppressed women and sexual minorities. Masculinity as it has been enacted and understood by generations became the subject of critique. These developments led to South African men distancing themselves from the previous traditional representations of masculinity (Reid & Walker, 2006). A 'crisis in masculinity, characterised by instability and uncertainty over social role and identity, sexuality, work and personal relationships" (Frosh, Phoenix, and Pattman, as cited in Reid & Walker, 2005 p.161) ensued.

This equalising shift in the balance of power between men, gay men, and women has provoked different reactions from men (Beall, Hassim & Todes, 1989; Reid & Walker, 2005). Some men have displayed significant resistance, by reacting violently and very

resistant to any changes which might diminish their patriarchal power, while others have been much more accepting and embracing.

These authors postulate that the openness displayed by some South African men to see equalising gender relations being implemented, might be seen as opportunity by them to reconfigure and ‘update’ their traditional sense of masculinity, such as changing media representations of what it is to be a modern man. An exhaustive search for qualitative research specifically focusing on South African men’s responses to changing views on masculinity yielded only a few studies. One such study, focusing on men in a rural township, divided the range of responses to gender transitions into three categories: men either wish to protect the privilege which hangs in the balance in the face of gender transitions, respond ambiguously and perplexedly to the crises of masculinity, or align themselves with those who fight for gender justice (Reid & Walker, 2005). While this study is useful to understand how one stratum of South African men understand the interface of modern constructions of gender and traditional masculinity, the present study conducted wishes to shed more light on constructions of masculinity as it intersects with sexual orientations, which is also couched in notions of gender.

Regardless of their skin colour, creed, sexual orientation, level of education, or any other demographic distinctions, masculinity remains a social construct which reflect the values, beliefs, norms and understanding of desirable and appropriate behaviour of every ethnic or racial group inhabiting South Africa today (Donham, 1998). This study, then, will strive to offer a composite understanding of masculinity among young South African men, and not attempt to provide findings that are linked to any specific strata of South Africans.

Aims of the study

This study seeks to investigate how young men grapple with defining their own masculinity, and focus is applied in how the men understand masculinity as it intersects with homosexuality.

METHOD

Rationale for qualitative research

Qualitative methods were used in the collection and analysis of the data. Qualitative enquiry seeks to explore how people make sense of their lives, as opposed to quantitative enquiry, which endeavours to classify and categorise events and observable phenomena related to human beings (Creswell, 1998). Qualitative analysis provides a portal to understanding how meanings are socially constructed, and how meaning varies from place to place. This renders systems of meaning as ultimately subjective and personal (Dey, 1993). According to Dey (1993), qualitative analysis is valuable, as it yields important and thorough information about the participants that are being studied.

Qualitative data yields valuable information about the participants' highly personal and subjective experiences of their own masculinity, as well as how it intersects with their ideas about homosexuality. The researcher chose to conduct interviews with the participants individually. According to Bless & Higson-Smith (2000, p.38) interviews "[provide a] sensitive and meaningful way of recording human experience". Research also shows that male adolescents are more serious, thoughtful and sincere when sharing their private thoughts and feelings individually, as opposed to a group setting (Phoenix et al., 1994). In addition, individually conducted interviews increases the chances that participants will feel safer in shedding a public persona and to acknowledge private feelings (Strauss & Corbin, 1997).

Research sample

The participants comprised of 10 first-year psychology students enrolled at the University of Cape Town. The ages of the participants ranged from 18 to 22, with one participant being 25 years old. This strata as the object of study was chosen for several reasons. As a post-graduate student at the University of Cape Town, the researcher had ease of access to his participants, and participation in psychological research was compulsory for all

undergraduate students. Five of the participants were White, three were Coloured, and the remaining two were Indian. The researcher did not specify that prospective participants be of a certain race, but opened up participation to any young man who wishes to be a part of the study. This is because this study is not focused on the experiences of a specific strata of South African men, because to accurately capture how men of different races, cultures, different socio-economic standings, and other categories of distinction, would be beyond the scope of this present study.

Procedure

The researcher employed several means of recruiting research participants for his study. First-year psychology students enrolled at the University of Cape Town were approached to act as participants in this study. Ninety minutes of participation in research conducted at the Department of Psychology is compulsory for every undergraduate course the student is enrolled in. The Student Research Participation Program (SRPP) is the system which organises this process. Although the researcher hoped that participation in this research project will benefit the participants in terms of possible insights that may be gained from engaging reflexively in the interview, it is undeniable that the compulsory participation added an important incentive for students to sign up for this study.

Due to the ease of access to first-year students, and their mandated task to participate in research projects in Psychology, the researcher contacted the convenor of the SRPP to notify first-year students of this study. The convenor proceeded to email all of the first-year university students with an attached advertisement which detailed the purposes of the study, and explained how participation will satisfy a portion of their course requirements. In addition, the researcher contacted all of the persons in charge of tutoring first-year psychology students to request their permission to speak to their students during class time.

Interviews were conducted in a reserved room in the Psychology Department of the university. Precautions were taken to ensure that the interviews would not be interrupted.

The interviews were recorded and later transcribed verbatim. The transcribing of the interviews was done in part by the researcher himself, and in part by two research assistants. Accuracy of the transcriptions that were not done by the researcher himself was checked by playing back the interviews while reading the transcripts, and correcting any mistakes made by the research assistants.

A semi-structured interview schedule was designed for use in the interviews, as the topics to be investigated during the interview has been identified prior to the conduct of the interviews. This interview schedule allows respondents to explore and express their viewpoints of the topics under investigation in whichever way they choose to, and to focus on specific areas of the topic (Bless & Higson-Smith, 2004; McCracken, 1988).

Interviewees were presented with a set of six questions which were asked in the same way and in the same order to each participant. The questions were broad and centred around considerations related to defining masculinity. Two examples include: what identifies you as a man, and what could happen to make you feel like less of a man. Participants were encouraged to express their own views and not to feel that they needed to answer with what they might think the interviewer may wish or expect to hear. It was stressed that there were no right or wrong answers. Questions were deliberately framed as open-ended and interpretive, in order to afford the participants the opportunity to delve into chosen areas of exploration concerning the intersection of masculinity and homosexuality.

All of the interviews were conducted in English. The researcher was aware that English was not the first language of one of the participants, and is cognisant of the possibility that this particular participant's ability to accurately express his thoughts and feelings may have been impeded by this fact. However, being enrolled in an English-medium university offers some assurance that the participant is comfortable in expressing himself in this language.

Ethical considerations

Since one's gender identity is a sensitive matter to young men, it was imperative that issues of consent and confidentiality be addressed. The researcher requested permission for the study to be conducted through the University of Cape Town's Faculty of Humanities Research Ethics Committee, and permission was subsequently granted.

The participation of the participants were sought and voluntarily contracted through an individual informed consent (see Appendix A). The consent form stipulated the content and approximate length of the interview, a guarantee of confidentiality, and permission to withdraw from the interview at any given time. Participants were required to sign the consent form before the interview commenced. No participant declined to sign the consent form.

The tapes containing the audio material of the interview were stored in a locked filing cabinet in a secure location. The interviews took place in a private room in the Department of Psychology at the upper campus of the university.

Participants were told that they may refuse to answer specific questions. Participants were also told that should they wish to end the interview at any given time, the researcher would make arrangements with the relevant parties at the Psychology Department to demonstrate that he has in fact participated in psychological research. No participant elected to end the interview before the researcher informed the participant that the interview has officially been concluded.

This research posed the risk of causing psychological distress and discomfort to the participant, due to intimately discussing related topics concerning one's identity as a man. The consent form indicated to the participants that, at their request, they would be supplied with the telephone number of Lifeline, which is a South African telephonic service offering free counselling and psychological support. The participants were also informed that any information gained during the study may be used for publication, but

that neither their names nor any other type of identifying information would be disclosed in such a publication.

DATA ANALYSIS

A grounded theory approach was adopted for the data analysis within a social constructionist framework. Grounded Theory can be explained as a method for representing knowledge that emerges out of texts. In this study's case, the 'text' refers to the interviews. The term 'grounded theory' derives from the fact that the knowledge that the researcher sees as emerging from the participant's interviews is grounded into a theory that seeks to represent the interpretations of the participants involved (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). According to Charmaz (2006, p.4), what distinguishes grounded theory from other qualitative methodological approaches is its main endeavor to "[develop] theories from research grounded in data rather than deducing testable hypotheses from existing theories". In other words, the theory should originate and derive from the data itself, and not from external factors, such as the researcher's preconceived ideas about the subject that is under study (Strauss & Corbin, 1997).

The social constructivist approach was appropriate for the interpretation of the data, as the research was more aimed at understanding how the participants construct meaning from their social worlds, rather than observing an actual reality, which is what an objectivist grounded theory would attempt to do (Charmaz, 2006). Social constructionists contend that not only one form of masculinity exists, but that multiple understandings of more than one type of masculinity exists (Haywood & Mac an Ghail, 2003).

Meaning is derived from the experiences of the participants as presented by themselves through a process of analysis, couched in the technique of coding data, by "[labeling] bits of data according to what they indicate" (Charmaz, 2006, p.11). Every spoken sentence of the participants was analysed in the preliminary stage of analysis. These phrases were then under a specific concept. Several codes arranged under one concept were then

submerged into a category, and the categories were then broadened into pervasive themes present in all or most of the interviews through constant comparisons within the data.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Masculinity is an achievement of self-management

Participants were well aware of how society laid out certain prescriptions for constructing a masculinity that was in line with certain norms that upheld specific types of behaviour. Without exception, participants touched the difficult area of experiencing emotions that were not as readily accessible to express. Emotions, such as sadness, and the more complicated psychical condition of being depressed, were offered as examples of what is not ‘done’ in dominant masculinity. Emotions which were contradictory to what is upheld in hegemonic masculinity were present nonetheless, and the participants dealt with this tension by inhibiting socially undesirable emotions and carefully managing its opportunities for expression, all in an effort to preserve their masculinity. One’s physical appearance was also a site for construction, and certain appearances were scorned as unmasculine, and therefore unwanted. Involving oneself in physical activities, with rugby being the most oft-cited form of activity, introduced another dimension of how young men manage their masculine selves by allying themselves with certain activities and interests that are upheld by hegemonic masculinity.

The expression of emotion

As participants grappled with the meaning of their own personal masculinity, many references were made to the management and expression of emotions, especially in the public arena. While participants indicated that men experience a full range of emotion, only certain emotions were thought of as masculine, and so only certain emotions were deemed acceptable to express in public. Invariably, these emotions included anger and rage. While anger and rage were acceptable emotions to be expressed by young men, the participants also felt that these emotions were supposed to be contained.

Some participants did indicate that men experienced a range of emotions which are more tender, sensitive, and soft than what is commonly associated with men, but these emotions called for careful management. These emotions should be kept hidden from public view, and should be suppressed.

Homosexual men were positioned by some of the participants as having more access to their emotions, and several participants responded that "gay men are more in touch with their feelings". Gay men's emotional worlds were thought to be similar to those of girls, and distinguished from the emotional realities from straight men.

X: … you know the more sort of characterizing the feminine qualities in a negative way and an ordinary heterosexual typical masculine guy would not talk about his feelings and he would bottle them up and that would definitely become a problem, I think

---

Significantly, the participant refers to a 'typical masculine guy' as heterosexual. Gay men are therefore not understood as ordinary or common, but as 'othered' beings. Straight men are thought to refrain from free emotional expression, while gay men are more considered to be more emotionally liberated, and unafraid to share emotions with others. This type of behaviour is deemed 'feminine'.

Many of the participants, including the one above, stated that men would benefit from being more open with their vulnerable emotions. While participants stated that men should express vulnerable emotions to one another, and seek emotional support from one another, many commented that this can be taken too far. Men are expected to contain their emotions, and to exercise control over which emotions they express.

X: Have you seen Fight Club? You don't want it to turn into something where it is like one of those group meetings that he goes to where the people all cry. I think that is kind of worst

---

X: Ja, I mean, ja... I have been in situations where I have wanted to, you know, just felt so shit that I just wanted to cry and disappear and be depressed and whatever

---

While women and gay men have been positioned by the participants as relying on their emotions to behave in specific ways, other men, therefore, by implication, straight men were positioned as employing rational thought and logical reasoning as a basis for behaviour.

Rugby and contact sports

Most of the participants also made frequent references to the importance of how sports, and more specifically rugby, define what it is that constructs masculinity.

X: I don't know, maybe it's the, maybe it's the sort the unconscious, I don't know type of thing to sort of, to give you an outlet for your anger type of thing. Sport acts as an outlet for things that you can't do in society, which society dictates you say you can't do.

Participants speculated that aggressive contact sports, such as rugby, provided a socially acceptable platform of venting pent-up frustration, anger, and the will to dominate. This dovetails with the previous section on how anger and rage are packaged as emotions that are condoned. In contact sports, these aggressive emotions are even supported and encouraged.

One participant considered men who do not participate in contact sports as atypical and less relatable than men who show a keen interest in these sports. While there was no overt suggestion that men who are not interested in sports are gay, men less active in contact sports were grouped with gay men as a group of men that are outside of the

sphere of what is expected in mainstream masculinity. One participant, who voluntarily asserted his heterosexuality earlier in the interview, considers the problem of relating to a gay man, and concluded that treating a gay man as he would treat a girl seems to be the most logical option:

X: It will go down better because you've got something to talk about. It's the same thing as speaking to an ordinary sort of guy – if he is not interested in rugby you going to find it hard to speak about rugby, you know

---

Physical appearance

Participants considered what a man's appearance reveals about his masculinity. A frequently occurring topic that arose was how a man's taste for a certain way of dressing himself. Participants paid attention to whether the men under question wore pink or tight-fitting shirts, kept up with the latest male fashions, and whether they applied make-up for cosmetic purposes. Many participants felt that men who paid this kind of attention to their appearance are comparable with women' supposed preoccupation with their appearance. Participants were more likely to wonder about the sexual orientation of these men, than men who wore more generic and unremarkable clothing. Interestingly, one participant countered this thread of thought, and speculated that men who wore tight-fitting clothing had the intent of attracting the attentions of females:

X: I think that sort of his sense of masculinity is bolstered by it because he is getting, you know – he is being noticed by girls because of it and that is one of the big things like you know being masculine is one of the things is to be noticed by girls

---

As the excerpt above shows, modifying one's appearance is positioned as an attempt to appear more attractive to the opposite sex, and as a function of wishing to increase one's appeal to the opposite sex, one is strengthening one's masculinity. Improving one's appearance is directly linked to possessing a heterosexual orientation. Managing one's appearance therefore implies that one is managing the level of masculinity that one possesses. However, overindulging in activities that are deemed more feminine in nature, led to the risk of compromising one's masculinity by appearing too feminine, and therefore lessening one's heterosexual appeal:

Re: What do you think of a guy that sometimes chooses to wear make-up?

X: I would say that a guy that wears make-up - well a lot of girls that I know – think that that's just taking it too far as sort of really sort of becoming too effeminate for them.

The above excerpt suggests that young men are permitted by their peers to feminise their appearance, but only as a function of attracting the opposite sex. These efforts to increase you heterosexual appeal can easily become too excessive, and have the opposite effect by repelling girls. This suggests that participants feel that one's masculinity is designated by your appearance and manageable by altering your appearance. One's appearance is also linked to one's preference for the same or opposite sex.

From the lone participant who identified as a homosexual man, appearance management was strongly linked to preserving social acceptance among his male peers. In this participant's account, appearance referred to suppressing language use which was connected with femininity, such as the abundant use of terms such as 'awesome' and 'fabulous'. Here, the participant is explaining how gay men appear feminine, and mentions his attempts to suppress behaviours which might appear feminine to his peers:

X: The way they speak, you, you catch things, um, specific sorts of words. Um, ‘awesome’ and ‘fabulous’, and those kind of things, they often use those terms, which I don’t really subscribe to myself (laugh).

Re: Is that like a conscious decision, or …?

X: I don’t know. Um, I think so, but, it, maybe I am suppressing it as well, cause I don’t wanna appear too feminine

---

The participant is showing that he is vigilant about feminine language and associated indicators of femininity to such an extent that it should be suppressed. During another stage in the interview, the same participant expressed a need to be accepted by heterosexual men. Connell’s concept of hegemonic masculinity (2005), and the concept of heteronormativity, is applicable here. The homosexual participant’s non-heterosexuality is not readily accepted by his heterosexual peers, as heterosexuality is so prominent and well-represented in society, that this particular sexual identity is the default option (Nielsen, et al., 2000). Compulsory heterosexuality makes homosexual men’s orientation almost invisible.

One participant also expressed a desire to interact with more masculine-appearing men than feminine-appearing men. This dovetails with the statements made by one of the participants who identified as heterosexual that he is more comfortable with gay men than appeared more masculine than feminine. This can be linked to a vigorous anti-effeminancy attitude among straight men, who view feminine-appearing men as violating traditional and valued gender codes of behaviour (Taywaditep, 2001).

Re: Would you feel more comfortable with a gay guy that seems more effeminate or more masculine?

X: One more masculine.

I: Why do you think that is?

X: I dunno, just because. It's just because it feels more comfortable when you around a guy that is a guy, you know.

The participant who identified as homosexual dubbed behaviour that is associated with overt masculinity as 'straight-acing'. The participant explained that many gay men eschewed behaviour that could be called as feminine, thereby preserving a façade of communality with mainstream men. This links interestingly with compulsory heterosexuality and heteronormativity. The most prevalent sexual orientation of men is indicated as heterosexual, and therefore any type of behaviour exhibited by men should conform to the norms of the dominant masculine culture. Homosexual men align with this culturally dominant mode of masculinity by carefully avoiding behaviour that may point to femininity, and therefore, homosexuality.

However, different audiences of the participants justify different enactments of masculinity. One participant elucidates as he considers the prospects of an intimate relationship with a girl:

X: I think it is emotional. I think it is emotional more than anything else because your typical guy doesn't get to express all these emotions or all these emotions towards his other guy friends. I think in a relationship with a girlfriend you would be looking to express all the things that are not expressed. I think that would be the pinnacle

---

This suggests that intimate heterosexual relationship offers a platform to express emotions which would be unacceptable in a homosocial context. Emotions which make the men vulnerable are more likely to be expressed towards a woman, than towards the men's male friends. The participant who identified as homosexual also mentioned how the company of women created a space where he could abandon restrictions of his emotional expression:

X: But I mainly had guy friends at school so, I, I only had a few number of chick friends and that's weird when I go out with them it feels like I just wanna lose myself, you know, have fun, and not worry about putting up appearances

---

To be masculine, is to be heterosexual

Heterosexuality was implicitly and explicitly posited as the most obvious playground of the masculine man. The participants made frequent references to relating with girls in such a way that is indicative of being heterosexually appealing, and offered this as evidence of a masculine man. Remarks made by significant female others could also serve as an indicator of his level of masculinity. In so doing, women virtually act as the gatekeepers of the man's masculine selves, and is appointed as the monitor of gender-appropriate behaviour.

Some of the participants considered how to react when they are in the company of a man who makes a derogatory remark about gay men. One of the participants stated that such remarks are unnecessary and immature, but feels it would be justifiable to indicate his heterosexuality in such a situation, 'just to set the record straight'. This suggests that the participant is allying himself with the dominant masculinity despite his disapproval of homophobia. As juxtaposed to homosexual men, one participant explicitly referred to heterosexual men as 'normal'.

A heterosexual man's intimate partner also served as the gatekeeper of his masculinity. One of the participants remarked that if he should wear a pink shirt, he would expect his girlfriend to perceive a decrease in his masculinity.

X: If say I for instance wore say a pink shirt and a jacket and stuff. It would be completely different for me. I know that my girlfriend would say: what's going on, you know. You are not the same sort of manly guy

---

Masculinity seems to be indelibly connected to gender roles, especially within the context of an intimate relationship. Heterosexual intimacy foregrounds gender relations, and necessitates the establishment of gender-appropriate behaviour. This is particularly evident when considering how many of the participants grappled with the notion of a homosexual relationship between two men.

X: … Within any homosexual relationship you can usually distinguish between a person playing a feminine or masculine role

---

Homosexual relationships are looked at through the lens of heterosexuality. The perceived 'masculine' roles of men and the 'feminine' roles of women in a heterosexual relationship are appropriated and applied onto a homosexual relationship. Gender roles are positioned as chosen and inhabitable, regardless of the person's sex.

Masculinity is the aversion of homosexuality

Homosexuality invariably served to refute popular notions of masculinity. Participants struggled with questions relating to the masculinity of gay men, and frequently contradicted themselves. The lone homosexual participant is also keenly aware of his level of gender-appropriate behaviour, and appeared anxious at the display of gender nonconformity.

The homosexual participant indicated that the approval of heterosexual men was also sought, and their understanding and empathy, as homosexuality was not a choice.

Re: What do you think is missing, what do you think is the first thing that a straight guy should know about a gay guy's masculinity?

X: I think that, just on a very humanist level, they need to realise that, there is you know, you want to be, you have, if they realise that it's not a choice. Then, what's

> the use in making a commotion about it, you know? Respect, you know, the person for being a person?

This implies that homosexuality was an unavoidable evil for some men, and it was being portrayed as not being natural, normal or in line with the expectations of others. The participant calls for heterosexual men to recognize gay men as fellow human beings. In so doing, he attempts to bridge the gap sexual orientation, and wishes for heterosexual men to rely on men's shared communality as human beings.

When the homosexually identified participant was asked what it is that identifies him as a man, he immediately revealed his sexual orientation as a precursor to his actual answer. This points to the tension that exists between identifying oneself as a man, and being homosexual at the same time. The participant goes on:

X: I find that a lot of gay guys often interact very feminine, and I've seen, I get a lot of feedback from friends that they don't see me as a typical well, feminine gay boy

---

Here, the monitoring of his masculine-typical or feminine-typical behaviour is applied by both the participant and his friends. Monitoring one's gender-related traits and deeming them as appropriate to his own sex is of concern for the gay participant. The gay participant expressed a need for straight men to accept gay men, and to develop empathy for the anxiety and struggles that gay men undergo as a result of their sexual orientation. This points to the cultural dominance that heterosexual men have over homosexual men, as heterosexist ideas determine what type of behaviour is socially acceptable, and what is not.

Participants also considered sexual relations between men through the lens of heterosexuality. One participant expressed surprise that a homosexual man who is effeminate in his behaviour would be the one to penetrate his partner. This points to a comparison of the straight man's typical role of penetrating his female partner, and how

the participant expected the more masculine-appearing man to be in charge of this sexual act.

Participants also equated success in a man's career with a pinnacle of masculine achievement.

X: I'm not so sure whether I totally agree with it but it's something that's definitely part of the fabric of me and that is to be successful, to, the whole status thing that is still… Get a good job, earn money, provide… For me it is an important symbol of achievement, and I suppose the most traditional thing about traditional masculinity is that I, to me it's that whole thing...

The participant considers the most long-standing indication of masculinity as being a good provider, and achieving financial success, which has the added reward of securing a good standing in society.

Another participant remarked with surprise that many gay men are 'successful' in their jobs and careers. He cited his acquaintance with men who held jobs that are typically socially esteemed, such as doctors and financial accountants. This suggests that gay men are not expected to occupy jobs that have prestige, and that it is more expected that straight men will achieve this type of success.

Summary of findings

Hegemonic masculinity in society reveres and seeks to perpetuate certain types of behaviour in men. The successful achievement of these behaviours is contingent upon young men's ability to present their physical appearance as gender conformist. Activity-oriented interests are promulgated as socially desirable, which typically include contact sports, such as rugby, that provided a platform of expressing pent-up emotions such as anger and rage.

Heterosexuality was positioned as the default construction of sexuality for masculine men. Throughout the interviews, references made to the level of heterosexual appeal, and the level of success in engaging sexually and romantically with a female, as examples of masculinity that is desirable. Behaviours that were deemed as effeminate, such as the employment of a vocabulary that is seen as more commonly used by women, and a preference for clothes that were tight-fitting or in the colour of the feminine-appearing pink, were very unappealing to participants. Homosexual men were implicitly and explicitly thought of as more likely to engage in feminine-appearing activities, and were as a result

REFLEXIVITY

Clarifying the positioning of the researcher within the research is important, in order to illustrate how the researcher's background may have produced assumptions which have shaped the end product (Dey, 1993). My standing as a middle-class, white man in his early twenties, whose sexual orientation is undefined, and subject to change, may have influenced my understanding of the discussions which transpired between myself and the participants. Although it is difficult to ascertain how the findings may have been influenced as a result, it is important to make note of this.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In tandem with previous literature on the intersection of masculinity and homosexuality, this study found that hegemonic masculinity predicated heterosexuality as the mode of sexuality that is the most highly valued. The idea of the heterosexual as the only viable masculine man is so prevalent, that homosexual men's masculinities are used as benchmarks for how not to conduct one's masculinity. Behaviours which are connoted as feminine in nature are also eschewed, and feared as evidence of an unmasculine man.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To m y father, Christo van der Walt: thank you for your unwavering emotional and moral support and for your sustained interest in my work this year.

To my mother, Leonore van der Walt: thank you for always being understanding and caring at all times during the past year.

To my supervisor, Anastasia Maw: thank you, Sia, for being patient and generous with your advice, time, and your generosity in always making time for me.

Finally, thank you to all of my participants for their time and their earnestness during the conduct of the interviews. Masculinity and homosexuality are not topics that are regularly investigated by young men in such a thoughtful and deep way, and their willingness to delve into such personal aspects of their identity is appreciated, as this study would not be possible without their participation.

REFERENCES

Backman, K., & Kyngäs, H. A. (1999). Challenges of the grounded theory approach to a novice researcher. *Nursing and Health Sciences, 1,* 147-153.

Beall, J., Hassim, S., & Todes, A. (1989). 'A bit on the side'?: Gender struggles in the politics of transformation in South Africa. *Feminist Review, 33,* 30-56.

Bennett, A., & Royle, N. (2004). *Introduction to literature, criticism and theory*. Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Education Limited.

Bird, S. E. (1996). Welcome to the men's club: Homosociality and the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity. *Gender and Society, 10,* 120-132.

Bless, C., & Higson-Smith, C. (2000). *Fundamentals of social research methods: An African perspective.* Cape Town: Juta Education (Pty) Ltd.

Carmele, J. A., Daniels, S., & Anderson, K. L. (2001). Defining normal: Constructions of race and gender in the DSM-IV Casebook. *Feminism & Psychology, 11,* 229-247.

Cock, J. (1989). Keeping the fires burning: Militarisation and the politics of gender in South Africa. *Review of African Political Economy, 16,* 50-64.

Connell, R. W. (1992). A very straight gay: Masculinity, homosexual experience, and the dynamics of gender. *American Sociological Review, 57,* 735-751.

Connell, R. W. (2000). *The men and the boys*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Connell, R. W. (2004). *Gender*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

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.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Demetriou, D. (2001). Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity: A critique. *Theory and Society, 30*, 337-361.

Derlega, V. J., Catanzaro, D., Lewis, R. J. (2001). Perceptions about tactile intimacy in same-sex and opposite-sex pairs based on research participants' sexual orientation. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 2,* 124-132.

Dey, I. (1993). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A user-friendly guide for social scientists.* London: Routledge.

Donham, D. L. (1998). Freeing South Africa: the "modernization" of male-male sexuality in Soweto. *Cultural Anthropology, 13,* 3-21.

Edley, N. (2006). Never the twain shall meet: A critical appraisal of the combination of discourse and psychoanalytic theory in studies of men and masculinity. *Sex Roles, 55,* 601-698.

Gergen, K. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist, 40,* 266-275.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Gough, B., & Edwards, G. (1998). The beer talking: four lads, a carry out and the reproduction of masculinities. *The Sociological Review, 46,* 409-435.

Hanke, R. (1998). Theorizing masculinity with in the media. *Communication Theory, 8,* 183–202.

Haywood, C., & Mac and Ghail, M. (2003). *Men and masculinities*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Herek, G. M. (1986). On heterosexual masculinity: Some psychical consequences of the social construction of gender and sexuality. In M. S., Kimmel (Ed.), *Changing men: New directions in research on men and masculinity* (pp. 69-82). California: Sage.

Herek, G. M. (1991). Stigma, prejudice, and violence against lesbians and gay men. In J. C., Gonsiorek, J. D., Weinrich (Eds), *Homosexuality: Research implications for public policy* (pp. 60-80). California: Sage.

Herek, G. M. (2001). Sexual prejudice and gender: Do heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men differ? *Journal of Social Issues, 56,* 251-266.

Kilianski, S. E. (2003). Explaining heterosexual men's attitudes towards women and gay men: The theory of exclusively male identity. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 4,* 37-56.

Kimmel, M. S. (1987). *Changing men: New directions in research on men and masculinity.* California: Sage.

Kimmel, M. S. (2005). *The history of men: Essays on the history of American and British masculinities.* California: Sage.

Konik, J., & Stewart, A. (2004). Sexual identity development in the context of compulsory heterosexuality. *Journal of Personality, 72,* 815-844.

Korobov, N. (2004). Inoculating against Prejudice: A discursive approach to homophobia and sexism in adolescent male talk. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 5,* 178-189.

LaMar, L., & Kite, M. (1998). Sex differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians: A multidimensional perspective. *The Journal of Sex Research, 35,* 189-196.

May, L., Strikwerda, R., & Hopking, P. D. (1996). *Rethinking masculinity: Philosophical explorations in light of feminism*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

McClintock, A. (1991). "No longer in future heaven": Women and nationalism in South Africa. *Transition, 51,* 104-123.

McCracken, G. (1988). *The long interview.* California: SAGE Publications.

Moissinac, L. (2006). Prejudicial expressions in defence of adolescent masculine identities in interaction. *Sex Roles, 55,* 609-619.

Morrell, R. (1998). Of boys and men: masculinity and gender in Southern African studies. *Journal of Southern African Studies, 24,* 605-630.

Morrell, R. (2002). Men, movements, and gender transformation in South Africa, *The Journal of Men's Studies, 10,* 309-313.

Parker, I. (2005). *Qualitative psychology: Introducing radical research.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Phoenix, A., Frosh, S., & Pattman, R. (2003). Producing contradictory masculine subject positions: Narratives of threat, homophobia and bullying in 11-14 year old boys. *Journal of Social Issues, 59,* 179-195.

Ratcliffe, J. J., Lassiter, D., Markman, K. D., & Snyder, C. J. (2006). Gender differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians: The role of motivation to respond without prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32,* 1325-1339.

Reid, G., & Walker, L. (2005). *Men behaving differently: South African men since 1994.* Cape Town: Double Storey Books.

Stein, A., & Plummer, K. (1994). "I can't even think straight" "Queer" theory and the missing revolution in sociology. *Sociological Theory, 12,* 178-187.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1997). *Grounded theory in practice.* California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Taywaditep, K. J. (2001). Marginalization among the marginalized: Gay men's anti-effeminancy attitudes. *Journal of Homosexuality, 42,* 1-28.

Thurlow, C. (2001). Naming the "outsider within": homophobic pejoratives and the verbal abuse of lesbian, gay and bisexual high-school pupils. *Journal of Adolescence, 24,* 25-38.

Van de Ven, P. (1994). Comparisons among homophobic reactions of undergraduates, high school students and youth offenders. *The Journal of Sex Research, 31,* 117-124.

Way, N., & Chu, J. Y. (2004). *Adolescent boys: Exploring diverse cultures of boyhood.* New York: New York University Press.

Wester, R. S., Pionke, D. R., & Vogel, D. L. (2005). Male gender role conflict, gay men, and same-sex romantic relationships. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 6,* 195-208.

Yeung, K., Stombler, M., & Wharton, R. (2006). Making men in gay fraternities: Resisting and reproducing multiple dimensions of hegemonic masculinity. *Gender and Society, 20,* 5-31.

Appendix A:

Consent Form

RESEARCH STUDY CONSENT FORM

Why is this study being done?

Malan is an Psychology Honours student at UCT and is doing a research project about masculinity for his studies. You are being asked to join this study because you are a man between the ages of 18 and 22 studying 1st year Psychology at UCT.

What happens in this study?

If you agree to take part in the study Malan will arrange to meet you at time that is convenient for you. In the interview Malan will ask you several questions related to your thoughts and perceptions about masculinity.

Other things you should know:

- As a first-year psychology student, 90 minutes of participation in the studies of post-graduate students is compulsory to satisfy your DP requirements for this course. By agreeing to do this interview, 45 to 60 minutes will be taken care of. I will let David Nunez know about your participation in this study so that your participation will go on record.
- The interview will take place in a room in the Department of Psychology at UCT and will be taped.
- The researcher, Malan, will keep information about you confidential. Your name will not be used in any reports or anything written about the study.
- You do not have to answer any questions that you think are too personal or make you feel uncomfortable.
- The questions may raise some personal issues for you. If you feel upset/distressed after the interview Malan will tell you where you can go to for help/counselling.
- If you have read the above and agree to participate in this research project please sign below:

_____ _____ _____ _____

Participant's signature Printed name Student No Date

_____ _____

Signature of researcher Date

Malan's contact details

Postal address: E-mail address:

Appendix B

Semi-structured Interview Form

Thank you for agreeing to meet with me, X. As you know, this is a very general interview about masculinity. I will be asking you some very broad questions on masculinity, and what it means to be a man, and we can discuss related issues as they come up. Thank you for agreeing to participate. Shall we start?

The following questions were asked in the same order to each and every participant. If this participant already covered the issue at hand, the relevant question was omitted, or elaborated upon at another stage in the interview.

1. What do you think identifies you as a man?
2. What could happen to make you feel like less of a man?
3. What do you think it means to be a man, and to be gay at the same time?
4. Do you think a gay man's masculinity is any different from a straight man's masculinity?
5. If there are any differences in masculinity between straight men and gay men, can you think of how these differences could be either positive or negative?
6. Do you believe there can be different kinds of men?

Appendix C

Transcription Conventions

X:	Participant, whose name is not disclosed for the purposes of confidentiality.
Re:	Researcher
[ ]:	Indicating simultaneous speech between the participant and the researcher. The text indicated between these symbols are the spoken words by the party that is interrupting the flow of speech.
( ):	The speaker's non-verbal gesture.
…:	Some words were omitted for the purposes of conciseness.

Appendix D

South African Journal of Psychology: Instructions to authors

South African Journal of Psychology

Instructions to authors

Submitting a manuscript

SAJP is a peer-reviewed journal publishing empirical, theoretical and review articles on all aspects of psychology. Articles may focus on South African, African or international issues. Manuscripts to be considered for publication should be e-mailed to sajp@unisa.ac.za. Include a covering letter with your postal address, email address, and phone number. The covering letter should indicate that the manuscript has not been published elsewhere and is not under consideration for publication in another journal. An acknowledgement of receipt will be e-mailed to the author within a few days and the manuscript will be sent for review by three independent reviewers. Incorrectly structured or formatted manuscripts will not be accepted into the review process.

Manuscript structure

- The manuscript should be no longer than 30 pages and no shorter than 10 pages.
- **First page:** The full title of the manuscript, the name(s) of the author(s) together with their affiliations, and the name, address, and e-mail address of the author to whom correspondence should be sent.
- **Second page:** The abstract, formatted as a single paragraph, and no longer than 300 words. A list of at least six key words should be provided below the abstract, with semi-colons between words.
- **Subsequent pages:** The text of the article. The introduction to the article does not require a heading.
- **Concluding pages:** A reference list, followed by tables and figures (if any). Each table or figure should be on a separate page. Tables and figures should be numbered consecutively and their appropriate positions in the text indicated. Each table or figure should be provided with a title (e.g., Figure 1. Frequency distribution of critical incidents). The title should be placed at the top for tables and at the bottom for figures.

Manuscript format

- The manuscript should be an MS Word document in 12-point Times Roman font with 1.5 line spacing. There should be no font changes, margin changes, hanging indents, or other unnecessarily complex formatting codes.
- American Psychological Association (APA) style guidelines and referencing format should be adhered to.
- Headings should start at the left margin, and should not be numbered. All headings should be in **bold**. Main headings should be in **CAPITAL LETTERS**.
- A line should be left open between paragraphs. The first line of a paragraph should not be indented.
- Use indents only for block quotes.

- In the reference list, a line should be left open above each reference. Do not use indents or hanging indents in the reference list.

Language

Manuscripts should be written in English. As the SAJP does not employ a full-time or dedicated language editor, authors are requested to send their manuscripts to an external language specialist for language editing before submission.

Appendix E:

Advertisement for research participation

Heading: **Help to promote psychological research while completing your compulsory first-year participation**

Honours student in Psychology doing a research report on masculinity and seeking participation of 10 first-year male psychology students at a time that is convenient during the first two weeks of the third term (30 July – 13 August). The interviews will be held in the Department of Psychology at UCT. My schedule is flexible. First-year students are reminded that that participation in research projects is compulsory, and that they will be awarded either a coursework mark, or take care of their duly performed (DP) requirements for the course.

Please reach me via e-mail if you are interested: vwlpie002@uct.ac.za

Appendix F

Plagiarism Declaration

1. I know that plagiarism is wrong. Plagiarism is to use another's work and pretend that it is one's own.

2. I have used the South African Journal of Psychology and the American Psychological Association conventions for citation and referencing. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this project from the work, or works, of other people has been acknowledged through citation and reference.

3. This project is my own work.

4. I have not allowed, and will not allow, anyone to copy my work with the intention of passing it off as his or her own work.

5. I have done the word processing and formatting of this assignment myself. I understand that the correct formatting is part of the mark for this assignment and that it is therefore wrong for another person to do it for me.

_____

Signature