

‘Rape’ As Constructed in Women’s Talk.

Siobhán Sweeney

Department of Psychology

University of Cape Town

Honours Dissertation

2008

Supervisor: Prof. Don Foster

Word Count:

Abstract: 195

Main Body: 9409

ABSTRACT

Despite high rates of rape in South Africa, there is little agreement in the definition of 'rape'. This is evident in the social constructions of rape in everyday talk. This study aims to examine how rape is socially constructed and socially defined in women's everyday talk: what does rape *mean* to women. A literature review reveals a significant lack of South African research that analyses how women talk about rape in unstructured conversations. In an attempt to address this gap, the study performs discourse analysis on sixteen interviews about rape incidents (stranger rape, date rape and male rape) between pairs of women psychology undergraduate students at the University of Cape Town. It is a partial replication of the work by Anderson and Doherty (2008) by examining discursive practices and racial differences around the construct of 'rape'. The analysis identified that patterns in women's talk about rape were dominated by contradictions, uncertainties and tensions. Dominant tensions revolved around two poles. On the one hand, feminist and critical perspectives were used; while on the other, patriarchal discourses and control of women were prevalent. Despite the tensions between "traditional" and "progressive" discourses, the coexistence of these two allows for a site of social change.

Keywords: rape; social definition of rape; women's talk; race; interviews; discourse analysis; South Africa

South Africa has been described as having a “war culture” where violence is accepted as a legitimate solution to problems and conflict. One of these typical violent acts is the act of rape (Cock, 1989). Approximately 75.6 women out of every 100 000 were raped in 2007 in South Africa (South African Police Services, 2007a). However, only one in twenty rapes is reported therefore this number is closer to 1300 rapes per day (“Rape Statistics”, 2008). But even with high rates of rape incidents, there is little agreement on the definition of what is considered to be rape (Bourke, 2007; Roiphe, 1994). These differences of the definition occur across gender and racial groups as discourses of rape are constructed through talk with different cultural meanings (Chasteen, 2001). This social construction of rape has practical and social implications on the *real* act of rape, such as stigma and victim-blaming. The use of rape myths results in victims experiencing “secondary victimization”¹ (Doherty & Anderson, 1998). Consequently, it is important and relevant to investigate how rape is constructed: what does rape actually mean to women, and within this meaning, do women confirm or challenge “traditional” discourses?

A review of the literature shows a significant lack of research on rape discourses and meanings amongst non-victims especially in South Africa. Consequently, this study analysed rape discourses and definitions among university female students, and the influence of race in South Africa. The researcher aims to answer the question: what discourses are women drawing on in order to describe and explain incidents of rape? According to Vogelmann (1990), the problem of rape appears to be entrenched in our cultural relations of patriarchy and violence. But are women psychology students using more “progressive” discourses after being exposed to theories such as feminism? This form of analysis moves away from individual explanations to including the social environment where there is competition for appropriate meanings of rape (Doherty & Anderson, 1998).

RATIONALE

Definitions of Rape

South African law defines rape as follows “Any person who unlawfully and intentionally commits an act of sexual penetration with a complainant, without consent of the complainant, is guilty of the offence rape” (SAPS, 2007b). Rape research in South Africa tends to focus on the actual violent relationships where coerced sex occurs. Research shows that coerced sex is common in relationships and women are experiencing gender inequity (Jewkes, Levin,

¹ In forms of “secondary victimization” victims are further victimised by negative feedback about their behaviour. It has a number of consequences such as victims feeling guilty, ashamed or developing negative psychological effects (Doherty & Anderson, 1998).

Mbananga & Bradshaw, 2002; Wood & Jewkes, 1997). Violence is also used to solve a variety of problems, and men use notions of male sexual entitlement and dominance (Abrahams, Jewkes, Hoffman & Laubsher, 2004). Therefore, within heterosexual relationships there are discourses of power and violence (Shefer & Foster, 2001). This dynamic is influenced by gender attitudes and rape myth endorsements (Kalichman et al., 2005). This suggests that it is important to look at gendered power relations and sexual violence in South Africa (Kalichman et al., 2005; Shefer & Foster, 2001).

Most studies looking at the definition of rape investigate whether rape victims have labelled their incidents as a rape. Results also suggest that women who hold rape myths are less likely to acknowledge their experience as rape (Kahn, Jackson, Kully, Badger, & Halvorsen, 2003; Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2004). The use of rape myths shows the influence of dominant discourses and thus societal constructions of rape. For example, Doherty and Anderson (2004) investigated how societal responses to male rape victims affect the social construction of rape. They reported that sexuality determined whether a forced sexual act was rape. Thus, only heterosexual, forced, sexual acts were regarded to be rape. This led to the construction of a hierarchy of suffering where rape was considered to be worse for heterosexual men (Doherty & Anderson, 2004). This suggests that there are influences of dominant discourses within the definition of rape that need to be addressed (Anderson & Doherty, 2008; Gavey, 2005). Consent and the issue of want have become conflated in definitions (Davion, 1999; Lyon, 2004; Murphy, 1996). These terms tend to also make the definition of rape unclear. Consequently, a review of the literature found that there is a great amount of ambiguity in these terms and a victim's willingness (Ellis, 1989). Recent research has shown that the definitions of rape are unclear and women are experiencing uncertainty about what is considered to be rape (Kahn et al., 2003; Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2004, 2007). This notion has been suggested by other authors in the past (Roiphe, 1994; Vogelmann, 1990).

Rape Myths

Burt (1980, p. 217) defined rape myths as “prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists.” Rape myths emerging from cultural notions frame rape as a sexual act and, thus, normalise it (Anderson & Doherty, 2008; Gavey, 2005; Shefer & Foster, 2001; Vogelmann, 1990). These myths state that: a) the assailant is a stranger or of a different race; b) only deviant or pathological men are rapists; but c) it is inherent in men because of their uncontrollable sex drive; d) women ask for it through their behaviour or appearance,

therefore they could prevent it; or e) only deviant women are raped; f) women are unsure what they want, so “no” does not really mean “no”; and g) in rape, there is always the involvement of great force or resistance (Anderson, 2007; Bourke, 2007; Doherty & Anderson, 1998; Kahn et al., 2003; Matlin, 1987). Other rape myths claim that women lie about rape or suggest that it is not damaging because it is only sex (Doherty & Anderson, 1998). Claims that women behave teasingly and do not fight back are the most damaging rape myths as they assume women *want* to be raped (Ellis, 1989; Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2004; Vogelmann, 1990). For some, rape is regarded as to only be of natural sex. But studies on male rape contradict this natural ‘rape desire’. In Doherty and Anderson (2004), homosexual men were perceived as wanting to be raped yet homosexual intercourse was also regarded as being unnatural. Associated with rape myths is the notion of violence and sex where sexual intercourse must be present; this excludes other forced sexual acts and silences the violence (Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2004).

Research suggests that one’s belief in rape myths will influence one’s definition (Kahn et al., 2003; Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2004). Therefore, acceptance of rape myths results in a narrow definition of rape (Bohner, Jarvis, Eyssel, & Siebler, 2005; Sawyer, Thompson & Chicorelli, 2002). A review of the literature shows that focus is on explanations as to why individuals use these rape myths, such as denying victimhood or justifying sexual aggression. But Anderson and Doherty (2008) examine the social context and discursive practices around rape.

Anderson and Doherty (2008) explore how rape and rape victimhood are defined in ways that reflect the social, political and cultural conditions of society. In other words, they examine the social explanations of rape. According to Anderson and Doherty (2008, p. 1), rape-supportive talk is based on “a range of deeply ingrained, cultural sense-making resources”. These resources construct and legitimise hegemonic discourses, such as traditional notions of gender, sex and rape. Therefore, in everyday talk there is the issue of what is regarded as sex and what is regarded as rape. Talk around rape usually blames the victim and frees the rapist from punishment. This suggests neo-liberal notions of ideal citizenship and discourses of accountability. Their analysis suggests that a number of discursive practices and sense-making resources justify a lack of support for rape victims and normalises some actions of the perpetrator – thus reflecting hegemonic discourses of gender and heterosexuality. The researchers reported that cultural constructions of sexual norms, such as assumptions of femininity, masculinity and the nature of normal heterosexual relationships, provide a framework for defining rape (Doherty & Anderson, 1998).

Hollway's (1998) discourse of the "male sexual drive" is an example that claims men's sexuality is caused by a biological drive to reproduce – inferring that this male behaviour is common sense, legitimate and inevitable. With regards to relationships, the "have/hold" discourse provides contradictory notions of women being asexual, where sex is purely for reproductive purposes but, underneath women's sexuality is dangerous and needs to be controlled. This results in the Madonna/whore dichotomy. Women are not seen as victims because they intentionally invoke men's sexual urges in order to attract a man (Hollway, 1998).

Studies have also suggested that rape myths are associated with other attitudes such as gender role-stereotyping, female restrictive social roles and acceptance of interpersonal violence (Burt, 1980; Costin & Kaptanoglu, 1993; Howard, 1984; Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2004; Sawyer et al., 2002). Public reactions to rape are mediated by sex, age and by race and ethnicity (Wyatt, 1992). Race is therefore a factor in the definition of rape and rape myths. The majority of studies of rape and race examine perceptions based on the race of the victim and the perpetrator in order to establish which myths are prominent, such as the notion of 'stranger rape' and the 'black rapist' (Anderson, 2007; Chasteen, 2001; Jimenez and Abreu, 2003; Varelas & Foley, 1998). This is contrary to the truth, where rape is usually committed by an acquaintance and is an intraracial crime.

From a South African context, according to Moffett (2006), rape is written in narratives of race instead of gender and this hardens racial barriers. Rape draws on apartheid practices of control that use violence as a solution. She concludes that the high levels of rape in South Africa are directly shaped by the legacy of apartheid. Moffett (2006) believes that rape needs to be viewed as an act of race *and* gender. She investigates the relation between gender and racial legacies of apartheid in order to deconstruct current narratives of rape and race. However, a review of the literature of rape and race found no research studies examining racial perceptions of rape in South Africa.

Feminism and Rape

It has been argued that feminist theory has become the dominant social science explanation for rape (Ellis, 1989). Feminism defines rape as "any situation of coercive sex, regardless of the behaviour or characteristics of the principals involved" (Lefley, Scott, Llabre, & Hicks, 1993, p. 624). This disrupts notions of normal sex and provides women with a language to voice their experiences. Feminism examines rape at a collective level where it is used to maintain the subordination of women to men (White & Sorenson, 1992). This control of

women takes place through the constant fear of rape (Brownmiller, 1975). Thus, rape is the use of sexual activities to maintain dominance over women (Ellis, 1989). An example is Levett's (1989) examination of childhood sexual abuse in South African women. Levett (1989) illustrates how women from a young age are exposed to warnings and codes of conduct. These warnings remind women of their vulnerability to men. Feminist perspectives describe rape as a violent, calculated crime that is an act of male power, domination and aggression resulting in psychological trauma (Vani, 1990). They also create alternative discourses that can be produced and used by women to redefine positions of gendered practices. In other words, these "progressive" discourses can challenge sexist discourses (Hollway, 1998) allowing for the possibility of social change (Bourke, 2007). According to Chasteen (2001), feminists' reconstruction of rape has resulted in women using broader definitions of rape. But there are no South African studies analysing whether females are using this "progressive" language in everyday conversations of rape. Therefore, the question is: are South African students challenging rape myths and "traditional" gender roles?

According to Lefley et al. (1993), higher education tends to be associated with more feminist conceptions of rape. Higher education allows women to be more knowledgeable about sex and, at the same time, less subjected to "traditional" taboos and fears (Bell, 1974). Thus, are tertiary-educated female psychology students, who are exposed to alternative and challenging theories, using a broader definition of rape?

Women's talk

Speakers draw upon linguistic repertoires or discourses available within their language community. These discourses represent the sociopolitical realm that is produced and reproduced through language (Lea, 2007). In other words, language shapes our world (Jackson, 1993), therefore it is part of our everyday lives and is linked to gender. According to Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberg and Tarule (1986), women struggle to claim power over their own voice and mind. Some women's voices are silenced as women are in a position that they experience themselves as mindless, voiceless and subject to the whims of external authority (Belenky et al., 1986). Women's talk tends to be devalued as women speak in a hesitant, qualified, question-posing style and content is focused on everyday, practical and interpersonal concerns. This study aims to value women's talk and their concerns.

Theoretical point of departure

The analysis for this study draws from post-structural and feminist theory. Feminist perspectives are committed to challenging oppression and bringing women's experience into the research domain while a post-structural framework rejects the notion of absolute truth – therefore a plurality of meanings are accepted. A feminist post-structural approach uses theories of language, subjectivity, social processes and institutions with the intention of further understanding and deconstructing existing gendered power relations and to identify areas for change (Anderson & Doherty, 2008; Gavey, 1989; Parker, 2005). These are constructed in an open system of language that is ever-changing and located in discursive practices. Discourses create positions and stances where power is exercised and established (Gavey, 1997; Wilbraham, 2004). Individuals are active in this discursive process, and thus have a choice to resist the dominant meanings (Gavey, 1997). The social world consists of discursive actions located in conversations and negotiated meaning, therefore conversations provide a good example of where cultural sense-making resources, social activity and subjectivity intersect (Anderson & Doherty, 2008).

Here, the term 'discourse' is from the Foucauldian perspective where discourses are "ways of constituting knowledge, together with social practices, forms of subjectivity, and power relations" (Weedon, 1987, p.105). From this particular perspective, it shows the paradox of power, as discourses have the ability to oppress but also to positively create. This allows for the development of challenges towards "traditional" discourses. Harris, Lea and Foster (1995) termed these resistant discourses as "progressive" as these discourses problematise current gender issues.

SPECIFIC AIMS AND HYPOTHESES

This research attempts to address the gap in the literature by focusing on socially constructed meanings and definitions of rape used by South African female students. The research explores this construction in women's talk in conducted interviews and how particular rape situations in given vignettes are depicted. Within these constructions of the term 'rape', the study also investigated the construction of race by examining how these women talk about race and rape freely in their conversations. It is a partial replication of Anderson and Doherty (2008), using discourse analysis in order to locate educated women's talk of rape in South Africa. Consequently, the aim is to gain a cultural understanding of how discourses of rape are constructed in social interactions by looking at the effects and consequences of discursive resources and practices which are culturally available (Doherty & Anderson, 1998; Anderson

& Doherty, 2008). Since discourses are challenged by other theories, such as feminism, the research also analyses “progressive” discourses to determine whether there are any alternative discourses used.

Based on the literature, the study predicts that educated female psychology students will hold a broader definition of rape with lower levels of acceptance of rape myths (Burt, 1980; Chasteen, 2001). Therefore, students may use more challenging perspectives, thus providing an alternative framework for understanding sexual violence (Chasteen, 2001). However, patriarchal discourses, gender roles and heterosexual norms are likely to be used as these are dominant discourses. Therefore, it is likely that there will be contradictions and tensions.

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Design

This study is descriptive and exploratory by examining the definition of rape and how female students construct ‘rape’ in conversations. The study uses a qualitative semi-structured interview method in order to perform discourse analysis. Using an inductive approach, which does not provide any given definitions, it allowed the participants to express rape in their own words (Way, 1995). This approach allows for the awareness of power relations, the role of the researcher, and reflexivity (Boonzaier & Shefer, 2006).

Participants

The participants for this study were women psychology undergraduate students (18 – 33 years) studying at UCT, who were required to take part in research studies in order to obtain credits for their degree. These students were obtained by placing sign-up sheets on the SRPP board in the Psychology Department at UCT. Only women students were chosen to allow for a focus on the *female* constructions of rape: how does a woman talk about rape as a woman with other women. Twenty interviews were conducted. Of these, four interviews were discarded due to discussions of personal experience of rape instead of the actual vignettes, leaving a corpus of sixteen interviews. Interviews planned to involve two participants in each session. Similar to Anderson and Doherty (2008), the study aimed to have two participants to allow for a natural conversation to develop where each participant talks freely. Data included a variety of racialised groups (Black, Coloured, Indian and White) to allow for different voices of women.

Materials

The data of this study was obtained through a semi-structured interview with three distinct parts based on an interview schedule (Appendix A). These interviews were recorded and then transcribed. Three fictional rape scenarios, or vignettes, describing situations of rape were given to participants (Appendix B). Vignettes were used to investigate how women define rape in real situations and how rape incidents are constructed in women's talk. In each scenario it was clear that the victim was forced. The first vignette involved female stranger rape. The second was of a rape that took place in an intimate relationship. This description was taken from Jimenez and Abreu (2003). The third scenario was similar to the first but was of a male rape. The first and third descriptions were taken from Anderson and Doherty (2008). Descriptions were slightly adjusted in order to create relevance for this particular study, such as omitting the characters' race.

Furthermore, students were asked questions about rape. The first of these is "What do you think is considered to be rape? How do you personally define rape?" This question aims to look at what the student actually understands to be rape and what discourses are used to define this particular act. The second question was focused on conversations of rape, asking women "How do you feel about talking about rape – here or outside with friends and family?" and "How do you think women in general feel about talking about rape?" This will examine women's talk itself and how women feel about constructing this topic in conversations. The aim of such newly introduced questions was to direct discussions to actual definitions of rape and to analyse women's voice in rape talk.

Procedure

Research took the form of semi-structured recorded interviews of forty-five minutes per session. The interview schedule consists of three parts: a) discussing three rape scenarios, b) the student's definition of rape, and c) the students' feelings towards conversations of rape. Within each of these sections the students talked naturally determining the direction of the conversation within that particular task without any interruptions (Parker, 2005). However, probing did take place when students took long pauses.

For the first section, participants were given three different rape vignettes. After this, each participant was asked directly, "What do you consider to be rape? How would you personally define rape?" Students were then asked "how do you feel about talking about rape?" and "How do you think women in general feel about talking about rape?" After the interview, a brief debriefing session took place. At this stage the participants were provided with a list of contact details of help-lines and organisations (Appendix D). Interviews were

fully transcribed. The transcribed data and any particular observations that were recorded during the interviews were used for discourse analysis.

Ethical Considerations

Students were informed that the study would be discussing opinions and feelings about sexual assault. Informed consent (Appendix C) notifies the students of the purpose of the study, stresses anonymity, and the voluntary nature of the research. With regards to anonymity, students' names have been omitted from this article. Although confidentiality was difficult to obtain with two students participating at a time, it was stressed that the interview was only of opinions and had no reflection of the participants. However, the majority of the pairs appeared to be friends and knew each other before the interviews were conducted. Arguments which had the potential of being offensive were monitored. However, arguments resulted in participants coming to a compromise. Students were also informed that no personal experience of sexual assault would be discussed. Interviews that resulted in students discussing their own experience of rape were omitted from the analysis and these participants were debriefed in order to assess any risk. There was the possibility of discomfort being experienced because rape is a sensitive topic for some. Consequently, after the interviews each participant was debriefed in order to identify whether there were any negative feelings. Participants were also provided with further details for contacting help-lines, rape crisis organisations and rape counselling (Appendix D).

Data Analysis

Analysis followed Anderson and Doherty (2008) in order to identify the usage of "traditional" or "progressive" discourses. According to Anderson and Doherty (2008), discourse analysis is based on the assumption that descriptions of events, people, groups, institutions and psychological phenomena are versions which should be treated as open-ended and flexible. A partial replication of Anderson and Doherty (2008) requires locating the construction of rape within a patriarchal society. Thus, one searches for variability and patterns that take place by examining how versions of the self, world and others emerge (Anderson & Doherty, 2008). Due to the construct "rape", particular attention was paid to power relations and subject positions. Therefore, women's talk is treated as a site for both producing and enacting broader social discourses and practices (Jackson & Cram, 2003).

Central to a thorough analysis is careful reading of texts in order to identify dominant discourses and variety around the concept of 'rape'. A feminist post-structural perspective treats these accounts as possible versions of reality and not universal truths (Doherty &

Anderson, 2004). This results in a “multiplicity of competing stories”, thus resisting discourses (Parker, 2005, p.55). With regards to race, the study analysed how women constructed the notion of race and rape. Therefore no race groups were mentioned in the given vignettes, in order to allow the students to place their own understanding of race and rape in South Africa onto the characters in the vignettes.

ANALYSIS

Re-reading of the texts identified dominant patterns of uncertainties and contradictions.

Uncertainties took the form of women being unsure about the definition of rape.

Contradictions were situated around a polarity of “traditional” and “progressive” discourses.

On the one hand, feminist and critical perspectives were used as one would expect from educated women at university. On the other hand, patriarchal discourses were used. Thus, students appeared to be in a conflicting space between Female Control Discourses and feminist ideologies.

I wish to clear up a number of incidents before presenting the main findings. As reported in Anderson and Doherty (2008), students tended to use humanistic and “pragmatic realist” terms in order to maintain rape myths by talking in a sensible but sympathetic manner:

“I don’t think rape is anyone’s fault but like, um, here you should avoid it (shortcut) in order to make yourself respond. Everyone is responsible. But it’s not her fault.” (Interview. 6, paragraph. 2).

To my surprise, there was little race talk in the construct of rape, but those who did use race critically examined it by challenging rape myths such as the “black rapist”. This shows development of “progressive” discourses:

“There is no prejudice, it isn’t the same message with the black rapist and the, the white female...you can’t just watch out for certain colours.” (Int. 9, para. 8).

Students also spoke about the benefits of the “talking cure” or “the therapeutic process of confession”² (Hook, 2004, p. 228). Students felt it was important to talk about rape in order to produce knowledge and create awareness. The majority of students claimed to be comfortable with talking about rape. But this was not clear in the interviews as some women spoke about being silenced (Belenky et al., 1986):

“There is no platform for people to speak out and people go through this alone” (Int 16, para. 1).

Overall, the students appeared to have difficulty with talking about feelings of rape. This could be due to the student’s own individual vulnerability (Feldman, Ullman & Dunkel-

² In the “therapeutic process of confession” the subject is scrutinised through disciplinary surveillance. Psychology plays a role here where confession is used as a form of normalising.

Schetter, 1998). It could also be due to rape usually being spoken about in a legal and factual manner that lacks women's experience and subjectivity. This is illustrated in women searching for details, such as the victim's feelings about the rape: "this one doesn't say anything about her, her feelings" (Int. 1, para. 31). It appears that students are calling for the victim's voice to be heard.

Conflicting Discourses and Contradictions

Contradictions and confusion occurred in incidents where women were correcting themselves or in breaks in their talk:

"I'd say it is any sexually advances that males you feel uncomfortable. It could be mental or physical, I don't think it is just physical because your mind can be violated and traumatized too. But it doesn't even have to be just a violation, when you're put into certain circumstances and there is anxiety or fear or panic. But more sexually circumstances. Not just anything." (Int 4. para. 32).

"I actually have mixed feelings about it, ah, I think, I don't know. Rape is, hm." (Int. 21, para. 26).

I will discuss these contradictions in terms of conflicting discourses: Patriarchal and Female Control Discourses versus Resisting or "Progressive" discourses. For each of these poles, there were a number of subcategories. Brief coverage is given in each of these.

Patriarchal Discourses and Female Control

Patriarchal discourses occurred in a number of sub-categories: rape myths, gendered constructs, themes of destruction, naturalness and othering, and Lerner's (1997) Just World Discourse. These operated to fulfil an ideological function of controlling and oppressing women. In other words, these constructed themes worked within what Levett (1989) called a Female Control Discourse. Discourses of Female Control occur where imposed restrictions through education, parenting and informal rules are used to control women's behaviour. From a young age, women are constantly told that they are potentially vulnerable victims in a dangerous world (Levett, 1989). Within the interviews, students spoke about news and media reports that inform women about the frequency of rapes. Women also spoke about the importance of awareness and how these function as warnings informing women of the dangers in the world. Consequently, there are informal rules that women know to abide to in order to remain safe:

"...she and everyone knows" (Int. 10, para. 19).

"But you always know, you are told from like age 3, that you must always be careful and that it's dangerous at night and alone. So like you can't say you didn't know, you can't not be aware." (Int. 11, para. 70).

But another level of warning operated in these interviews: the notion of female intuition. The assumption is that women innately know, they just have a feeling, a “sixth sense” or that there are “warning signs” that women can interpret.

Lerner’s (1997) Just World Discourse³ reinforced notions of female control. For example, the female victim (vignette one) was viewed as deserving rape because she broke the rules or misbehaved:

“...she should have learnt her lesson.” (Int. 10, para. 7).

This is opposite to the male rape story where the rapist was seen as being justly punished:

“ya but at least the guy was caught, that’s good that he was identified and stuff. So he did report it, that’s good.” (Int. 13, para. 19).

Within the Discourse of Female Control, femininity is constructed as being weak and powerless (Levett, 1989). Gavey (2005) discusses how culture provides a context for rape and coercive sex because of the preconditions of femininity (passive) and masculinity (active). These constructions of femininity were used as a form of victim-blaming for women who were perceived as deviant. In this case, deviant women were victims who behaved outside the norms of femininity or those who broke the informal rules. An example is conceptions of awareness. Women were blamed for the occurrence of rape because they were “not paying attention”. Victims, being women, were also constructed as unintelligent or “stupid”. This maintained the notions that women are irrational beings and inferior to men. For date rape, the victim received less blame as she was portrayed as a demure, passive woman but a responsible being that is in a relationship. This scene appeared to have a clear right and wrong for the students. According to Belenky et al. (1986), this polar view of the world is dependent on the truths that authorities hand down. This victim behaved within the norms of femininity by lacking agency where she merely reacted to her boyfriend’s force and “eventually gives in”, therefore normalizing female resistance to sex. However, some participants tended to blame the girlfriend by questioning her agency in terms of her involvement at university. This involvement was associated with sexuality. She was perceived as an involved woman who is active and extroverted, therefore flirtatious and sexually provocative. This illustrates the “have/hold discourse” where women are the subjects and instigators of the “male sexual drive”, reinforcing the Madonna/whore dichotomy (Hollway, 1998):

“I think it means that she is quite promiscuous...” (Int. 11, para. 31).

³ The Just World Discourse states that the world is a place where individuals get what they deserve because one is either good or evil and behaved in a specific way that brought about a good or bad outcome (Lerner, 1997).

As women are constructed as passive, masculinity is constructed as active, strong, powerful and violent. This maintained the male dichotomy of protector versus attacker. Therefore it maintains patriarchal discourses where women are further restricted, as they require male protectors. The notion of a male protector is associated with romantic discourses (Levett, 2005) such as the male passerby being described as a hero who stopped the monster and saved the damsel in distress:

“It’s good, it was nice of him to do that, um, he scared the rapist away” (Int. 4, para. 10).

This further perpetuates women as weak victims and men as strong subjects. Within relationships, students stressed notions of safety and that it is the male’s responsibility to keep a woman safe. Consequently, if the boyfriend crosses over from the protector to the attacker, he is clearly the perpetrator. He has failed as a man and deviated from hegemonic masculinity. This is linked to the construction of femininity where female vulnerability is perpetuated through the depiction of female victimhood (Levett, 2005).

The perception of naturalness was used to strengthen these gendered constructs. This operated in heterosexual institutions and practices which make forced heterosexual intercourse unthinkable. Cultural expectations of heterosexual relations confuse what is sex and what is rape (Gavey, 2005). An example of concepts of naturalness is male rape being constructed as unnatural and rare:

“Like it’s that traditional, um, men are more capably physical, like, you know it makes me feel like is crime getting so bad that it can even overcome men.” (Int. 22, para. 43).

This notion of male rape created an interesting shift. Women were supportive of the female victim before reading the third vignette of male rape. In other words, concepts of naturalness used for male rape caused a shift to a transgressive view claiming that male rape is worse than female stranger rape because it is rare or unnatural. For example, for the first vignette a student states:

“It makes me angry because it makes it out as if it’s her fault. And it isn’t.” (Int. 9, para. 29).

But after reading the third vignette, the student said:

“It’s just more pitiful, a guy being raped. The first one just seems more like her fault, not sure why but she, I don’t know. And the second one is just disgusting because she was raped by her boyfriend.” (Int. 9, para. 71).

As reported in Doherty and Anderson (2004), this resulted in a hierarchy of suffering where students were more sympathetic to the male victim because male rape was perceived to be the worst:

“Ya, it’s probably harder for guys, because it’s more rare, they aren’t as desensitized to this kind of thing like women are because it’s always happening to women, we are just use to it.” (Int. 22, para. 45).

However, this hierarchy was not clear-cut where more sympathy was expressed for the male victim but the students also used “traditional” discourses that challenged his masculinity in terms of strength and sexuality.

Women’s behaviour is restricted by stereotypes, rape myths and perceptions of a dangerous world which are taught to women as forms of common sense (Lea, 2001). The majority of interviews used rape myths and stereotypes. Similar to results of Anderson and Doherty (2008), “traditional” discourses of female risky behaviour and irresponsibility in the first vignette was used as justification for victim-blaming. It was believed that she is taking unnecessary chances such as walking alone at night and taking shortcuts. Associated with this is the actual rape being described as sudden and as an act of desire, therefore following Hollway’s (1998) “male sexual drive” discourse:

“It’s a normal night, um, situation and there’s...just this, this, later this discomfort” (Int.1, para. 16).

Women are expected to restrict their behaviour and not provoke men because men cannot control their sexual behaviour (Hollway, 1998). Contrasted to this are women being constructed as asexual. The notion of want was either conflated with consent (Peterson and Muehlenhard, 2007) or was neglected entirely, reinforcing the discourse of women lacking sexual desire (Hollway, 1998). Therefore, rape was defined as being a forceful and unconsented act that violated a woman’s body and mind.

There was little focus on the rapist and therefore he is not held accountable for his actions. But if the rapist was mentioned, he was described as being pathological or “a strange guy” (Int. 1, para. 9). He is invisible, dark, sick or animalistic. This is similar to Anderson and Doherty (2008) where rapists are subhuman without agency. This acts to reinforce the patriarchal discourses that divide men into two groups: dangerous men or protective men. By focusing on individual characteristics of the rapist, it individualises the act of rape. Therefore, this ignores the social domination over women through rape. For male rape, the rapist was depicted either as a serial rapist or a gang member. Therefore it was only pathological or extremely violent men that took part in this unnatural act:

“He (rapist) is probably a very sick person, um (*nervous laugh*), ya, I think he did all the rapes...a cruel kind of person” (Int. 14, para. 26).

Similar to Draucker (2001), the world was constructed as being a dangerous place for women who are vulnerable beings. But in this dangerous society, attack is gendered (Anderson & Doherty, 2008). Therefore students believed that rape is always a possibility. Women are also restricted through this perception of dangerous areas that suggest women must avoid these places. Here the female victim was being blamed for taking a short-cut

because it was perceived to be secluded and “off the path” (Int. 1, para. 4). This metaphor, “off the path”, could be hinting towards her stepping out of line or deviating from the mainstream.

There was a repeated notion that South Africa as a country is especially dangerous, where rape is occurring all the time. This functions to create a rape culture where South Africa is a world that is dangerous to women. Therefore it maintains female passivity and victimhood as it aims to restrict women’s behaviour.

“There’s no way you would do this in South Africa!” (Int. 5, para. 2).

“...especially in South Africa where rape is so, so, and crime is so high and rape is, it’s so high” (Int. 15, para. 19).

By claiming that the world is dangerous, especially South Africa, it shifts the blame onto the victim stating that women *know* the world is dangerous. Consequently, it is a women’s individual responsibility to avoid dangerous situations and to pursue her safety (Draucker, 2001). This serves the functions of patriarchy by maintaining dichotomies, sex-roles stereotypes and forms of social control. However, in line with Anderson and Doherty (2008), students did not wholly blame the victim. Blame was deflected onto authorities in the form of the university, security personnel, the community and the state by claiming that it is their responsibility to protect women who are depicted as passive and vulnerable victims:

“It makes me feel angry ‘cause of the lame authority of the university...like, still nothing was done...” (Int 21, para. 5).

This blame also took the form of a third party where “people” could have done something, such as the other students in the university residences. This deflects blame away from the rapist maintaining him in a position of the unknown. Here, students also appeared to acknowledge and accept the world as dangerous, thus ignoring how rape operates as a form of social control of women (Anderson & Doherty, 2008). Consequently, students expressed feelings of distrust about their world. Students illustrated women’s isolation by claiming that everyone is a threat and that nobody cares:

“Nobody reacts about rape” (Int 7, para. 7).

“...you never really know a person.” (Int. 10, para. 50).

This distrust was also illustrated in talk about the passerby who was constructed as a “particular”⁴ (Billig, 1996) because it was unusual that some one would help a rape victim.

⁴ Billig (1996) explains rhetoric in terms of categorization and particularity. Particularity keeps elements separate from a general category for certain benefits.

As stated by Anderson and Doherty (2008), these constructs legitimise hegemonic discourses, such as traditional notions of gender, sex and rape. Similar to their analysis, a number of discursive practices justified victim-blaming and normalised actions of the perpetrator – consequently perpetuating larger dynamics of gender and heterosexuality.

Own Fears

Within the Discourse of Female Control, there was a dominant pattern of students resorting to their own fears and personalizing the rape incidents. According to Levett (1989), these rules that dictate women's behaviour become internalized and thus interwoven with fears. Women's behaviour is dictated through fears and codes of conducts. Repeated emphasis throughout all the interviews was the fact that the victims were students and that the incidents occurred on campus:

“But this story does resonate with me, because it's as if the woman is like me...” (Int 22, para. 1).

“Um, it makes me worry about myself. 'cause I have to walk alone on campus sometimes...But when it is here that an incident happens, in a similar environment, on campus at university, it does make you think that it could happen to you as well. And it makes you wonder, what if it was you?” (Int. 18, para. 10).

“...we just aren't safe anymore...” (Int. 13, para. 10).

As students talked about the vignettes of rape, they resorted to talking about their own fears and safety by positioning themselves in a dangerous world. This was a repeated occurrence showing that the fear of rape is something that these students experience, and that safety appears to be important:

“...they're both horrible (pause)...like the woman thought she was probably safe, um, like on university it is safe...and at here, at home she thinks she is safe and she thinks she is with someone who is close to her...” (Int. 7, para. 21).

In these incidents, women described rape as being the worse thing that could happen to a woman but were unsure why. Rape was described as an act of “theft” and “personal destruction” (Chasteen, 2001). It is viewed as an act of “theft” because something valuable was stolen from the victim (Chasteen, 2001). The notion of “personal destruction” takes the form of losing one's identity and being stripped of everything (Chasteen, 2001). Therefore the assumption is that rape destroys you, ruins your life and is viewed as a public devastation. These discourses took the form of describing the victim as being marked or damaged by rape. Damage was believed to be permanent where all areas of a victim's life would be affected negatively. This contributed to the notion of a weak and powerless, female victim. The

consequence of this was that victims were described as being stigmatised, cheapened or pathological, thus prohibiting them from moving into a survivor status:

“How would you recover from the first, let alone the second time?!” (Int. 11, para. 10).

Resisting or “Progressive” Discourses

In contrast to patriarchal discourses, “progressive” discourses aimed to resist and challenge discourses that control women’s behaviour. These discourses contradicted patriarchal discourses and discursive practices of female control. This is evident in students not using the following rapes myths: a) stranger-only rape; b) women being unsure about sex; c) rape involving physical force; and d) women asking to be raped by appearance (Bourke, 2007; Chasteen, 2001; Ford, Liwag-Mclamb, & Foley, 1998). Dominant patterns of resisting or “progressive” discourses involved challenging rape myths, victim-support, feminist and critical perspectives, and calls for social action. In the interviews, students challenged rape myths such as dangerous places and restrictive female behavior:

“I don’t think it (location) has anything to do with this because really speaking, it could happen anywhere” (Int. 14, para. 4).

“You know, you should be able to do that, you should be able to walk at that time” (Int. 14, para. 2).

These challenges resulted in supporting the victim by stressing her rights and rationality:

“It makes sense to take a shortcut, it is the quick way home” (Int. 9, para. 5).

Students also attempted to challenge beliefs of a dangerous world by stating that women cannot be expected to be aware all the time. This showed more empathy towards the victim by understanding and agreeing with her behaviour:

“So I think its OK for her to assume that” (Int 14, para. 2).

Contrary to Anderson and Doherty (2008), students were supportive towards female victims. This support involved descriptions of victims as brave and strong. As a result, students positioned victims in a space of empowerment and survivor-hood. These women were also more understanding of the victim’s experience and experiences of secondary victimization. By doing this, students elevated the victim’s experiences by valuing subjective female experience over authority. Students also stressed that we should be examining the rapist who is usually someone you know. Along with this, women stated that arousal is not an excuse for rape and men have the ability to control their sexual desires. In other words, there was no trigger or “cracking” that caused the rapist to behave this way. Consequently, rape was constructed as being planned, calculated and motivated, such as the rapist stalking the female victim.

Students drew on the feminist definition of rape by describing how women are disempowered through the act of rape. Women used broad definitions of rape where the body is controlled in a variety of ways by another. Some examples are unwanted touching, brushing off bodies, heavy petting or even being forced to watch pornographic films. There was evidence of feminist movements influencing these students through phrases such as phrases, “no means no!” and that women have the right to withdraw sex at anytime. Female students claimed that the act of sex is one of equality where women also have a choice. A good relationship is one that allows for negotiation – where sex is a “combined decision” (Int. 1, para. 16). Consequently, rape was theorised in terms of feminism which focuses on power relations and gender inequity (Bourke, 2007; Chasteen, 2001) where men act through superiority and a sense of entitlement⁵ (Foster, Haupt & De Beer, 2005). This was achieved by talking about rape as an act of male domination within a patriarchal society.

Some interviews took the direction of women being critical of the vignettes and definition of rapes. Therefore women were developing a new perspective that challenged taken-for-granted assumptions. This opens up a new space of theorising about rape. Examples of critical stances were women being aware of how broader systems attempt to blame rape victims:

“They say what they want people, stereotypes come through...try to discredit women, like... They’re lying about it” (Int. 7, para. 1).

“Like it’s saying it’s stuff that women do that attracts rape” (Int. 7, para.13).

These women were also critical to how the vignettes did not focus on the rapist and that he is merely constructed as a man in the stories: “he’s blank, dark, um, and unknown” (Int. 7, para.17).

Critical stances give students opportunities to reflect on and to consider the impact of the local sociopolitical context, and their agency within this context. This allows for the creation of alternative stories (Bozalek, 2006). There were moments when women would also reflect on their own talk and assumptions, thus allowing for other forms of interpretation. This stance illustrates the students’ realisation of constructed meanings. It also challenges the notion of a universal truth and the legitimacy of rape myths.

“There is many assumptions that you can make on this actually” (Int. 1, para. 10).

According to Belenky et al. (1986), individuals who speak in terms of multiplicity do not take authority’s truth for granted; therefore these views are “progressive” and challenging.

⁵ According to Foster, Haupt and De Beer (2005), entitlement is a sense of deservingness between the self and the other. This exaggerated form of entitlement involves a sense of superiority over women and showing little concern for victims.

Women also noted how they themselves are desensitized and distanced from the victim because rape is common in society. This form of critical engagement and reflection is important for self-change by allowing one's self to think in a different way and be less governed by dominant power relations (Bozalek, 2006). Women were also critical about the lack of social action with rape:

“um, it's just it is so wrong what happens to women and how little is done, it's a human right issue – degrading women and treating them like that and I don't think it is dealt with seriously enough, like with the courts and the police. People just don't understand.” (Int. 6, para. 38).

“...the community needs to get involved...” (Int 11, para. 79).

These statements show the student's perceived powerlessness in situations of rape. Students are powerless because they are asking authorities, who are usually men, to protect women. But it also shows women's isolation – how women feel alone and misunderstood because their experiences and feelings are considered to be insignificant:

“There is no platform for people to speak out and people go through this alone and it isn't really ever spoken about but people have problems. We don't really sit down and talk to people, most of the time I find that, when you actually sit down and talk to people, they have problems, lives are hectic.” (Int. 16, para. 1).

Contradictions

The majority of students used a broad definition of rape illustrating feminist perspectives by claiming that it was any forced sexual act (Chasteen, 2001). However, women were not clear as to what they meant about 'sexual acts'. Consequently, women used broad but unclear definitions of rape. There was also uncertainty in “progressive” discourses where students resisted victim-blaming but also attempted to not reduce the victim's experience:

“Raped once before...what's the relevance of this attack? Like, you know – it is but not (laugh under breath) at the same time” (Int. 7, para. 1).

Here, the participant is attempting to move away from the perception that this victim attracts rape, yet she is also trying to value her (victim's) traumatic experiencing of being raped twice. It appears it was difficult to operate these two simultaneously – this is borne out by them struggling to claim power over their own voice (Belenky et al., 1986).

This “progressive” world challenges the “traditional” notions of rape and gender stereotypes, but this was conducted in a contradictory way. These women were more critical because they did not take “traditional” assumptions for granted. This new perspective did not blame the victim but it also did not wholly blame the rapist. Students stressed women's rights but also described the world as being a very dangerous place for women. Although, students took a “pragmatic realist” approach, students did not *fully* accept the world as dangerous. Contrary to Anderson and Doherty

(2008), students challenged this perceived sensibility by calling for social action. In other words, students stated that something must be done to restore equality. Overall, the students' world appeared to be unstable and changing as the women made many contradictions in attempts to not use "traditional" discourses. But in some cases, students still resorted to using them as it was difficult to talk about rape in a marginal voice.

These students appear to be in a polar space where tensions occurred between Female Control Discourses and feminist ideologies. As women, they are victims in a dangerous world but at the same time, they are attempting to be active agents striving for freedom:

"It's a violation of human rights and women rights. Um, I think on one hand you feel sorry for her and on one hand you think, you know, she should've been more aware of her surroundings of what's going on. But then, um, it shouldn't happen. Why are women exposed to this?" (Int. 11, para. 14).

Some students attempted to deal with this tension and their own personal fear of rape by distancing themselves from the victims. Students stressed that there is a difference between women who were victims and those who were not. This was used as a form of othering by positioning the self as different to women who were raped. Consequently, the victims became the objects who were being gazed upon by the subjects, researcher and the participants.

According to Hollway (1998), contradictions are the result of co-existing new and old discourses. Contradictions interrupt reproductions of dominant discourses, therefore providing a site for social change. These contradictions in discussions of rape allow for challenges of rape myths and patriarchal discourses. Therefore, alternative discourses can be produced and used by women in order to redefine gendered positions (Hollway, 1998).

DISCUSSION

In line with Anderson and Doherty (2008), women's conversations of rape are constructed by cultural knowledge such as patriarchal discourses and rape myths. But in line with feminist perspectives, women appear to be challenging these discourses through contradictions and variety (Hollway, 1998). These discourses have an individual and ideological function. Individually, women are voicing their feelings and opinions in order to create a particular subjectivity or to protect this subjectivity. Ideologically, patriarchal discourses reproduce "traditional" notions of sex-roles and gendered power relations. They operated to maintain and reinforce the current status-quo of male power by controlling women's behaviour and sexuality. As reported by Anderson and Doherty (2008), students are reproducing cultural understandings of risk and acknowledging the restriction of female freedom.

However, it appears that students were experiencing great difficulty with achieving this function, as women were also using alternative discourses that challenge the patriarchal discourses. As a result of these, polarity developed in women's talk. This allowed for a space of new discourses. As predicted, educated students held a broader definition of rape that challenged rape myths and provided a new understanding of sexual violence. But students still used a number of rape myths that operate within patriarchal and oppressive discourses. A possible explanation for this tension is the notion of "investment" (Hollway, 1998; Levett, 1989). Women are invested in different discourses that are beneficial. For example, women remain invested in patriarchal discourses because it protects them from stigma, negative constructions of identity and being cast out from mainstream society (Hollway, 1998). But in today's world, after feminism, educated women are also expected to be independent and supportive of all women. Consequently, women students become invested in this new ideology by resisting dominant discourses.

From a reflexive perspective, there are always broader power relations that take place in interviews between the researcher and the interviewees (Parker, 2005). It is important to reflect on the researcher's role as a white woman as social identities like race, gender and class can influence the process (Boonzaier & Shefer, 2006). However, due to the nature of the topic, gender identities appeared to be most salient therefore it was easier for women to talk about rape with other women. This is evident in statements such as "you know" or "you see" illustrating common assumptions and female shared meanings (Shefer, Strebel & Foster, 2000). It could also illustrate how women share a common fear of rape. Other limitations are related to discourse analysis itself, where broad generalizations cannot be made, as the results are restricted to the confines of the text. There is also the issue of the analyst who could possibly lack cultural knowledge or impose meanings onto other's texts (Burman & Parker, 1993).

Students appeared to be slightly uncertain with what was expected of them in the interviews. This could be a methodological flaw due to short vignettes with insufficient details. This could be improved by using written and video vignettes. However, using more detailed scenes may have influenced the students' constructions (Anderson & Lyons, 2005). Another form of improvement could be conducting longer interviews or more than one. This could allow for further development of discourses and constructions. But this uncertainty could also illustrate a broader trend within research and society: women are not given a space to talk freely about female societal issues and are therefore unsure what do when they are given this platform.

By deconstructing public narratives of rape it contributes to the experience of women and victims. Labelling, such as victim-status or deviant women, is a powerful technique which impacts experiences (Moffett, 2006). In this case, cultural constructs of sexual norms provide a framework for defining rape (Anderson & Doherty, 2008). This study contributes to knowledge of discursive practices that are used to define and construct the term “rape”. But it also illustrates that women students are making progress by resisting patriarchal and oppressive discourses. The study also shows that taught feminist theories have a positive impact by creating resistance to Discourses of Female Control. The present findings have implications for social change. They can be used in rape-education interventions to challenge rape myths, stigma and victim-blaming. However, the variety of discourses used by women also suggests that there is a need for further understanding about woman’s social constructions of rape in South Africa. The study could also be applied to male students or couples to analyse gender differences; or to postgraduate or mature students in order to make comparisons of educational levels and age differences.

CONCLUSION

South African students displayed similar discourses reported by Anderson and Doherty (2008). But contrary to Anderson and Doherty (2008), students also used “progressive” discourses. Overall uncertainty in women’s talk about rape could suggest that women find it difficult to talk about rape in their own voices, therefore resulting in contradictions and polarities. This suggests that students are creating a feminine voice where contradictions are products of social change (Hollway, 1998). These “progressive” discourses allow women to have a powerful and active subjectivity. It appears that these students have made a great amount of progress by attempting to resist the dominant and transgressive discourses. Although women are attempting to resist these, this analysis suggests that women are still being controlled through patriarchal discourses such as the fear of rape. Consequently, women are still on the journey of constructing a world of female freedom. Along this unstable journey to equality, women are using broader definitions of rape. These definitions are based on women’s experiences, therefore serving their own interests (Muehlenhard, Powch, Phelps and Giusti, 1992). This work is a significant step towards transforming damaging discourses, which shape women’s experiences, as it highlights possible de-legitimisation of assumptions of patriarchy and social oppression of women that occur in rape talk (Doherty & Anderson, 1998).

REFERENCES

- Abrahams, N., Jewkes, R., Hoffman, M., & Laubsher, R. (2004). Sexual violence against intimate partners in Cape Town: prevalence and risk factors reported by men. *Bulletin of the World Health Organisation*, 82, 330-337.
- Anderson, I. (2007). What is a typical rape? Effects of victim and participant gender in female and male rape perception. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 46, 225-245.
- Anderson, I. & Doherty, K. (2008). *Accounting for rape*. London: Routledge.
- Anderson, I. & Lyons, A. (2005). The effects of victims' social support on attributions of blame in female and male rape, 35, 1400-1417.
- Aosved, A. C. & Long, P. J. (2006). Co-occurrence of rape myth acceptance, sexism, racism, homophobia, ageism, classism, and religious intolerance. *Sex Roles*, 55, 481-492.
- Belenky, M.F., Clinchy, B.M., Goldberg, M.R., & Tarule, J.M. (1986). *Women's way of knowing*. New York, USA: Basic Books.
- Bell, R. (1974). Female sexual satisfaction and levels of education. In L. Gross (Ed.), *Sexual behaviour* (pp. 3 – 17). New York: Spectrum Publishers.
- Billig, M. (1996). *Arguing and thinking*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bohner, G., Jarvis, C.I., Eyssel, F., & Siebler, F. (2005). The causal impact of rape myth acceptance on men's rape proclivity: comparing sexually coercive and noncoercive men. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 819-828.
- Boonzaier, F. & Shefer, T. (2006). Gendered research. In T. Shefer, F. Boonzaier & P. Kiguwa (Eds.), *The gender of psychology* (pp. 3 - 11). Cape Town, South Africa: UCT Press.
- Bourke, J. (2007). *Rape: a history from 1860 to the present day*. London: Virago Press.
- Bozalek, V. (2006). Analysing a text on the prevailing paradigm of 'family' in the 'psy' professions. In T. Shefer, F. Boonzaier & P. Kiguwa (Eds.), *The gender of psychology* (pp. 151 - 163). Cape Town, South Africa: UCT Press.
- Burman, E. & Parker, I. (1993). *Discourse analytic research*. London: Routledge.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 217-230.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will*. New York: Random House.
- Chasteen, A.L. (2001). Constructing rape. *Sociological Spectrum*, 21, 101-139.
- Cock, J. (1990). Preface. In L. Vogelmann (Ed.), *The sexual face of violence: rapists on rape* (pp. 1-6). Johannesburg: Raven Press.

- Costin, F. & Kaptanoglu, C. (1993). Beliefs about rape and women's social roles. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 327-330.
- Davion, V. (1999). The difference debate: rape and moral responsibility. In K. Burgess-Jackson (Ed.), *A most detestable crime*. (pp. 230-244). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Doherty, K., & Anderson, I. (2004). Making sense of male rape: constructions of gender, sexuality and experience of rape victims. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 14, 85-103.
- Doherty, K., & Anderson, I. (1998). Talking about rape. *The Psychologist*, December 1998, 583 - 587.
- Draucker, C. B. (2001). Learning the harsh realities of life. *Health Care for Women International*, 22, 67-84.
- Ellis, L. (1989). *Theories of rape: inquiries into the causes of sexual aggression*. New York: Hemisphere.
- Feldman, P., Ullman, J., & Dunkel-Schetter, C. (1998). Women's reaction to rape victims. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 469 – 503.
- Ford, T. M., Liwag-Mclamb, M.G., & Foley, L.A. (1998). Perceptions of rape based on sex and sexual orientation of victim. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, 13, 253-263.
- Foster, D. Haupt, P., & De Beer, M. (2005). *The theatre of violence*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Gavey, N. (1989). Feminist poststructuralist and discourse analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 13, 459-475.
- Gavey, N. (1997). Feminist poststructuralist and discourse analysis. In M. Gergern, & S. Davis (Eds.), *Toward a new psychology of gender* (pp. 49-64). New York: Routledge.
- Gavey, N. (2005). *Just sex? The cultural scaffolding of rape*. London: Routledge.
- Harris, E., Lea, S., & Foster, D. (1995). The construction of gender: an analysis of men's talk on gender. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 25, 175-183.
- Hollway, W. (1998). Gender difference and the production of subjectivity. In J. Henriques, C. Urwin, C. Venn, & V. Walkerdine. (Eds.), *Changing the subject, psychology, social regulation and subjectivity* (pp. 227 – 263). London: Routledge.
- Hook, D. (2004). Foucault, disciplinary power and critical pre-history of psychology. In D. Hook. (Ed.), *Critical psychology* (pp. 210 – 238). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Howard, J.A. (1984). The "normal victim". *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47, 270 – 281.

- Jackson, S. (1993). *Women's studies*. New York: New York University Press.
- Jackson, S. M., & Cram, F. (2003). Disrupting the sexual double standard: young women's talk about heterosexuality. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42, 113-127.
- Jewkes, R., Levin, J., Mbananga, N., & Bradshaw, D. (2002). Rape of girls in South Africa. *The Lancet*, 359, 319-320.
- Jimenez, J. A., & Abreu, J. M. (2003). Race and sex effects on attitudinal perceptions of acquaintance rape. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 50, 2, 252-256.
- Kahn, A. S., Jackson, J., Kully, C., Badger, K., & Halvorsen, J. (2003). Calling it rape: differences in experiences of women who do or do not label their sexual. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 27, 233-242.
- Kalichman, S. C., Simbayi, L. C., Kaufman, M., Cain, D., Cherry, C., Jooste, S., et al. (2005). Gender Attitudes, sexual violence, and HIV/AIDS risks among men and women in Cape Town, South Africa. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 42, 299-305.
- Lea, S. J. (2007). A discursive investigation into victim responsibility in rape. *Feminism & Psychology*, 17, 495 – 514.
- Lefley, H., Scott, C., Llabre, M., & Hicks, D. (1993). Cultural beliefs about rape and victims' response in here ethnic groups. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 63, 623-632.
- Lerner, M.J. (1997). What does the belief in a just world protect us from? *Psychology Inquiry*, 8, 29 – 32.
- Levett, A. (1989). *Psychology trauma*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cape Town, Cape Town.
- Levett, A. (2005). Research on child sexual abuse. In L. Richter, A. Dawes, & C. Higson-Smith (Eds.), *Sexual abuse of young children in Southern Africa* (pp. 429 – 451). Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Lyon, M. R. (2004). No means no?: Withdrawal of consent during intercourse and the continuing evolution of the definition of rape. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 95, 277-314.
- Matlin, M.W. (1987). *The psychology of women*. Chicago, USA: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Moffett, H. (2006). 'These women, they force us to rape them': rape as narrative of social control in post-apartheid South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 32, 129-144.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., Powch, I., Phelps, J. L., & Giusti, L. M. (1992). Definitions of rape: scientific and political implications. *Journal of Social Issues*, 48, 23-44.

- Murphy, T. W. (1996). A matter of force: the redefinition of rape. *Air Force Law Review*, 39, 19-37.
- Parker, I. (2005). *Qualitative psychology*. New York: Open University Press.
- Peterson, Z. D., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (2004). Was it rape? The function of women's rape myth acceptance and definitions of sex in labelling their own experiences. *Sex Roles*, 51, 129-144.
- Peterson, Z. D., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (2007). Conceptualising the "wantedness" of women's consensual and non-consensual sexual experiences: implication for how women label their experiences with rape. *Journal of Sex Research*, 44, 72-88.
- Rape Statistics: South Africa and Worldwide*. (2008). Retrieved from <http://www.rape.co.za/index.php?option=com.content&task=view&id=875&Itemid=6> 9. 25 October 2008.
- Roiphe, K. (1994). *The morning after: sex, fear and feminism*. Toronto: Little, Brown & Company.
- South African Police Services. (2007a). *Rape in the RSA for the period April to September 2001 to 2007*. Retrieved from http://www.saps.gov.za/statistics/reports/crimestats/2007/_pdf/category/rape.pdf. 13 March 2008.
- SAPS. (2007b). *Sexual offences act 32*. Retrieved from http://www.saps.gov.za/docs_pubs/legislation/sexual_offences_act32_2007_eng. 13 March 2008.
- Sawyer, R. G., Thompson, E. E., & Chicorelli, A. M. (2002). Rape myth acceptance among intercollegiate student athletes: a preliminary examination. *American Journal of Health Sciences*, 18, 19-25.
- Shefer, T., & Foster, D. (2001). Discourse on women's (hetero) sexuality and desire in a South African local context. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 3, 375-390.
- Shefer, T., Strebel, A., & Foster, D. (2000). 'So women have to submit to that...' *South Africa Journal of Psychology*, 30, 11-20.
- Vani, W. (1990). What is rape after all? *Women's International Network News*, 16, 31-33.
- Varelas, N., & Foley, L.A. (1998). Blacks' and whites' perceptions of interracial and intraracial date rape. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 138, 392-400.
- Vogelman, L. (1990). *The sexual face of violence: rapists on rape*. Johannesburg: Raven Press.

- Way, N. (1995). "Can't you see the courage, the strength that I have?" *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 19, 107 – 128.
- Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wilbraham, L. (2004). Discursive practice. In D. Hook (Ed.), *Critical psychology*. (pp. 487 – 521). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- White, J. & Sorenson, S. (1992). A sociocultural view of sexual assault. *Journal of Social Issues*, 48, 187-195.
- Wood, K., & Jewkes, R. (1997). Violence, rape, and sexual coercion: everyday love in a South African township. *Gender and Development*, 5, 41-46.
- Wyatt, G. E. (1992). The sociocultural context of African American and white American women's rape. *Journal of Social Issues*, 48, 77-91.

APPENDIX A**Interview Schedule/ Guideline:**

1. *Ask the participants to read the vignettes (Events 1, 2 and 3) and reach their own conclusions around the event.*

Prompts: Anything about the location?

Anything about the behaviours of the characters?

How does this make you feel?

How would you describe this act?

2. *What do you think is considered to be rape?*

Prompts: How would you personally define rape?

What does the word 'rape' mean to you?

3. *How do you feel about talking about rape?*

Prompts: How do you feel about talking about rape in this interview?

How do you feel about talking about rape with others?

How do you think women in general feel about talking about rape?

Debriefing: Ask students how they are feeling and if there are any problems?

Give list of help-lines and rape organizations.

APPENDIX B

Event Description 1

Read the following description and reach your own conclusions of what you think about the event and discuss it in the interview.

A 22 year old single woman testified in court that she was raped in the campus of a middle-sized university where she was attending as a full-time student. On the evening of the attack, the woman had taken a short-cut home through campus after attending a dance class. The alleged rape took place at 9:30 p.m., when the woman was attacked and dragged away from the main path and sexually assaulted. The woman told the court that she was aware of a man walking behind her but this had not aroused any suspicion. The woman's screams from the attack were heard by the passer-by who chased the attacker away. The woman had been raped once before about one year prior to this attack. It was known that no other women had been sexually assaulted on the campus in the past 6 months before this alleged attack took place.

Some changes have been made to this description to create relevance for this particular study. Original description is from Anderson, I. & Doherty, K. (2008). *Accounting for Rape*. (pp. 61). London: Routledge.

APPENDIX B

Event Description 2

Read the following description and reach your own conclusions of what you think about the event and discuss it in the interview.

A female student, who is involved in many activities, has a long term boyfriend. Although in their time together there has been no sexual activity, the relationship between the two has been long-term and comfortable. This past Friday night they went out on a date. They went for a pizza and later rented a movie to watch in the dorm. While watching the movie, they began kissing. The boyfriend became aroused and began to pet heavily. The female student asked to stop, gently at first, then emphatically. She began crying and fighting, but he continued, eventually forcing her to have sex with him.

Some changes have been made to this description to make it relevant for this particular study. Original description is from Jimenez, J. A., & Abreu, J. M. (2003). Race and sex effects on attitudinal perceptions of acquaintance rape. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 50, 2, 252-256.

APPENDIX B

Event Description 3

Read the following description and reach your own conclusions of what you think about the event and discuss it in the interview.

A male student was raped on the campus of a middle-sized university where he was attending as a full-time student. On the evening of the attack, the man had taken a short-cut home through campus after attending an exercise class and he was aware of a man walking behind him but this had not aroused any suspicion. At approximately 9:30 p.m., the man was attacked and dragged away from the main path and sexually assaulted. The man's shouts from the attack were heard by the passer-by who chased the attacker away. The passer-by subsequently identified the accused in a police line-up. The man had been raped once before about one year prior to this attack. It was known that five other men had been sexually assaulted on the campus in the past 6 months before this alleged attack took place.

Some changes have been made to this description to create relevance for this particular study. Original description is from Anderson, I. & Doherty, K. (2008). *Accounting for Rape*. (pp. 61). London: Routledge.

APPENDIX C

University of Cape Town
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
Honours Research Project

CONSENT FORM

RESEARCHER: Siobhán Sweeney

Intention of Study:

This research project intends to examine UCT students' opinions of sexual relationships and acts of sexual assault which take place in South Africa, such as the act of rape. This examination will be conducted through the form of an interview, which will be recorded, by discussing topics and event descriptions of rape.

I AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY. I REALISE THAT MY PARTICIPATION WILL BE CONFIDENTIAL AND THAT MY ANONYMITY WILL BE OBTAINED WHEN THE RESEARCH IS WRITTE FOR EDUCTIONAL PURPOSES. I UNDERSTAND THAT I MAY WITHDRAW FROM THE STUDY AT ANY TIME AND REFUSE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS THAT MAKE ME FEEL UNCOMFORTABLE. I UNDERSTAND THAT ALL INFORMATION IS ONLY OF OPINIONS AND DOES NOT HAVE ANY REFLECTION ON ME OR THE OTHER PARTICIPANT PRESENT. I UNDERSTAND THAT MY PERSONAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC DETAILS (BELOW) WILL ONLY BE USED FOR SAMPLING NUMBERS AND ANALYSIS FOR THIS PARTICULAR RESEARCH STUDY. I UNDERSTAND THE INTENT OF THE STUDY.

SIGNED: _____

DATE: _____

DEMOGRAPHIC DETAILS:

Age: _____

How would you classify your Racial/ Ethnic identity? _____

APPENDIX D

Professional Helpline and Counseling

Professional help and Counselling:

Life Line	0861 322 322
Rape Crisis	021 447 9762 (24 hr service)
Stop Gender Violence	0800 150150
Aids Helpline	0800 012 322
People Opposed to Women Abuse	www.powa.co.za
One in Nine	www.oneinnine.org.za
DISCHO (UCT Discrimination & Harassment Services)	021 650 3530

Support the Men's Groups Working to Combat Rape:

South African Men's Forum	082 518 1177
Men in Partnership Against HIV & Aids	083 415 2157

Acknowledgements

I would like to give thanks to a few individuals who have provided me with support for this project and for other areas of my life during this year:

To Prof. Don Foster for providing insight, direction and encouragement for every step of this dissertation – you have opened my eyes to the real workings of our society.

To my parents, Madeline and John, for all their support and belief in me – you gave me this wonderful opportunity. And to my brother for all his encouragement and strength.

To the Psychology Department for provided me with knowledge and resources during this year and for the future.

To my participants – the strong women who are actively changing the world!

And I would like to thank Gareth Cotten for comments and suggestions on a draft of this article but for also teaching me many lessons in my life and for all your encouragement over the years.

I thank you all and I am eternally grateful for your help,
Siobhán.

PLAGIARISM DECLARATION

1. I know that plagiarism is wrong. Plagiarism is using another's work and to pretend that it is ones own.
2. I have used the American Psychological Association (APA) as the convention for citation and referencing. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this essay/report/project/... from the work, or works of other people has been attributed and has cited and referenced.
3. This essay/report/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.

SIGNATURE: _____

DATE: _____