

**Be more than a bystander, break the silence on
violence: A discursive analysis of student responses
to anti-rape poster campaigns.**

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Arts in
Psychology

Rhodes University

Shannon Lalla Rookh Skae

July 2021

ABSTRACT

University students are a population vulnerable to sex and gender-based violence (SGBV). The use of alcohol is prominent in university life and is argued to contribute significantly to SGBV in South Africa and worldwide. Interventions to reduce SGBV at South African universities are thus a relevant social concern. One increasingly popular approach to addressing SGBV on university campuses is the bystander intervention. The bystander intervention goes to the cause of SGBV by targeting peer acceptance as the primary foundation supporting rape; arguing that witnesses to SGBV can be empowered to interrupt potential SGBV situations. The aim of this thesis was to investigate student responses to anti-rape intervention campaigns of various kinds. Different theories were examined, and this research then proceeded from a social constructionist theoretical perspective, which was relevant as it is about what individuals say, the societies formed, the rules made, the language used to pass on knowledge and the interactions experienced with others and how they all form the reality people inhabit. The study focused on the individual constructions and talk about the posters and the discursive positions he or she took up in relation to them, which is what social constructionism is interested in, as it is concerned with the language and talk people use and how these are molded by society. Forty five student volunteer participants were shown two examples of anti-rape poster campaigns (one using the bystander approach and the other not), and were asked to respond to a structured open-ended questionnaire. Responses to the questionnaire were subjected to Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA). The analysis revealed the ways in which the constructions of sexual violence, perpetrators and victims in the poster campaigns shaped and limited participant responses and talk about SGBV in different ways, according to which of the two posters were being responded to. Key findings of this study showed that the bystander intervention poster produced more positive change in response to dominant discursive constructions in relation to the SGBV poster than did the non-bystander intervention poster. This means the establishment of the potential for success of the bystander intervention in helping to prevent SGBV in a South African context.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the support and guidance of a number of people. I wish to express my thanks to the following:

- To my supervisor Werner Böhmke for your encouragement, support, and guidance.
- To my participants for answering my analysis questions openly and honestly.
- To Wendy Jacobson for proof reading and editing this thesis.
- To my parents for their love, patience, and support even when times were tough.
- To my brother for his support and motivational advice.
- To my friends for always being there to push me to keep going.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to all the women out there who fight this fight every day.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

1. Overview	1
1.1. The type of research that needs to be done	2
1.2. Relevance of this research to psychology as a discipline	2

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction.....	3
2.2. Matters of Definition.....	3
2.2.1. Definitions and their elements.....	3
i. SGBV overview	3
2.3. History/debates of definition.....	5
2.3.1. Worldwide.....	5
2.3.2. South Africa	6
2.4. Prevalence of SGBV	7
2.4.1. Violence against women	7
2.4.2. Violence against men.....	9
2.4.3. Violence against romantic partners	9
2.4.4. Violence against children	10
2.4.5. COVID-19 and its impact on SGBV prevalence	10
2.5. Consequences of SGBV	11
2.5.1. Individual	11
i. Physically	11
ii. Mentally.....	11
iii. Interpersonally	12
2.5.2. Socially	13
2.6. Explanations for SGBV	14
2.6.1. Risk factors for perpetration and victimisation	14
i. Alcoholism	14
ii. Social/structural explanations	15
iii. Culture/ Values/ Belief systems	20
iv. Specific contextual explanations.....	25
2.7. Interventions.....	27
2.7.1. Attitude Change	27
2.7.2. Legal reform.....	29
2.7.3. Socioeconomic status.....	30
2.7.4. Public Awareness	31

2.7.5.	Protest	33
2.7.6.	Bystander Interventions.....	34
2.8.	Concluding comments	37
2.8.1.	Why this research is important.....	37
2.8.2.	Focus of research.....	38
2.9.	Conclusion	38

CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON SGBV

3.1.	Introduction.....	39
3.2.	Theories.....	39
3.2.1.	Individual-level theories.....	39
a.	Evolutionary theory.....	39
i.	How the evolutionary theory relates to SGBV	40
1.	Sexual selection	40
2.	Criminal behaviour	41
ii.	Evaluation of the merits of the evolutionary perspective	43
1.	Evolutionary biology	43
2.	Sexual selection	43
3.	Criminal behaviour	45
b.	Psychopathology	45
1.	Psychopathology and neurobiological factors	45
2.	Attachment	46
3.	Aggression.....	47
i.	Evaluating psychoanalytic explanations for SGBV	48
3.2.2.	Psychosocial/cultural theories.....	49
a.	Social learning theory.....	49
i.	Evaluating social learning perspectives on SGBV	50
b.	Gender role strain theory (GRST)	52
i.	Evaluating GRST perspectives on SGBV	55
3.2.3.	Socio-structural theories	57
a.	Social constructionism.....	57
1.	Gender roles/ideology.....	58
2.	Historical/cultural contextual analyses	59
3.	Patriarchy.....	60
4.	Socialisation.....	61
5.	Male dominance	63
i.	Evaluating social constructionist perspectives on SGBV	64
3.2.4.	Integrative theories	66
a.	Ecological theory.....	66
i.	Evaluating ecological theory perspective on SGBV	67
3.3.	Discussion of the theory chosen in this research.....	68

CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1.	Introduction.....	70
4.2.	Aim of this study	70
4.3.	Research statements.....	70

4.3.1.	Main research statement	70
4.4.	Research paradigm	71
4.4.1.	The social constructionist paradigm	71
4.5.	Research design	72
4.6.	Definition of Discourse and Discourse Analysis	72
4.7.	Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA).....	73
4.8.	Sampling	75
i.	Confidentiality and informed consent	77
4.9.	Data collection	78
4.10.	Data analysis.....	79
4.11.	Validation	81
4.11.1.	Coherence.....	82
4.11.2.	Reflexivity	82
4.13.	Conclusion	83

CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

5.1.	Introduction.....	84
5.2.	Figure. 1.	85
5.2.1.	Poster one (figure one) and its link to individual-level theories regarding SGBV ..	86
5.2.2.	Discourse of gender roles and gendered constructions	86
5.2.3.	Discourse of victim-blaming.....	88
5.2.4.	Discourse of female responsibility and risk management	91
5.2.5.	Discourse of fear.....	94
5.2.6.	Construction of the perpetrator	95
5.2.7.	Discourse of deviance	96
5.2.8.	Links to the evolutionary theory and psychopathology	98
5.2.9.	Discourse of risk management	98
5.2.10.	Discourse of consent	100
5.2.11.	Resistance to dominant discursive constructions	104
5.2.12.	Discourse of permissiveness and freedom	105
5.3.	Figure. 2.	109
5.3.1.	Discourse of gender roles and gendered constructions	110
5.3.2.	Discourse of victim-blaming.....	111
5.3.3.	Discourse of female responsibility and risk management	112
5.3.4.	Discourse of fear.....	114

5.3.5.	Construction of the perpetrator	114
5.3.6.	Discourse of deviance	116
5.3.7.	Discourse of consent	117
5.3.8.	Resistance to dominant discursive constructions	118
5.3.9.	Discourse of collective responsibility.....	121
5.3.10.	Discourse of permissiveness and freedom	123
5.4.	The similarities and differences between poster one (figure. 1.) and poster two (figure. 2).....	124
5.4.1.	Similarities:	124
5.4.2.	Differences.....	125
5.5.	Conclusion	126
 CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUDING CHAPTER		
6.	Introduction.....	127
6.1.	Summary of findings	127
6.2.	Similarities and differences in the posters.....	128
-	Poster one (figure one).....	128
-	Poster two (figure two)	129
6.3.	Limitations of research	130
6.4.	Recommendations for future research	132
6.5.	Conclusion	132
REFERENCES.....		134
APPENDICES		152
Appendix A.....		152
Appendix B		154
Appendix C.....		156
Appendix D.....		157
Appendix E: Questions used in the questionnaire		159
Appendix F		163
Appendix G.....		165

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Non-bystander intervention poster

Figure 2: Bystander intervention poster

LIST OF ACRONYMS

SGBV:	Sex and gender-based violence
FDA:	Foucauldian Discourse Analysis
USA:	United States of America
UK:	United Kingdom
WHO:	The World Health Organization
UN:	The United Nations
DEVAW:	Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
CEDAW:	Inter-American Convention on the Prevention, Punishment and Eradication of Violence Against women
HIV:	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
STIs:	Sexually Transmitted Infections
PTSD:	Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder
SAPS:	South African Police Service
UWC:	University of the Western Cape
SVTT:	Sexual Violence Task Team
BPD:	Borderline Personality Disorder
GRST:	Gender Role Strain Theory

CHAPTER ONE

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

1. Overview

The researcher originally decided to focus this study on SGBV in 2019 because of cases, such as Khensani Maseko, Hannah Cornelius, and Uyinene Mrwetyana, which were prominent rape, murder, and suicide cases of South African university students in 2018 to 2019 (Carlisle, 2018; Nombembe, 2019; Petersen, 2018). These cases, among others, sparked a desire to try to help make a positive change in preventing SGBV in South Africa. South Africa is deemed to be the rape capital of the world, according to the Human Rights Watch in 2010 (Gordon & Collins, 2013) regarded as having the highest rape statistics for a country not at war (Watson, 2014). South Africa, moreover, has a rate six times higher than the global average of femicide (Gordon & Collins, 2013). This is why it is so important to focus on the topic of SGBV, as it is such a prominent social concern both in South Africa, and worldwide (Cybulska & Forster, 2010).

The bystander intervention was then established to be the phenomenon of interest because it has shown the potential for success in helping to prevent SGBV in countries around the world, such as in the United States (USA) and the United Kingdom (UK) (Chen et al., 2020; Fairbairn, 2020; Foubert et al., 2010; Gidycz et al., 2011; Malamuth et al., 2018; McMahan & Banyard, 2012; McMahan, 2010). This type of intervention targets bystanders to a potential SGBV situation and challenges them to intervene before this occurs (Chen et al., 2020; Foubert et al., 2010; McMahan, 2010). This study then compared two anti-rape poster campaigns, one from a non-bystander intervention, and the other from a bystander intervention perspective (Chen et al., 2020; Foubert et al., 2010; McMahan, 2010). Poster-based intervention-campaigns are common on college campuses being an easy way to get messages across to students and to raise awareness about social matters (Potter et al., 2009). A study by Potter et al. (2009) showed poster campaigns using the bystander intervention were seen by college students as an important tool for raising awareness around SGBV (Potter et al., 2009). This highlights the potential efficacy of poster campaigns of this nature for SGBV awareness amongst university populations, and establishes why this research used these as a potential tool to raise discussion around the potential for success of the bystander intervention in helping to prevent SGBV.

1.1. The type of research that needs to be done

The bystander intervention needs to be researched further and this is particularly pertinent in the context of South Africa where it has not been considered before. This intervention seems to have the most potential for success out of SGBV interventions, which is why it is the focus of this research (Alegría-Flores et al., 2017). Discourse around rape requires thorough analysis in order to understand the underlying meaning behind what message is being portrayed by and to individuals in society. The written and spoken discourse around anti-rape bystander interventions invites a careful investigation in order to give careful consideration as to whether the implementation of the concept would be useful in South Africa. Because the bystander intervention has been so promisingly explored in the USA and the UK, its potential for success elsewhere could be examined in the particular context of South African society in order to limit the escalation of sexual violence among its population (Malamuth et al., 2018).

1.2. Relevance of this research to psychology as a discipline

SGBV impacts the victim, their family and friends, society, and the economy, among other factors. It can cause a range of mental health disorders in the victim that has experienced SGBV (Gavey & Schmidt, 2011; McMahon, 2010). SGBV disproportionately affects women and girls, and is deeply entrenched in institutions, cultures, and traditions in South Africa (Jewkes et al., 2011). It has many social implications for everyone and is a prevalent problem. It is driven by the patriarchy, gender inequality, and the social acceptability of violence (Jewkes et al., 2011). Psychologists and psychology as a discipline have a responsibility over the mental health and wellbeing of individuals in society, which is why SGBV and the profound impact it has makes it our duty to try and find solutions to problems like this and to help people where we can in relation to this. The consequences of SGBV will be discussed in more detail in the literature review.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This chapter begins by describing what SGBV is, detailing the different aspects that fall under it. It then establishes some of the history and debates around SGBV. The worldwide prevalence of SGBV is discussed, followed by the consequences of SGBV. Explanations for why this occurs are highlighted, such as alcoholism, patriarchy, and gender inequality. Culture, values, and belief systems are central to maintaining SGBV, for example, rape myth acceptance and gender constructions, which are unpacked. SGBV in the university context is portrayed as central to this research. Interventions are explored in this chapter. Finally, this chapter briefly describes why this research is important, the type of research being done, and its focus.

2.2. Matters of Definition

2.2.1. Definitions and their elements

i. SGBV overview

The term SGBV encompasses a broad range of sexual acts, and is defined by researchers as sexual acts or attempted sexual acts that are unwanted by the recipient (García-Moreno et al., 2015; White, 2015). Unwanted sexual comments or approaches, trafficking, or other coercive actions directed against an individual's sexuality, in any situation, including the home, work-place, or elsewhere are included in this definition (García-Moreno et al., 2015). Benbouriche and Parent (2018) state that sexual violence includes sexual coercion, sexual aggression, or any other actual sexual offence. Sexual violence is any violence that manifests in a sexual action (Benbouriche & Parent, 2018). Krolikowski and Koyfman (2012) extend this definition to include intimate partner violence, forced prostitution, exploitation, bondage, infanticide, and neglect. The World Health Organization (WHO) defines SGBV as rape within a marriage or dating relationship, rape by strangers or by acquaintances, sexual harassment or unwanted sexual advances at school or work, systematic rape, sex slavery, forced impregnation, sexual abuse of mentally or physically disabled people, rape or sexual abuse of children and customary forms of sexual violence (World Health Organization [WHO], 2017). These customary forms include forced marriage or cohabitation and wife inheritance (WHO, 2017). The United

Nations (UN) defines violence against women as any act of gender-based violence that leads to physical, sexual, or psychological harm (United Nations [UN], 2003). This can also refer to any cause of suffering, which includes threats of coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty occurring in public or private life (UN, 2003). Sexual offences in South Africa, as determined by the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act Number 32 of 2007 (2007 Act) lists rape, compelled rape, sexual assault, compelled sexual assault, compelled self-sexual assault, incest, bestiality and sexual acts with a corpse all as criminal acts.

Rape

Rape is a specific form of sexual violence, which is non-consensual sexual relations with an individual through physical force, threat or intimidation and includes the intentional, unwelcome penetration of the penis into the vagina, anus, or mouth of another (Cybulska & Forster, 2010; White, 2015). Sarnquist et al. (2014) adds other body parts and not just the penis. This act violates the right to bodily integrity (Jewkes et al., 2011).

Sexual assault

Sexual assault or abuse is defined as intentional but unwanted sexual touching or fondling and can include penetration (Cromby et al., 2013; Cybulska & Forster, 2010). Penetration means of the vagina or anus by a part of the body or any other object thereby forcing the victim to engage in sexual activity through the use of psychological pressure or physical force (Cromby et al., 2013; Cybulska & Forster, 2010). Sexual assault is defined by the South African 2007 Act, as an unlawful and intentional sexual violation without consent of a complainant.

Sexual harassment

Sexual harassment has been noted in the literature as a serious problem over the last 30 years defying a set definition because indecisive definitions limit what constitutes sexual harassment (Pina et al., 2009). There are those who argue that the subordination of women is served by staring, whistling, sexual jokes, and sexual innuendos. The opposite argument claims these are natural flirtatious interactions (Pina et al., 2009). The legal definition of sexual harassment in the USA is “unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favours, and other verbal or

physical conduct of a sexual nature” (Pina et al., 2009, p. 127). The legal definition is similar in South Africa, as “unwanted conduct of a sexual nature” (paragraph. 3) that is persistent and offensive to the recipient (The South African Labour Guide, 2020). Sexual harassment has been defined elsewhere, for instance in a study conducted in Belgium, as occurring when individuals are “targets of unwanted sexual comments, sexual propositions or requests, non-verbal sexual gestures, or sexual actions and assault” (Hardies, 2019, p. 1). It can, in addition, include unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion (Chester & Sigal, 2018).

Sexual abuse of a child

A person under the age of eighteen years is considered a child (White, 2015). Child sexual abuse is established as the use of a child for sexual gratification (Cromby et al., 2013); child pornography and verbal or physical contact between either an adult or an older child with a child falls under this definition. The WHO defines child sexual abuse as a child’s being involved in sexual activity without his or her full comprehension or informed consent (White, 2015).

2.3. History/debates of definition

2.3.1. Worldwide

The battle for women’s rights has gone on throughout history (Winslow, 1995). In the past, there were human rights activists who only had a passing thought about women’s rights (Winslow, 1995). A step towards recognition of women rights was made in 1979 when the UN General Assembly adopted the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, which was to be formally ratified by other states during that time (Cook, 2012). Before the 1990s, the concept of human rights was usually seen as “men’s rights” (O’Hare, 1999, p. 364) due to human rights having been defined by men (O’Hare, 1999). 1993 set the bar on the World Conference of Human Rights for when it was finally accepted that the UN had not properly addressed the concerns of women safety (Gallagher, 1997). The UN was supposed to acknowledge the human rights of everyone by promoting and protecting these rights. This year marked the recognition of the human rights of women by defining them as universally “inalienable, integral and indivisible” (Gallagher, 1997, p. 281). The UN, furthermore, stated that women’s rights would be a priority and that violence in the public and

private sphere were to be condemned (Winslow, 1995). Sexual harassment, exploitation, and trafficking of women were defined as problems of human rights (Winslow, 1995). There was a formalisation of the UN Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (DEVAW) and in 1994 the Inter-American Convention on the Prevention, Punishment and Eradication of Violence Against women (CEDAW) (O'Hare, 1999). There have been four UN Conferences on Women: Mexico City in 1975, Copenhagen in 1980, Nairobi in 1975, and the Fourth World conference of Women was held in Beijing in 1995, since then there have been five-year reviews; the Beijing conference proved to be a turning point through its adding women to the definitions already in the UN Human Rights System (Gallagher, 1997). The intention was to advance equality, development and peace for all women everywhere (Qureshi, 2020). The wish to empower women was underpinned by the sense that women's rights are human rights (Qureshi, 2020).

These conferences allowed for violence against women to be defined as a matter that is seriously concerning so that women enjoy a life free of violence (Qureshi, 2020). While women's rights and the definitions around SGBV have changed and progressed overtime, there is still room for improvement, as for example, the USA among others, has not ratified the Women's Convention, which limits positive development towards the non-discrimination of women (Qureshi, 2020).

2.3.2. South Africa

In South Africa in particular the Immorality Act 23 of 1957 (Immorality Act), which defined SGBV as unlawful carnal intercourse along with other related acts, and also dealt with the illegality of brothels. Unlawful carnal intercourse was defined as parent or guardian defilement of a child through unlawful carnal intercourse, prostitution, detention for unlawful carnal intercourse, abduction for the purpose of carnal intercourse, sexual offences of children under sixteen and sexual offences committed with "female idiots and imbeciles" (p. 10). This was later changed to the 2007 Act, which is concerned with sexual offences with the focus not now mainly on brothels, but defines sexual offences as rape, sexual assault, incest, bestiality, sexual acts with a corpse and any sexual acts against underage children and mentally disabled individuals. It lists in greater detail than did the Immorality Act with definitions of rape, sexual assault and other related sexual offences.

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 (The Constitution) allowed for progressive definitions around SGBV and a greater inclusion of what constitutes sexual offences; Chapter 2, sections 9, 10 and 12 defines rights to equality, human dignity, freedom, the security of the person, and the right to bodily and psychological integrity. The definition of these rights led the way to the creation of the 2007 Act. The Constitution also promotes the right to make decisions concerning reproduction, security and control over one's body, which is inclusive of women's rights, in that it refers to everyone, in Chapter 2, section 12.

South African President, Cyril Ramaphosa, has initiated a process of three new bills through the South African parliament designed to bring justice to SGBV survivors (Mlaba, 2020). These are the Domestic Violence Amendment Bill, the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act Amendment Bill and the Criminal and Related Matters Amendment Bill (Mlaba, 2020). These will include definitions of adequate punishment for sexual offenders and of sexual intimidation as an offence as well as the right of a complainant in a domestic violence related offence to partake in parole proceedings, among other matters (Mlaba, 2020).

2.4. Prevalence of SGBV

White (2015) states that sexual violence is prevalent worldwide affecting men, women and children (Friedman, 2018; White, 2015). It was established that from 2008 up until 2012 that rape has been on the increase in the UK, and worldwide (Cybulska & Forster, 2010; White, 2015).

2.4.1. Violence against women

Cybulska and Forster (2010) established rape and sexual assault as common criminal offences having found that approximately one in five women worldwide will become a victim of rape or attempted rape in her lifetime. Jewkes et al. (2011) note that research demonstrates that 6% to 59% of women worldwide report sexual violence from an intimate partner. These authors demonstrate that rape has reached epidemic proportions and on a global scale. Other studies estimate that one in three women globally will experience some form of sexual violence from

a stranger or an intimate partner in her lifetime (García-Moreno et al., 2015; Luce et al., 2010). Thompson (2014) estimates a forcible rape occurs every six minutes in the USA. Cromby et al. (2013) found that women in the UK were more likely than men to be victims of domestic violence, sexual abuse (up to 30% of all girls) and all forms of violence, rape included. Suarez and Gadalla (2011) focused on the USA where, they established, one in six women are a victim of sexual assault or rape compared to one in 33 men. They also focused on Canada recording that out of 23,000 sexual assault incidents 86% were reported by women. The study by García-Moreno et al. (2015) established that the risk for sexual abuse of girls is 2.5% to 3% higher than that of boys and that girls are subjected to other forms of violence born out of gender inequality; these include forced marriage, sex trafficking and female genital mutilation (García-Moreno et al., 2015). The WHO, furthermore, reported that sexual abuse of women under the age of 15 in Namibia was 21%, in Tanzania 10%, and in Ethiopia 7% (Krolikowski & Koyfman, 2012).

A study in South Africa by Jewkes et al. (2011) showed that rape is prevalent, especially rape by young South African men. It was found that more than one in four men disclosed having raped a woman and 15% had raped more than one (Jewkes et al., 2011). Boonzaier and de la Rey (2003) found that approximately one in four to one in six women in South Africa are victims of sexual abuse. Other forms of gender violence in South Africa include femicide, the misogynistic killing of women; corrective rape of lesbians or gays, female genital mutilation and forced prostitution (Lahiri, 2011; Luty, 2009; Mathews et al., 2008).

It has been said that 55, 000 rapes of women and girls are reported to the police every year in South Africa, an estimation thought to be at least nine times lower than the actual numbers (Morrell et al., 2012). Notwithstanding the recorded prevalence of SGBV, 95% of women do not report their victimisation to the police (Belknap, 2010; Kruttschnitt et al., 2014). Neither the 80% of college women in the USA nor the 67% in the rest of the population of women report being raped to the police (Martin, 2016), and Belknap (2010) found that only 8% to 10% of rapes are reported (see Luce et al., 2010). In South Africa, women do not report to police because the general consensus is that “police would do nothing or could do nothing” and they have provided unsatisfactory police services (Maluleke, 2018). The amount of women that report to police are estimated to be around 30.2% for sexual offences in South Africa, according to Risenga Maluleke who is the Statistician-General of South Africa (Maluleke, 2018).

2.4.2. Violence against men

Women and children are at risk, although men do experience sexual violence. Men, women and children need to be engaged to reduce the frequency of sexual violence. Weiss (2010) looked into the rape and sexual assault of men in the USA and found that 9% of men reported being victims. Cybulska and Forster (2010) note that the sexual assault of men is still not recorded as an offence in some criminal justice systems across the world and therefore remains an unreported crime which victims must endure. It is therefore recognised that SGBV can be (and is) committed against men as well, however, the overwhelming majority of SGBV cases of various kinds are committed against women, which makes it a gendered phenomenon (Cybulska & Forster, 2010).

2.4.3. Violence against romantic partners

Sexual violence by partners, non-partners and people known to the victim are common in many situations, such as through marital relations, work colleagues, friends or relatives (Cybulska & Forster, 2010). García-Moreno et al. (2015) in addition, note that 53 countries in the world do not recognise marital rape. Marital rape is situated deeply within gender inequality, which means that the countries that do not recognise this show culturally located attitudes towards women that are rooted in gender inequality and discrimination against women (Randall et al., 2017). Not recognising rape in a marriage violates women's rights to autonomy, security of the person, and access to justice (Randall et al., 2017). The countries that do not recognise this are then still embedded in patriarchal ideologies (Randall et al., 2017). Marital rape has been acknowledged in more than 50 countries, such as USA, Nepal, the UK, and South Africa, however, in most of Asia this is not the case (Wulfhorst, 2019). In many countries in the world sexual access is seen as part of a marriage contract (Wulfhorst, 2019). Over 58% of countries worldwide still do recognise marital rape and many have only recently established this as a crime (Wulfhorst, 2019). This suggests that there is still a substantial amount of work to be done in terms of eradicating gender inequality and discrimination against women (Wulfhorst, 2019).

2.4.4. Violence against children

Krolikowski and Koyfman (2012) reported that over 41% of rapes in South Africa involved children under the age of 18 and that 25% of girls were likely to be raped before the age of 16. In South Africa during 2011 to 2012 a crime statistics report revealed that nearly 26, 000 children were victims of sexual violence, which statistically accounts for 40% of all sexual offences (Matthews et al., 2014). Krolikowski and Koyfman (2012) noted that in Nigeria 47% of female child labourers were sexually assaulted, and that 11% of adolescent males in South Africa and 29.9% in the Cameroon were found to have endured forced sexual initiation (Krolikowski & Koyfman, 2012). Adolescent males in Tanzania (13.4%) and Namibia (3.4%) were, in addition, found to have experienced sexual assault (Krolikowski & Koyfman, 2012).

Many young South African women have first sexual encounters that are forced or coerced (Richter et al., 2015). Sexual coercion is where an individual is forced to have sexual encounters through violence, threats to the body or insistence verbally, and cultural expectations or economic circumstances (Richter et al., 2015). The average age of South African men and women having their sexual debut are 16 and 17 years old respectively (Richter et al., 2015). The perpetrators are often underaged boys who are slightly older than the girl victims and these acts tend to happen in the context of intimate relationships (Russell et al., 2014). This is due to community level attitudes in South Africa usually being supportive of the superiority of men and the use of violence or coercion to control women (Russell et al., 2014). Family backgrounds and negative interpersonal conflict resolution styles also lead to young men engaging in coercive sexual relations (Russell et al., 2014).

2.4.5. COVID-19 and its impact on SGBV prevalence

The COVID-19 pandemic that began in 2019 has led to an increase in SGBV worldwide (Mittal & Singh, 2020) because of the rise in economic insecurity, alcohol consumption, the lockdown, feelings of isolation, loneliness, all of which means confinement in the home and often forced proximity to an abuser (Mittal & Singh, 2020). Women and girls are therefore at an increased risk of intimate partner violence, child abuse and other forms of sexual violence (Sharifi, 2020). Pandemics are, furthermore, said to break down social infrastructures and highlight weaknesses and conflicts already in place (Mittal & Singh, 2020). Pandemics and epidemics aggravate

existing forms of violence resulting in the rise of SGBV (Sharifi, 2020). This means that intervention is vital in 2020 and 2021 (Mittal & Singh, 2020).

Because violence and sexual violence are socially constructed and learned behaviours, cultural and social norms are significant (Matthews et al., 2014; Thompson, 2014). If one can remedy and prevent the social problems that perpetuate sexual violence, a difference could be made to its prevalence, and thereby to its victims.

2.5. Consequences of SGBV

2.5.1. Individual

Substantial negative impacts on survivors in terms of sexual violence include negative effects on physical and mental health, academic performance, and inter-personal relationships (Gavey & Schmidt, 2011; McMahon, 2010).

i. Physically

Sexual violence results in a lack of control over sexual and reproductive choices for women, often with long-term negative effects, such as unwanted pregnancies, unsafe abortions, Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) and AIDS, sexual dysfunction and low-birthweight babies (Cybulska & Forster, 2010; García-Moreno et al., 2015; Kruttschnitt et al., 2014). When a child is sexually abused, serious health consequences can emerge in adulthood, such as HIV infection (Ward et al., 2018). Pregnancy following rape is at 5% and the risk of Sexually Transmitted Infections (STIs) ranges from 4% to 56% (Cybulska & Forster, 2010). There can be chronic pelvic pain and difficulty with pelvic examinations (Luce et al., 2010). Health consequences of sexual assault include physical injuries, hemorrhage and shock, wound infections, genito-anal trauma, infertility, and sleep disturbance (White, 2015).

ii. Mentally

Rape and sexual assault can result in acute chronic psychological morbidity (Cybulska & Forster, 2010). A toll is taken on a woman's mental health manifesting in trauma related responses (depression, anxiety, chronic stress, low self-esteem), post-traumatic stress disorder

(PTSD), the risk of alcohol and substance abuse, self-harm and recurring victimisation later on in life (Cybulska & Forster, 2010; Fedina et al., 2018; García-Moreno et al., 2015; Kruttschnitt et al., 2014; White, 2015). Kruttschnitt et al. (2014) and Fedina et al. (2018) establish other consequences, such as STIs, flashbacks, sleep and eating disorders, chronic illness, risky behaviours and suicidal ideation or suicide. Cybulska and Forster (2010) estimate that around one-fifth of women attempt suicide after rape and a greater number suffer suicidal ideation. Krolkowski and Koyfman (2012) found that over their lifetimes sexual assault survivors are at increased risk of PTSD (30% of victims), major depression (30% of victims), suicidal ideation (33% of victims), and suicide attempts (13% of victims).

Male victims may engage in physical violence after a sexual assault in order to attempt to reclaim their masculinity (Weiss, 2010). Heavy drinking, aggression, and fighting can be manifestations of strength to obviate embarrassment at having been overpowered and of having submitted to the humiliation of SGBV (Weiss, 2010).

iii. Interpersonally

Where health care providers and police are unsympathetic the examination of survivors of SGBV can be traumatic and intrusive (Cybulska & Forster, 2010; Krolkowski & Koyfman, 2012; White, 2015). These individuals are often the first point of contact after assault, which is then problematic if they are unsympathetic, especially for crucial examination of the victim in order to gain evidence strong enough for an assault case successfully to be brought to court (Cybulska & Forster, 2010; Gidycz et al., 2011; Krolkowski & Koyfman, 2012; White, 2015).

Ullman and Peter-Hagene (2014) note that negative social reactions from family and peers have been found to relate to PTSD symptoms in sexual assault victims. These negative social reactions, in addition, created maladaptive and avoidant coping strategies in the victim, such as denial, disengagement, substance and alcohol abuse and social withdrawal (Ullman & Peter-Hagene, 2014). Positive reactions towards survivors were associated with victims suffering fewer PTSD symptoms and the ability to develop more adaptive social and individual coping strategies in themselves (Ullman & Peter-Hagene, 2014).

Sexual violence also makes it difficult for women to trust and to have happy relationships because they are rendered fearful of relationships and of revealing lasting vulnerabilities (Gavey & Schmidt, 2011).

2.5.2. Socially

A study in South Africa for the year of 2012 to 2013 found that the economic impact of gender-based violence amounts approximately to between R28.4 billion and R42.4 billion (García-Moreno et al., 2015). This means to between 0.9% and 3% of the annual gross domestic product (García-Moreno et al., 2015).

There is not enough information on the impact that rape has on society, even so, sexual violence is a silent and still stigmatised subject, which suggests that society is reluctant to deal with it (Cybulska & Forster, 2010; Krolikowski & Koyfman, 2012; White, 2015). Sexual violence has a substantial impact on the health care system in that survivors tend to use the health care system increasingly after assault (Cybulska & Forster, 2010; Friedman, 2018; Krolikowski & Koyfman, 2012; White, 2015). This has an impact on the economy (Cybulska & Forster, 2010; Krolikowski & Koyfman, 2012; White, 2015).

There are some interventions and prevention strategies that have been mentioned in research many of which only have short-term success rates, but have not had the desired effect of eradicating the scourge of rape, which highlights a problem that needs to be addressed (Friedman, 2018; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). Suarez and Gadalla (2011) state that “it seems that three decades after the first studies of rape myths, prejudices and stereotypes concerning rape and rape victims still exist” (p. 651). The implication is that the interventions and prevention strategies that have been instituted are inadequate and that not enough has been done to change attitudes and perspectives.

2.6. Explanations for SGBV

2.6.1. Risk factors for perpetration and victimisation

i. Alcoholism

Alcohol is known to be a significant contributor to SGBV, especially on university and college campuses, in places like South Africa and that young students who are women and who are new to campus life are vulnerable (Clowes et al., 2009). Similar results were found in the UK (Monk & Jones, 2014). Extreme alcohol consumption was established as having preceded over 70% of these SGBV cases (Monk & Jones, 2014). A history of sexual assault and alcohol are associated with a strong likelihood of subsequent assault in a study by Neilson et al. (2018) in the USA. Approximately half of the sexual assaults recorded in the USA involve survivors who had consumed alcohol immediately before being assaulted (Lorenz & Ullman, 2016). Another study in Washington had similar results regarding alcohol as a risk factor for SGBV particularly among college students (Bird et al., 2016). Also established is that alcohol can be exploited as a coping mechanism in cases of SGBV (Neilson et al., 2018).

Research has shown that alcohol is related to a lack of condom use and incapacitated rape (Livingston et al., 2015). The study by Kaysen et al., (2006) had similar findings to those of Livingston et al. (2015) who noted that incapacitated rape was linked to higher alcohol use in the USA. Bedard-Gilligan et al., (2011) highlight the fact that alcohol consumption by the victim is common before sexual assault in the USA. Livingstone et al. (2015) also found that alcohol exacerbated the possibility of women making risky partner choices when at a club or bar.

Evidence shows that alcohol abuse among female university students is rising to unparalleled levels in the UK and the USA (Kheswa & Hoho, 2017). Other countries in which alcohol dependence is on the rise, especially in university settings, are Sub-Saharan countries, such as Uganda, and these universities have noted that rape and SGBV often occur alongside alcohol consumption (Kheswa & Hoho, 2017). It has been established that the majority of students who are female that abuse alcohol are economically unstable, have unclear sexual values and poor self-esteem (Kheswa & Hoho, 2017).

Alcohol abuse led many women students to engage in transactional sex at a university in the Eastern Cape of South Africa and was often involved in rape cases in this university (Kheswa & Hoho, 2017). A university in KwaZulu Natal in South Africa also noted that students who attend a rural university, such as the one focused on in that study, often abuse alcohol, which leads to unsafe environments inviting SGBV (Dlamini et al., 2012). Another study in South Africa shows rape involved in relationships where there is an abuse of alcohol by men within married couples, to their girlfriends, and to other women (Jewkes et al., 2010).

ii. Social/structural explanations

Patriarchy & gender inequality

The patriarchal nature of society is a reason for the social problems that relate to SGBV (Jewkes et al., 2011). Boonzaier and de la Rey (2003) demonstrate that the biggest challenge to gender equality is violence against women, in that sexual harassment and rape are perpetrated mostly by men who are described as having hostile attitudes and behaviours towards women whom they consider to be their inferiors (Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). Where there are traditional norms that support male superiority or tolerate violence against women there is a higher rate of sexual violence (Krolikowski & Koyfman, 2012). Unequal power relations between men and women are seen as a substantial driving factor for sexual violence in low-income to middle-income countries, according to García-Moreno et al. (2015) who comment on violence against women as a pervasive social problem rooted in the unequal distribution of resources and power between men and women. This is institutionalised through law, policies and social norms that give preference to men (García-Moreno et al., 2015). This then supports the premise made by feminists that sexism perpetuates rape myth acceptance and sexual violence (Suarez & Gadalla, 2011).

There is gender inequality in many societies, and this is often concomitant with social inequality and due to differences in wealth and opportunity between men and women (Cromby et al., 2013). For example, women usually earn less, have lower status jobs and are unemployed more than are men. Lower socioeconomic status is associated with an increased risk of sexual abuse (Ward et al., 2018). García-Moreno et al. (2015) highlight the status of women as second-class citizens in many situations in which they are discriminated against as inferior or

subservient to men. Even where women have many freedoms, they fear the reality of the persistent violence by men. Women who earn substantially more than men are often at risk of SGBV because their financial status can create a perceived loss of masculinity in the man who earns less and who uses violence to compensate and reassert delusions of superiority (Boonzanier & de la Rey, 2003).

Another social matter typical of patriarchal society relates to cases of sexual assault of men, rape and/or sexual harassment but which are not acknowledged as real crimes (Weiss, 2010). For example, it is held that women are unable to rape because rape is defined by the necessity of a penis penetrating a vagina or anus (Weiss, 2010). That men can then rape men, but this is a stigmatised subject for men are supposed to be strong, tough and therefore impenetrable (Weiss, 2010). When a man is overpowered, he is seen as gay or womanly; it is hard for men to be seen as victims of sexual violence because men are the predators, violent and aggressive in nature (Weiss, 2010). This is a social problem surrounding the idea of hyper-masculinity in which men cannot be recognised as victims (Weiss, 2010).

Patriarchy is significant in incidents of sexual violence in South Africa. For example, South Africa suffers from frequent gang rape, which is a worldwide problem (Jewkes et al., 2011). One in five men have been said to participate in gang rape in South Africa where it is viewed as something boys do, which explains its prevalence (Jewkes et al., 2011). Young men's ideas around masculinity have been partially defined in terms of their control over their sexual relationships with women (Boonzaier & de la Rey, 2003). Women have been shaped as sexually passive and men as sexually aggressive and it is acceptable for men to be sexually promiscuous, but not women who are branded a "whore" if they do not conform to what is perceived as sexual purity (Boonzaier & de la Rey, 2003, p. 1014). Girls are exposed to more sexual violence, which highlights how gender is established in the experience of sexual violence (Devries & Meinck, 2018).

Guns which play a large role in terms of SGBV in South Africa are in frequent use by men to intimidate and sexually assault women highlighting the role of them in the domination of women and emphasising the unequal power relations between men and women (Abrahams et al., 2010). The patriarchal nature of South African society is amplified by racism, gender inequality and the normative use of violence (Morell et al., 2012).

Marginalisation & vulnerability

Sexual violence and rape myth acceptance are often associated with racism, heterosexism, classism, and ageism (Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). Those who are particularly vulnerable to sexual violence include adolescents, victims of childhood sexual or physical abuse, disabled persons, drug or alcohol addicts, sex workers, poor and homeless individuals, prisoners, patients in mental institutions, and people who live in a war zone (Fedina et al., 2018; Luce et al., 2010). One in two transgender individuals experience sexual assault or abuse in a lifetime and women who are lesbian, bisexual, or who belong to racial or ethnic minorities or university sororities run a high risk of sexual victimisation (Fedina et al., 2018). African American women are also targets (Belknap, 2010). This list confirms that rape myth acceptance is widespread particularly in relation to race, sexual orientation, and class (Cromby et al., 2013; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011).

Perpetrators of sexual violence, who target women particularly those of divergent race, mentality, gender preference, and/or ethnicity, may well do so from a position of assumed superiority to those at risk so that rape and sexual violence are frequently associated with the desire for power over another (Cromby et al., 2013; Luce et al., 2010; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). Underlying this is the notion of the “corrective” rape of bisexual or lesbian women in order to “cure” them of their perceived sexual preferences (Macleod et al., 2018).

Among the many social issues that relate to sexual violence in South Africa are included a lack of education concerning such matters as STIs, tradition, rape myth acceptance, and concepts of patriarchy (Abrahams et al., 2010; Jewkes et al., 2011; Ward et al., 2018).

Ignorance concerning sexually transmitted infection is a motivation for the rape of young girls in the erroneous belief that this will cleanse perpetrators of sexual disease; virgins, too, are a preferred target for HIV sufferers; in most cases, in parts of South Africa, the rape of a virgin, usually a child, is believed to be a cleansing action after male circumcision (Jewkes et al., 2011).

Additional risk factors that may result in sexual violence in South Africa are domestic violence, substance abuse, delinquency, marital problems between parents, a high level of crime in the

community, poor and inadequate social services, substance abuse and, almost always, a low income (Matthews et al., 2014). These factors result from the overall societal problems of stereotyped social and cultural norms, for example, heterosexuality, high unemployment rates, inequality and discrimination between races, genders and classes, and weak legal, regulatory and policy frameworks along with feeble law enforcement in South Africa (Matthews et al., 2014). Many South African townships harbour people who are poverty stricken and deprived in terms of education and opportunity (Matthews et al., 2014). Concomitant with these are the intersecting factors that contribute to inequalities, some of which are discussed above, such as race, age, and gender (Macleod et al., 2018). This leads inevitably to SGBV (Macleod et al., 2018).

The legacy of Apartheid persists with negative, long-lasting consequences for individuals discriminated against on grounds of race and class whose socio-economic status increases their risk of sexual violence (Matthews et al., 2014).

A ubiquitous fact in South Africa is the propensity for men to father children and then absent themselves so that 40% of households are headed by one adult living in very poor conditions (Morrell et al., 2012).

Justice system

Attempting to limit the high number of cases of SGBV, South Africa has set up specialised courts to deal with sexual offences with the purpose of training the staff in the skills necessary to facilitate minimal contact between victims and perpetrators in SGBV cases, and then to prosecute these cases (Onyejekwe, 2004).

Women often do not have access to the judicial system, or they are confronted with many legal barriers, especially when reporting on SGBV (Onyejekwe, 2004). Conviction rates of rape perpetrators are low in South Africa and men who commit SGBV are rarely punished (Jewkes et al., 2012). Rape tends to be under-reported, and cases are shabbily documented (Jewkes et al., 2012; Naidoo, 2013; Strebel et al., 2006). The under-reporting is due to lack of faith in the criminal justice system, medical services, stigma, fear, and embarrassment that surrounds this

subject, so the courts are unable to help the women whose access to the law is compromised (Morrell et al., 2012).

Dealing with the South African Police Service (SAPS) can be traumatic for victims because the police who first come into contact with a SGBV victim can be uninformed and therefore unsympathetic (Naidoo, 2013). The result is that the justice system is usually unhelpful when attempting to eradicate SGBV (Naidoo, 2013). For a conviction of rape to succeed, each stage of the criminal justice system from police and healthcare workers to the courts, have to manage their section successfully (Sigsworth et al., 2009). With the report of the rape at the police station, careful documentation by the police who are the first point of call for survivors, must be guaranteed (Sigsworth et al., 2009). Police attitudes to a rape determines whether and how they pursue justice, their correct documentation of the case will keep the victim informed and offer confidence in the process, and a comprehensive statement is important in conviction of the perpetrator (Sigsworth et al., 2009). Problems with investigation; results from lack of training, resources, and/or supervision, which despite the specialised courts, has not been achieved (Sigsworth et al., 2009).

The 2007 Act offers definitions of rape and sexual assault and highlights what services should be available to victims, emphasising compulsory HIV testing for alleged perpetrators (Naidoo, 2013). These ideals and their enforcement are not necessarily carried out (Naidoo, 2013). Another reformed policy is The National Sexual Assault Policy of 2005 which provides guidelines for after care such as collecting evidence by using a collection kit and the documentation thereof; and ongoing counselling for victims (Naidoo, 2013). Although the policies around SGBV have been reformed that there is lack of resources and proper training for healthcare workers and the police obviates the success of these ideal reforms (Naidoo, 2013).

Even with the best efforts at effecting reforming health policies the South African justice system has still made no substantial change to its quality of services towards rape survivors not least because reform efforts are not consistent across all health districts, and due to a lack of human and financial resources and inadequate training in clinical forensic medicine, these efforts are not substantial (Naidoo, 2013).

iii. Culture/ Values/ Belief systems

Rape myth acceptance

Rape myths are central to SGBV (Avery, 2020; O'Hara, 2012; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011), and can be described as “prejudicial, stereotyped or false beliefs, prejudices or stereotypes about rape, rapists, and rape victims.” (Burt, 1980, p. 217). Suarez and Gadalla (2011) believe that rape myths are a way of shifting the blame from the perpetrator to the victim and are the means whereby men justify rape and for women to minimise their personal vulnerability to rape (Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). Rape myths do not only function at the level of individual beliefs or attitudes and are entrenched in the larger societal patriarchy (Avery, 2020; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011) in that men show a significantly higher endorsement of rape myth acceptance than do women (Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). A study by Gray (2018) in Japan found gender bias in the legal system whereby the points of views of men around sexual violence and assault are prioritised over those of women, which influences the way different types of victims and attacks are understood and how they are treated in the pre-trial stages of the Japanese legal system. Aggressiveness, traditional gender roles, conservative political beliefs, and older generations tend to be predictors of rape myth acceptance (Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). Individuals in South Africa tend to tolerate and even encourage sexual offending in certain instances, such as parents, families, and society who place little to no social pressure on men and boys in order to discourage SGBV, while blaming women for provoking what has happened to them, which intensifies rape myth acceptance (Van der Bijl & Rumney, 2009).

Rape myths circulate worldwide, especially through the media (Avery, 2020; Belknap, 2010; O'Hara, 2012) which frequently portrays date rape victims' as “lying, vindictive shrews” and date rape defendants as “folk heroes, innocent boys tragically charged by vindictive women” (Gruber, 2009, p. 598). This reinforces the idea that rape is a pathology, a deviance from the norm, and therefore is not so much a responsibility for society to control but is for the attention of psychologists (O'Hara, 2012). O'Hara (2012) believes that this allows for a disassociation of society from an endemic problem.

A study of the language of rape used by the *Daily Mail* found that the paper often apportions blame to women who binge drink: the sense is that a woman, anxious to reclaim a damaged

reputation after having been seduced, will cry rape to exonerate herself. The paper's suggestion is that because a woman is drunk it is her fault that she is raped, in which case, the paper argues, the burden of blame is borne by the victim (Meyer, 2010).

A slogan posted by Budweiser in 2015 for a beer urged that the word no be removed from an individual's vocabulary for the night (Martin, 2016), an example of how alcohol, which is implicated in a significant number of rape cases, can imply erroneously that the rape is the fault of the victim who does not say no (Jewkes et al., 2011; Meyer, 2010). The problem lies with the perpetrator, but also with society and how the community engages with problems, such as alcoholism, gender inequality, poverty, lack of education, and violent behaviours that often go hand in hand with alcohol and rape. The criminal justice system and the public are influenced by these media headlines which perpetuate adherence to rape myths (Belknap, 2010; O'Hara, 2012).

Other rape myths that circulate exonerate rapists because women ask for it by drinking too much or wear provocative clothing (McMahon, 2010; O'Hara, 2012). There is, in addition, still the belief that a real rape is an act of extreme violence committed by a stranger, but reality is that most victims experience acquaintance rape committed by a known person (Martin, 2016). When rape is admitted as acquaintance rape, blame is likely to be apportioned to the victim who has placed herself in a vulnerable position with a friend or acquaintance which means that rape by a stranger is assumed to be more convincing an accusation than that by a friend (Persson & Dhingra, 2020).

The reason that rape myths are so harmful in a social context is because the victims of rape or SGBV receive non-supportive reactions from individuals after speaking about their assault because of rape myth acceptance (Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). These reactions come from the social network of the victim, such as legal services, clergy, health care providers, and friends (Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). Weiss (2010) explains that there are few crimes in the world that bring about as much skepticism and victim blaming as do allegations of sexual assault and rape. This is because persistent myths support the idea that the victim wanted to be raped, deserved it or is in some way responsible for the sexual assault (Weiss, 2010). Violence against women and girls has been hidden, ignored, and accepted continuously by society (García-Moreno et al., 2015).

Responses to the victims of sexual assault include: the blaming of the victim, instead of the perpetrator, who is stigmatised in the community (Garcia-Moreno et al., 2015); a raped woman is seen to be damaged, and somehow made different, which is a demonstration of prejudice; being forced to confess and/or to go to the police (Ullman & Peter-Hagene, 2014); community structures can reject a woman whose credibility is negated; negative responses can manifest in the victim as a feeling of a “second rape” a possible outcome of rape myth acceptances of disbelief, blame, and negative judgment against her (Gavey & Schmidt, 2011).

Constructions of gender (specifically masculinities)

Human beings manifest various gender identities but gender stereotypes, as well as gender norms continue to be held by individuals (Eagly et al., 2000; Grubb & Turner, 2012; Rudman & Glick, 2012; Unger, 2020).

Women can be portrayed as “innocent, weak, dependent and blindingly adoring of men” and subordinate to them (Unger, 2020, p. 23). It is asserted that women are usually raised to be passive (Eagly et al., 2000; Grubb & Turner, 2012; Rudman & Glick, 2012). Because women are child bearers they are also seen as rearers, which creates stereotyped expectations, such as that the necessity that women be kind, nurturing, and helpful (Eagly et al., 2000; Rudman & Glick, 2012). This is described as “emphasised femininity” (Messerschmidt et al., 2018, p. 2) or “the habitual feminine position of incompetence” (Thornham & McFarlane, 2011, p. 64). Gender constructions of women can therefore show inferiority and passivity in comparison to men (Eagly et al., 2000; Rudman, & Glick, 2012; Thornham & McFarlane, 2011).

Hegemonic masculinity or the dominant masculinity on the other hand tends to describe the type of behaviours men display towards women as the result of both societal norms and upbringing (Jewkes et al., 2015; Messerschmidt et al., 2018). Hegemonic masculinity renders men superior to women, from which they benefit economically, politically, and socially (Jewkes et al., 2015). This patriarchal dividend or the legitimization of patriarchy and the elite power of men (Hearn et al., 2012; Jewkes et al., 2015) is, on the whole, confined to straight, white men who are dominant in society (Griffith et al., 2011; Jordan et al., 2018). The image of the male is socially constructed to be assertive, competitive, and aggressive in their

establishment of nondomestic working roles in harsh environments often requiring physical bravery and leadership skills (Eagly et al., 2000; Rudman & Glick, 2012). The maintenance of status as “real men” is earned in order to affirm group status among other men (DiMuccio & Knowles, 2020, p. 25).

This restrictive gender role construction can lead men to conform to the ideal of hegemonic masculinity which is toxic in its being defined by violence, sex, status, and aggression (Griffith et al., 2011; Jordan et al., 2018). Men must avoid seeming to be effeminate, so must be unemotional, controlling, and tough; risks must be taken to adhere to traditional gender constructions (Berkowitz, 1992). Fragile masculinity describes those men who fear falling short of the masculine cultural standards set by society (DiMuccio & Knowles, 2020).

Those men who are of a different class, race, ethnicity, and/or sexual orientation and do not fit the ideal of hegemonic masculinity or other stereotypical gender constructions can be marginalised (Jackson, 2006). A man who is outside heteronormativity is, exemplified in research done by Bhana and Mayeza (2016) who offer a quote from a group of young children: “we don’t play with gays, they’re not real boys” (p. 36).

Such restrictive gender constructions detailed above perpetuate problems, such as SGBV, rape myth acceptance and victim blaming, among others (Griffith et al., 2011; Jordan et al., 2018). This is because men who conform to standards of hegemonic masculinity often view themselves as superior and who retain power over others deemed to be inferior (Griffith et al., 2011; Jordan et al., 2018) by violent means which stem from a “stereotyped and obsolete concept of masculinity” (Hearn et al., 2012, p. 46).

Constructions of consent

Consent can relate to gender identity and stereotypes. It impacts how genders think and speak about SGBV as well as perpetuates some of the problems with defining SGBV. Consent is a complex concept, as many people have varying ideas about what it constitutes with sexual activity (Gruber, 2016). It is often when a woman has to verbally say “yes” to sexual advances (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). The idea here is that consent must be freely given (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). It has been found that women tend to indicate consent more by verbal cues,

such as asking a man if they have a condom and saying “yes” when asked (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). However, men indicate their consent more via nonverbal cues (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013).

There is still a significant endorsement of stereotypical beliefs around men and women’s roles in sexual intercourse (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). This is that men are viewed as the initiator and women as the gatekeeper, which establishes that even if a woman says no then the response is often that she is teasing him and still wants him to continue (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). There is a lot of confusion around what constitutes consent, as some believe there needs to be an enthusiastic “yes” and others just a passive submission (Gruber, 2016). Passive submission means that the person engages in sexual activity without resistance (Gruber, 2016). This is problematic, as this line of thinking can lead to men engaging in SGBV without fully understanding why their actions are wrongful (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). This makes instances of SGBV difficult to define (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). The way we think and speak about SGBV is then based solely on the perspective of different people, which can cause complications around where, when, and what constitutes consent (Gruber, 2016). SGBV can then become the outcome of contradictory views about this (Gruber, 2016).

When alcohol is involved, it also changes certain perspectives around consent, as college students often believe that when someone is intoxicated then this means that they cannot or are not willing to engage in sexual intercourse (Gruber, 2016; Jozkowski & Wiersma, 2015). In essence, being intoxicated often means the opposite, as consent is said to be tainted when an individual is not fully aware of their actions (Gruber, 2016). However, others may still engage in sexual intercourse with an intoxicated person and claim that they did say “yes” and this meant consent in the moment, especially if both parties were under the influence of alcohol (Gruber, 2016). This makes constructions of consent in relation to SGBV a very complicated phenomenon.

Specific cultural practices

There are cultural traditions in South Africa that have an ambiguous relation with general notions of sexual violence in that certain “legitimate” acts that occur within those cultural traditions are not deemed to be violent or to be rape (Jewkes et al., 2011). This includes a

traditional marriage practice, still carried out today, called *ukuthwala* (wife abduction) (Jewkes et al., 2011); this describes the custom of a man forcibly taking a girl to his home in anticipation of a customary marriage ceremony (Mwambene & Sloth-Nielsen, 2011). These girls can be as young as 12 and are forced to marry older men (Mwambene & Sloth-Nielsen, 2011). The custom is discussed by Ovens and Van der Watt (2012) who argue that *ukuthwala* has diverged from what once was a tradition that has now degenerated into a criminal act because the new manifestation sexually exploits and abuses children. They explain that there is now a reluctance to challenge the harmful practice; *ukuthwala* could silence and subordinate girls in this attempt to control their sexuality (Matthews et al., 2014). Sexual cleansing after traditional circumcision is another practice that is concerning in that it often takes the form of rape of a sexual partner about whom the man does not care (Jewkes et al., 2011).

iv. Specific contextual explanations

Universities/ college campuses

The population of college and university students is vulnerable to sexual violence (Belknap, 2010; Fedina et al., 2018; Gidycz et al., 2011; Potter et al., 2009); it is estimated that in the USA women aged 16 to 24 are most at risk of SGBV (Gross et al., 2006) creating a major public health problem in colleges' (McMahon, 2010). McMahon (2010) reports that between one in four to one in five college women have been victims of rape or attempted rape and 5% of these rapes are reported to the police (Belknap, 2010). Martin (2016) observes that forcible or incapacitated sexual assaults and rape have reached epidemic levels among college and university women and Fedina et al. (2018) showed that 25.4% of college women had experienced unwanted sexual contact, 14.2% unwanted sexual intercourse through use of drugs or alcohol and 9.7% unwanted sexual intercourse through sexual coercion.

Fraternities in the USA are risky perpetrators of sexual violence, alcoholism and American athletic teams have also been found to be rape prone (Martin, 2016; McMahon, 2010). The reasons are the homogeneity of members, extensive alcohol use, secrecy between and loyalty to members (Martin, 2016); fraternities have been known to keep silent even in illegal situations (Martin, 2016). Men in athletics teams are perceived as heroes in a university or college setting where they receive special treatment due to their athleticism encouraging the

delusion that they are exempt from the standard rules of society (Martin, 2016). Loud music, low lighting, and alcohol are exploited to enhance female compliance in a competition to prove and assert masculinity in these institutions which potentially reward aggression, competition, and the exploitation of women (Martin, 2016). When a dominating and aggressive masculinity is encouraged the likelihood of SGBV is increased (Martin, 2016). Although South African universities do not have fraternities, residences and athletics clubs are often linked to the proliferation of SGBV tolerant attitudes and behaviours.

Martin (2016) shows how university and college campuses in the USA perpetuate the risk of sexual violence. The academic administration often has conflicting priorities, in that sports teams, for example, provide significant income for the university or college because of donations from alumni, accrediting bodies, sports agencies, and corporations; they would not be afraid to withdraw contributions for a star athlete who finds himself on the bench for any reason. Fraternity alumni in America may, furthermore, believe that boys will be boys by drinking alcohol, having lots of sex and may put pressure on the president of the fraternity to limit the punishment of an accused if he does rape a woman (Martin, 2016).

There are some incidents of rape and SGBV on university/college campuses in South Africa reported by Clowes et al. (2009). For example, the University of the Western Cape (UWC) had a reported case of a female student stabbed to death by her boyfriend. This led the university to conduct 20 focus groups which brought to light coercive and unequal practices in heterosexual relationships that were and are common on this campus. In this study it was found that first-year female students from poverty-stricken backgrounds were particularly vulnerable to SGBV. Young women from university and college campuses in South Africa are, in addition, a likely target for older men known as sugar daddies, a risk factor in inequitable sexual relationships (Clowes et al., 2009; Gordon & Collins, 2013).

There have been reported incidents at Rhodes University in South Africa where rape protests in 2016 resulted from the #RU reference list having been circulated around the campus naming alleged rapists from the university (Carlisle, 2018; Carlisle & Macgregor, 2016; Macleod et al., 2018; Seddon, 2016). The protestors put pressure on the university to exclude the alleged rapists (Carlisle & Macgregor, 2016; Macleod et al., 2018; Seddon, 2016).

The social problems here are the criminal justice system, gender inequality in South African society, stigmatisation over sexual violence and acceptance of the larger problem of violence as a whole (Jewkes et al., 2011; Matthews et al., 2014). Rhodes University created a Sexual Violence Task Team (SVTT) after these protests which has been described as a systematic intervention and institutional response to SGBV in that it was set up in an open, public and participatory way (Macleod et al., 2018). This differs from the manner in which other universities in South Africa established SVTTs (Macleod et al., 2018).

Other South African universities that attracted the attention of the press are Nelson Mandela University, the University of Cape Town where numerous students were allegedly raped on campus, the University of Witwatersrand where women marched against rape and violence on campus and Tshwane University of Technology (Shange, 2018).

Such events suggests that college and university campuses are a space where SGBV is common (Gordon & Collins, 2013). The reasons for this are, firstly, that alcohol is a major part of university life (Jewkes et al., 2011; Kheswa & Hoho, 2017; Livingston et al., 2015; Macleod et al., 2018). Secondly, young women attending university, especially at an entry level, are often perceived as easy targets for unwanted sexual attention from older students who are men (Clowes et al., 2009). This is exacerbated by socioeconomic vulnerabilities experienced by many young, black women at universities in South Africa (Clowes et al., 2009). Thirdly, residences, private houses rented out with university friends and called digs, or fraternities can perpetuate SGBV because of absence of authority figures in these locations; hence inviting reckless behaviour (Macleod et al., 2018; Martin, 2016; McMahon, 2010). Lastly, certain situations of SGBV, such as forced sex, are sometimes seen as the norm of the community in certain areas in South Africa (Gordon & Collins, 2013). For example, in urban and rural townships in KwaZulu-Natal, an acceptance that is extended into tertiary institutions like universities and colleges (Gordon & Collins, 2013).

2.7. Interventions

2.7.1. Attitude Change

Research around interventions for sexual violence collectively agrees that rape prevention and intervention strategies must target men, as the most likely offenders (Carline, et al., 2018; Flood, 2015; García-Moreno et al., 2015; Malamuth et al., 2018; Weiss, 2010). They, in

addition, explain that men who are most likely to be sexual aggressive must be focused on particularly (Malamuth et al., 2018). This focus, however, has been absent in research in the majority of studies (Malamuth et al., 2018). García-Moreno et al. (2015) and Weiss (2010) note that focus on men will not be sufficient in an intervention against sexual violence, and that women and girls should be focused on too. A study by Sarnquist et al. (2014) in Kenya established that where rape prevention concentrated on the empowerment of adolescent girls, sexual assault rates decreased because increased disclosure of assault enabled victims to gain the care and support that they needed. This would assist in the identification and prosecution of perpetrators (Sarnquist et al., 2014). This suggests that empowerment of women is important in intervention strategies. The intervention strategies, based on the education and empowerment of women, include self-defense skills, role-plays, and facilitated discussions around self-awareness, communication, and how to set boundaries (Flood, 2015; García-Moreno et al., 2015; Ikeda & Rosser, 2010; Sarnquist et al., 2014). Carline et al. (2018) note, on the other hand, that many strategies for prevention in the UK have been criticised for focusing only on the behaviour of women, and that this perpetuates victim-blaming. Such helpful strategies often come in the form of carefully designed media campaigns which can be extremely influential in society (Carline et al., 2018).

A study by DeGue et al., (2014) showed how the majority of sexual violence prevention strategies have been psycho-educational programmes focused on educating and changing attitudes, which have been limited in curbing sexually violent behaviour. There is, furthermore, a discussion of a boomerang effect in which the interventions can have a reverse influence and increase the probability of sexually violent attitudes and aggression in high-risk men (Malamuth et al., 2018); but this possibility, not yet researched thoroughly, needs careful study to understand the extent of this possibility (Malamuth et al., 2018).

The reason for the boomerang effect results from psychological reactance of an individual's being aroused in defiance of perceived threats to personal choice and rejecting the preaching tone of interventions and contravening a sense of entitlement, causing angry reactions and hostile behaviours (Byrne & Hart, 2016).

2.7.2. Legal reform

Broad intervention strategies are discussed in the research, such as a need to improve awareness in the public and criminal justice system regarding what rape is in order to counter rape myths (Belknap, 2010). The law is important in enforcing correct social values and gender equity, but it cannot do this alone, especially when so few perpetrators are convicted of their crimes (Baker & Bevacqua, 2018; Jewkes et al., 2011; McGlynn, 2011). McGlynn (2011), furthermore, noticed that focus is too centered on punishment of the perpetrator. Other means of securing justice, such as believing the victim and providing them with compensation are not centralised (McGlynn, 2011).

Reasons why rape is under-reported in South Africa; include a lack of trust in the criminal justice system and a general fear of crime (Gordon & Collins, 2013). Women are raped on a seemingly uncontrollable level and authorities have no way of adequately responding to the situation meaning that more needs to be done to deal with SGBV on a legal level (Gordon & Collins, 2013).

Over the years South Africa has gone through substantial legal reform with regards to sexual offence laws which have addressed the definitions of different forms of SGBV, of evidence and of procedure (Van der Bijl & Rumney, 2009). An enactment of the 2007 Act shows a detailed reform of the legal rules relating to SGBV in South Africa thereby effecting many changes to the law in terms of rape (Van der Bijl & Rumney, 2009). Rape had been defined as a man having sexual intercourse with a woman without her consent, but after the 2007 Act, consent is referred to as voluntary or uncoerced agreement, which has widened the concept of sexual penetration (Van der Bijl & Rumney, 2009). The 2007 Act refers to any person and not only to men as the perpetrator (Van der Bijl & Rumney, 2009). Rape is therefore defined in the 2007 Act, “as any person (“A”) who unlawfully and intentionally commits an act of sexual penetration with a complainant (“B”), without consent of B, is guilty of the offence of rape” (Van der Bijl & Rumney, 2009, p. 418). Sexual penetration is, in addition, widely defined, as “genital organs of one person into or beyond the genital organs, anus, or mouth of another person”, “any part of the body of one person or, any object, including any part of the body of an animal” which has been placed into the “genital organs or anus of another person” and the

“genital organs of an animal” having been placed “into or beyond the mouth of another person” (Van der Bijl & Rumney, 2009, p. 418).

Although legal reform is promising on paper, evidence, however, suggests that rape law reform has only had a limited impact on the criminal justice system and its operation in South Africa (Van der Bijl & Rumney, 2009). The rule of law and law reform are one way of creating change in the legal process while social attitudes have a significant effect on the decision making processes of criminal justice particularly in relation to interventions against SGBV (Van der Bijl & Rumney, 2009). Many prejudicial, stereotypical, and incorrect perceptions of sexual violence in South Africa persist rendering changes in social attitudes towards SGBV equally as important as legal reform (Van der Bijl & Rumney, 2009). The police, prosecution, courts, and jury can often be influenced by negative social attitudes, myths, and stereotypes and is another reason for striving for an alteration in social attitudes (Van der Bijl & Rumney, 2009).

The process of enacting three new Bills in response to SGBV in South Africa by Cyril Ramaphosa was discussed above, but these are still a work in process (Mlaba, 2020).

The limited impact of law reform on the criminal justice system is not only a concern for South Africa; the USA is also concerned (Van der Bijl & Rumney, 2009). The reason being that legal reform and new legal rules might not have the desired results because the judge and, in America, the jury play a substantial role in using their own discretion when making decisions regarding a criminal case (Van der Bijl & Rumney, 2009). If they are swayed by public opinion then the outcome of the case will follow bias (Van der Bijl & Rumney, 2009).

2.7.3. Socioeconomic status

Individuals of a lower socioeconomic status often suffer from the risk of poor health (Semenza, 2010) so that young women are at risk of STIs, aggravated by SGBV which in turn is a contributory factor, worldwide, in the spread of HIV and AIDS (Onyejekwe, 2004). Women make up the vast majority of South Africa’s poor (Onyejekwe, 2004) and particular interventions target socioeconomic status, especially with regards to research on HIV and Tuberculosis (Semenza, 2010). The interventions are part of the vulnerable population approach which implements education for children around, for example, hygiene and safe sex

practices (Semenza, 2010). These education programmes target young people who may be at risk of SGBV and/or teenage pregnancy, especially in rural areas because unsafe sex practices can put people more at risk of STIs (Parwej et al., 2005). HIV interventions use behavioural, biomedical, and structural strategies when combating the disease; HIV spread is reduced by condom use, fewer sexual partners, and antiretroviral medications (Rotheram-Borus et al., 2009).

The focus in South Africa has been on participatory interventions some of which refer to “Stepping Stones” and “Creating Futures” which seek to reduce intimate partner violence and HIV through the promotion of gender equality and improved livelihoods for individuals (Gibbs et al., 2015). These interventions focus on specifically changing the behaviour of men and their ideas of masculinity (Gibbs et al., 2015). These interventions were examined by Gibbs et al. (2015) who found that a key part of the interventions was an improvement in financial outcomes for the participants and an increase in participation in the formal and informal economy. Furthermore, that there has been a shift in gender norms and relationships was helpful to this research. It demonstrated that men tended to engage with critical thinking about, for example, the power dynamics in their relationships as fundamental to challenging the dominant attitudes to masculinities. There were many, however, who continued to exert subtle control over their relationships, through several measures typical of coercive control of partners, some engaged in multiple sexual relationships, and some continued to indulge in SGBV against their partners. The implication is, therefore, that these interventions are not altogether successful (Gibbs et al., 2015).

2.7.4. Public Awareness

In order to change the dominant ideas of masculinity in society and to enable gender equality as essential to rape prevention programmes concerns would be sexual entitlement, gender hierarchy, and the prevention of punishment using violence as a show of power over women (García-Moreno et al., 2015; Jewkes et al., 2011). Jewkes et al. (2011), in addition, say that reducing men’s exposure to childhood trauma is of critical importance. The media should be required to provide accurate examples of rape and those that show rape myth acceptance should be condemned (O’Hara, 2012). García-Moreno et al. (2015) highlight government need to address political, social, and economic structures that subordinate women. They should

publicly condemn violence, develop and enforce laws to reduce violence, and create better policies to strengthen capabilities of institutions to support survivors (García-Moreno et al., 2015). Community and group interventions that involve both women and men should shift discriminatory social norms in order to reduce the risk of violence (García-Moreno et al., 2015). Men as victims of sexual violence should be acknowledged and not silenced in interventions and prevention strategies as well (Weiss, 2010). Rape-education programmes should address other oppressive beliefs alongside these programmes, such as racism and classism, as these have a role to play in sexual violence (Suarez & Gadalla, 2015).

A multi-media promotion project under the Soul City Institute for Health and Development Communication partnered with the National Network on Violence Against Women, created an intervention to address SGBV in South Africa (Usdin et al., 2005). This intervention intended to have an impact on the public at different levels, which were individual, community, and socio-political (Usdin et al., 2005). They managed to reach the public through Soul City television, booklets, and radio (Tufte, 2001) thereby spreading awareness and slightly shifting attitudes towards domestic violence, including an acquaintance and not only a stranger (Usdin et al., 2005). There was also a shift in perceptions of social norms regarding SGBV so that women felt an increased sense of efficacy in making decisions around their health in relation to SGBV (Usdin et al., 2005). There was therefore a connection between exposure to the intervention and resulting social change (Usdin et al., 2005). Soul City has had a large impact especially with raising awareness and the show was particularly successful in demonstrating to the audience how community-based interventions can help fight against SGBV (Tufte, 2001). The intervention, however, did not result in an actual reduction of SGBV (Usdin et al., 2005) so work remains to be done between measuring the causal links between media interventions such as that of Soul City and the extent to which they provide practical social change (Tufte, 2001). This suggests that there needs to be more in-depth research into this subject (Tufte, 2001).

Health care workers should be trained to support survivors and to be aware of the negative implications of rape myths (García-Moreno et al., 2015; Krolikowski & Koyfman, 2012; Luce et al., 2010). Krolikowski and Koyfman (2012) found that in a study on medical students in the USA, sexual assault education during healthcare training diminished their rape myth acceptance and promoted the need for screenings for sexual assault. Strategies on how to reduce

sexual violence should be run concurrently with services for child, sexual and reproductive, mental health, HIV infection, and substance abuse (García-Moreno et al., 2015). The most successful interventions, according to García-Moreno et al. (2015), are those that use multiple approaches when dealing with sexual violence, such as looking at not only the individual, but at the community and society at large as well; individual interventions are of importance too (Ullman & Peter-Hagene, 2014). For example, victims could benefit from being taught adaptive coping strategies, such as meditation and empowering self-defense training (Thompson, 2014; Ullman & Peter-Hagene, 2014). It has been demonstrated that self-defense training can promote freedom, a sense of self-worth, and can increase the safety of women and girls (Thompson, 2014).

Many victims of sexual violence feel that justice would be served were they to be believed and treated with respect by both the authorities and the public (McGlynn, 2011). Rape myths, however, remain pervasive, and there has been a limited consideration of how to address this phenomenon, with the persistent result that individuals do not receive the justice they both need, and deserve (Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). There is, for instance, no updated information on the demographics, attitudes, or behavioural factors that are associated with rape myths (Suarez & Gadalla, 2011).

2.7.5. Protest

Examples of intense protest interventions are when naked protests take place (Veneracion-Rallonza, 2014). These have happened on a global scale in recent years not only in relation to SGBV, although this has been a major focus for them (Veneracion-Rallonza, 2014). The concept is to use the naked body to stand for or against the matters for which the protest is initiated, and to use nakedness as a protest against SGBV in particular to highlight an assertion of ownership over the body and of celebrating an expression of womanhood: with the aim of a revolt against patriarchy (Veneracion-Rallonza, 2014).

Protests in South Africa that have targeted SGBV in 2016 were the #RURReferenceList, #EndPatriarchy, and #EndRapeCulture protests that took place on various university campuses around the country with the purpose of bringing an end to attitudes and behaviours that normalise SGBV on campuses (Gouws, 2018). These protests escalated, such as those at

Rhodes University when a Rhodes University Reference List released the names of men claiming to be known for SGBV with the result that two women were arrested for improper action against the alleged perpetrators (Gouws, 2018). The protestors argued that the university trivialises rape and they demanded action (Gouws, 2018). The topless marches undertaken by women from different universities in response to this led to an outcry from some men and members of the public who argued that these women were objectifying themselves (Gouws, 2018). The majority of the women in these protests were black, while other naked protests worldwide, such as FEMEN and SlutWalks have been mainly constituted by white women whose appearance fulfills the now outdated ideals of feminine beauty of western women and in turn serve the stereotype of heterosexual hegemonic femineity which can be seen to be insensitive towards so-called marginalised women (Gouws, 2018). Such types of interventions are therefore largely controversial, which makes them difficult to agree with (Gouws, 2018).

Protest interventions in South Africa have encountered particular problems, such as the SAPS using violent means to disrupt them and the protests themselves often becoming violent (Gouws, 2018; Thamm, 2019). Women in naked protests in South Africa have on many occasions been arrested, shot at with stun guns and water cannons, and have been manhandled by police (Thamm, 2019).

In response to the SGBV protests at Rhodes University, Rhodes created a SVTT, as mentioned above: the drafting of this document dealt with the management of sexual violence on campus and policies related to sexual offences (Macleod et al., 2018). There were, however, some matters of concern during the process to do with rifts between students and management and the role of university administration and faculty have in prosecuting alleged rapists and the extent to which the university itself can intervene in matters of public law (Macleod et al., 2018).

2.7.6. Bystander Interventions

An intervention that has received considerable attention in certain areas in the world is the bystander intervention (Chen et al., 2020; Fairbairn, 2020; Foubert et al., 2010; Gidycz et al., 2011; Malamuth et al., 2018; McMahan & Banyard, 2012; McMahan, 2010). This concept is gaining in respect and has been researched mainly on college campuses in the USA although

the extent of the research is as yet limited (Malamuth et al., 2018; McMahon & Banyard, 2012; McMahon, 2010). The idea behind this intervention is that potential witnesses to SGBV are equipped with, and taught, the correct skills that enable them to intervene or interrupt in these situations (Chen et al., 2020; Foubert et al., 2010; McMahon, 2010). Bystanders could respond supportively to a victim after an assault, which may be helpful for recovery (McMahon, 2010). Elias-Lambert and Black (2015) describe the bystander intervention as something that “targets all community members as potential bystanders and seeks to engage them in proactive behaviours that establish intolerance of violence as the norm, as well as reactive interventions in high-risk situations, resulting in the ultimate reduction of violence” (pp. 4-5). Foubert et al. (2010) explain that the bystander intervention goes right to the cause of sexual assault by targeting the primary foundation of the peer acceptance that supports and enables rape.

There are three levels to the intervention. These are primary, or prior to SGBV taking place, secondary which is in response during SGBV or in the midst of a high-risk situation, and tertiary prevention levels are undertaken after the assault (McMahon & Banyard, 2012). Primary interventions focus on changing social attitudes towards SGBV and educating individuals to recognise what high-risk situations would be and how to prevent them (Banyard et al., 2007), for example, helping individuals to intervene when hearing sexist comments and challenging any acceptance of violence (Banyard et al., 2004). Secondary interventions help bystanders recognise a threat of SGBV and to establish how to intervene when this occurs (Banyard et al., 2007). An example would be learning how to intervene at a party when a woman who may be intoxicated is being taken upstairs where she is likely to be raped (Banyard et al., 2004). Tertiary interventions are targeted towards approaching police, securing legal help, and providing support for the victim (McMahon & Banyard, 2012).

McMahon (2010) establishes that education around rape myths should coincide with bystander interventions in order to gain the best results. McMahon and Banyard (2012), furthermore, note that the conceptual framework behind the bystander intervention needs to be improved in that the range of opportunities for bystander action, the instances in which intervention would be appropriate, and the connections between them require a lucid articulation in order to secure their effectiveness; without all these elements being in place there can be no helpful and practical assistance or only limited success. This is because individuals who may understand

how to intervene in theory, can be inept when faced with the realities of a crisis in real life (McMahon & Banyard, 2012).

A study undertaken by Coker et al. (2011) on the bystander intervention on college campuses in the USA found that it significantly lowered rape myth acceptance and created more active bystander behaviours in trained students when compared with non-trained students. Gidycz et al. (2011), furthermore, found positive results for bystander interventions on a college campus. Men who participated in the intervention found sexually aggressive behaviour less reinforcing than they had done before the study took place. Foubert et al. (2010), in an all-men college campus study, found that the programme was effective in changing the attitudes and behaviours of the participants. What was interesting in this study was that the participants felt that the programme still influenced them as much as two years after the study which indicates the long-term success rate of the bystander intervention (Foubert et al., 2010). Another study established a positive impact on bystander confidence as being able to intercede with those who participated in the intervention but noted that research needs to be done not only on college campuses, but elsewhere in the USA community in order to measure the possibly larger impact of the intervention on individuals (Alegría-Flores et al., 2017). The intervention shows potential, but needs to be improved upon, as is discussed above.

The study by Malamuth et al. (2018) in the USA argues that most of the sexual violence prevention programmes that have been published to date, specifically around college campuses, are not effective other than the bystander model. There is, moreover, no information demonstrating that the bystander model or any other interventions succeed in changing the behaviour of those high-risk men who have ingrained hostile attitudes towards women, and this is because there has been no specific examination of them (Malamuth et al., 2018). The fact is that even the few interventions that have had very positive reviews have shown changes in attitudes, but not in behaviours (Malamuth et al., 2018).

In China, a recent study of the bystander intervention found that the study was in line with existing literature affirming that the bystander intervention is a valuable way of addressing sexual assault for Chinese college communities (Chen et al., 2020).

Fairbairn (2020) has noted that although the bystander intervention has been used mostly in a face-to-face context, there is a possibility that using these interventions can be effective if employed online.

2.8. Concluding comments

2.8.1. Why this research is important

The research cited above has pointed out, apart from bystander intervention, what may help to reduce sexual violence. There is no specificity about interventions and prevention strategies in much of the research considered. This is problematic, as it shows that the research done to date is not very helpful in finding proper concrete solutions to SGBV. The interventions are discussed as ideals of what should be done, but not many have implemented the interventions themselves (Michau et al., 2015). García-Moreno et al. (2015) argue that there should be more research done on rape interventions and prevention strategies and more data collection pointing to the need for much more research into interventions and prevention strategies in order to make a difference in reducing the incidences of SGBV. Not that many articles could be traced that dealt with intervention and prevention strategies either, which suggests that more research is necessary. Rates of SGBV remain extremely high and still very little is known on how to prevent it (DeGue et al., 2014) while Baker and Bevacqua (2018) emphasise that literature regarding feminist anti-rape campaigns has been shown to be misguided, ineffective or often harmful to survivors. They do not necessarily agree with this position in their article and support the promotion of community-based interventions, but this does highlight inadequacies concerning the interventions being used and the research being done (Baker & Bevacqua, 2018). Baker and Bevacqua (2018) also discuss the fact that Patricia Yancey Martin, who is an American sociologist and specialises in gender and feminist research, believes that certain scholars do not feel that research around rape is needed anymore. Her understanding is that scholars may be too distressed to engage with the topic or that they may think it has become an illegitimate area of research. This is concerning, as the scale of SGBV worldwide is on the increase and therefore research and interventions should be increasing as well, and not decreasing (Friedman, 2018; White, 2015).

2.8.2. Focus of research

The focus of this research concentrates on student responses to anti-rape poster campaigns; the discourse surrounding rape falls under the broad definition of SGBV. This research extends its purview towards a possible amelioration of a persistent and damagingly high rate of sexual violence by means of an examination of the study of bystander intervention with a view to its successful implementation. In the pursuit of this goal, matters such as sexism, sexual harassment, and sexual assault are explored. Primary intervention is central to this research, which means changing the social attitudes of individuals in order to prevent rape (McMahon & Banyard, 2012).

This study concentrates on student discursive positioning in relation to anti-rape poster campaigns and the use of the bystander intervention approach together with the reception of such campaigns by target audiences. The focus is on social responses towards anti-rape poster campaigns and student constructions of SGBV and to an analysis of their responses to anti-rape poster campaigns regarding such interventions. Posters are a useful tool for the introduction of bystander interventions onto South African university campuses because students might be fruitful receptors of such interventions. The research looks into how these discursive strategies could inform the success of such a poster campaign particularly in relation to explicit student views about SGBV, as well as to gauge how students may view bystander approaches to interventions.

2.9. Conclusion

This chapter discussed the literature about SGBV, its history, prevalence, consequences, and explanations for why it occurs. Interventions were explored followed by a brief description of the importance of this research and its focus. The next chapter deals with theories that relate to SGBV.

CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON SGBV

3.1. Introduction

This chapter outlines theoretical perspectives on SGBV, which include individual, psychosocial/cultural, socio-structural and integrative theories. Each theory is discussed in terms of strengths and weaknesses followed by an explanation of why the theory of social constructionism has been chosen to underpin this study.

3.2. Theories

3.2.1. Individual-level theories

Individual-level theories are about the individual, their behaviours, emotions, and physical and psychological makeup (Jasinski, 2001; Jewkes et al., 2011; Mooney, 2000; Yakeley, 2009). SGBV is seen as something inherently part of their genetics or physical and psychological composition (Jasinski, 2001; Jewkes et al., 2011; Mooney, 2000; Yakeley, 2009). Individual-level theories can include/incorporate evolutionary psychology and psychopathology with branches, such as psychoanalysis (Jasinski, 2001; Jewkes et al., 2011; Mooney, 2000; Rudman & Glick, 2012; Travis, 2003; Yakeley, 2009).

a. Evolutionary theory

The evolutionary theory stipulates that the human mind is inherited and is a product of the evolutionary process having shaped thoughts and behaviour (Barkow et al., 1995). Adaptation in humans is due to the functioning of the brain evolving over time (Barkow et al., 1995). This is facilitated by the process of natural selection (Barlow et al., 1995; Ferguson & Beaver, 2009; Klasios, 2019). Individuals have created psychological adaptations or cognitive mechanisms to deal better with the changing nature of the world (Barkow et al., 1995). The evolutionary theory draws upon Darwin's Theory of Evolution highlighting present behaviours and mental processes of individuals that are passed down by ancestors (Barkow et al., 1995; Klasios, 2019).

This theory states that sex differences between individuals are biologically based and are characterised both through physical characteristics and psychological traits, behaviours, and mental processes (Rudman & Glick, 2012). The psychological parts of the human makeup are genetic and biological and are not learnt by social or cultural means (Rudman & Glick, 2012). Evolutionary biology then asserts that men and women differ fundamentally and that gender stereotypes, such as men being logical and women emotional, stem from stable sex differences that have evolved as a result of the need to increase the odds of survival of the human race (Rudman & Glick, 2012). Men would be stereotyped as aggressive and women nurturing as a result of innate sex differences; that men have evolved to be competitive providers and women to become caregivers is classified under the definition, essentialism (Rudman & Glick, 2012).

Another argument of this theory is that heterosexual reproduction in humans can be compared to that of animals (Rudman & Glick, 2012). Psychological and behavioural sex differences must then have an evolutionary impact that is similar across species (Rudman & Glick, 2012).

i. How the evolutionary theory relates to SGBV

There are those who believe that what is understood about sex and sexuality is socially constructed (Travis, 2003). SGBV behaviours are said to be learned and normalised by society (Burr, 2018; Jasinski, 2001; Nayak et al., 2003; Rudman & Glick, 2012). The evolutionary theory argues differently by considering behaviours that result in SGBV as inherently part of the human biological makeup (Jasinski, 2001). Different unique factors that relate the evolutionary theory to SGBV are sexual selection and criminal behaviour, which will be detailed below.

1. Sexual selection

This theory argues the premise of sexual selection, which is similar to Darwin's Theory of Natural Selection and focuses on the reproductive need to pass on genetic constitutions (Ferguson & Beaver, 2009; Rudman & Glick, 2012). Individuals seek the most attractive mate, with the purpose of the man to procreate as much as possible in order to pass on, and ensure the survival of, his genes (Jasinski, 2001; Pina et al., 2009). Rape is understood to be an extreme

response to the pressure of natural selection whereby men face reproductive desperation and then overpower a woman to satisfy this need (Jasinski, 2001).

Sexual harassment is viewed as sexual aggression in men with a very strong inner drive to find a partner and to procreate at any cost resulting in coercive sexual behaviours when denied the opportunity to satisfy his desire in a socially acceptable way (Klasios, 2019; Pina et al., 2009). This behaviour should not be viewed as harassment according to this theory (Pina et al., 2009).

The “male-warrior” hypothesis determines that men are more aggressive and competitive by comparison with women because the benefits of access to a mate, prestige, and heroism outweigh the risks of engaging in harassing behaviour (Klasios, 2019; Vugt et al., 2007). These above factors highlight the tendency to dominate women and behave aggressively which is linked to SGBV (Jasinski, 2001; Rudman & Glick, 2012).

For women, this theory has it, the desire for a mate who can provide resources for her family maximises their potential for survival (Rudman & Glick, 2012). A man’s social status and dominance supposedly indicate his ability to provide and outdo other men for resources which will influence a woman’s choice of partner (Rudman & Glick, 2012). When men feel the pressure of increasing competition for male dominance, rape evens out the playing field because procreation through rape allows men to pass on genes even when they cannot find a “romantic” partner (Rudman & Glick, 2012). This is how rape comes to be viewed as a woman’s fault because her choosing only provider men forces non-providers to engage in SGBV (Rudman & Glick, 2012).

2. Criminal behaviour

Neurobiological factors are the underlying biology that give rise to personalities, trait affects, and temperaments, which make an individual vulnerable to, or can be a predictor of, a mental pathology (Hariri, 2009). It has been established that increased amygdala reactivity can be a predictor of anxiety (Hariri, 2009). Other studies have noted that the serotonergic system and hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis system along with stress can promote aggression and borderline personality disorder (BPD) (Gollan et al., 2005). The triggering of violence is individualistic to the background and biological makeup and therefore something that has gone

wrong physiologically within the person themselves (Hariri, 2009). SGBV is therefore said to be a consequence of genetic physiology and pre-existing mental pathology, which promotes aggression and violence (Hariri, 2009).

This theory explains criminal behaviours, such as engaging in SGBV as being determined by biology and evolution (Ferguson, 2009; Klasios, 2019). Genetics, as the most powerful contributor to SGBV or other violent and antisocial behaviours are found in genetically at-risk individuals who are most likely to engage in impulsive, aggressive, antisocial, and violent behaviour (Ferguson & Beaver, 2009; Rose, 2000). An abnormality leads to an uncontrollable urge to perform such acts due to gene polymorphisms (genetic variation due to natural selection) that increase the risk of violent behaviour (Ferguson & Beaver, 2009; Rose, 2000).

Additionally, the idea of “criminality” itself is a consequence of human social practices and convention (Ferguson & Beaver, 2009; Rose, 2000). This theory if correct then argues that the anti-social behaviours mentioned here (impulsivity, aggression, violence) result from genetic predisposition, which presumably supercedes social convention and means that behaviours such as SGBV that are consequences of aggressive and antisocial personalities, are inevitable (Ferguson & Beaver, 2009; Rose, 2000). Consequently, these behaviours should not be seen as immoral or criminal acts but have only become so due to subsequent social convention (Ferguson & Beaver, 2009; Rose, 2000). This is problematic as society must then not punish anyone for SGBV or other criminal behaviours because this is genetic and no intervention can change this (Ferguson & Beaver, 2009; Rose, 2000). SGBV would never be reduced if this theory is correct (Ferguson & Beaver, 2009; Rose, 2000). This along with the sexual selection premise then causes common-sense understandings of everyday people to associate SGBV as a product of the biology of men or as the result of deviant individuals who have a mental pathology (Ferguson & Beaver, 2009; Rose, 2000). This consequently supports rape myths and undermines the prevalence of SGBV as being the result of the actions of many ordinary individuals who are both men and women (Ferguson & Beaver, 2009; Rose, 2000).

ii. Evaluation of the merits of the evolutionary perspective

This is a recognition, proved by research, that there are potentially inherent human instincts that drive sexually aggressive behaviour and that genetic factors marginally can cause violent behaviour (Ferguson & Beaver, 2009).

The weaknesses of this theory centre on evolutionary biology, sexual selection, paternity, masculinity, and criminal behaviour which are highlighted below.

1. Evolutionary biology

Men and women differ psychologically and physically, but psychological traits can be small and even non-existent (Rudman & Glick, 2012). Sex differences do not mean that different capabilities manifest in different genders as the evolutionary theory argues (Rudman & Glick, 2012). This means that the premise that SGBV is a result of genetics or personality traits in men and women is false (Rudman & Glick, 2012).

This theory ignores societal and personal factors in its trivialisation of SGBV as merely the result of a normal reproductive ritual or the behaviour of a few deviant individuals (Pina et al., 2009). It predicts that women are sole victims of SGBV, which does not account for the abuse of men or children, and there is, importantly, very little literature that supports this perception of SGBV (Pina et al., 2009).

2. Sexual selection

Men and women supposedly cross-culturally focus on different sexual characteristics when choosing a partner, such as women on earning potential and men on attractiveness. This theory is proven inadequate in that women of high status and earning potential are often indifferent to a man's earning power and this is not cross-culturally consistent, occurring only in particular economic configurations, making it social (Rudman & Glick, 2012). Women are furthermore, according to this theory, seen as passive and driven by reproductive, not sexual, desire to prefer men with status and not those of the working-class which causes male desperation and uncontrollable desire (Burr, 2001). This is problematic, as it highlights that because women are

particular, they essentially cause the fostering of men's dominance and women's subordination (Kelly, 2013; Rudman & Glick, 2012). This places pressure on men to outcompete other men, essentially causing aggression and the women's victimisation, faulting them for rape (Kelly, 2013; Rudman & Glick, 2012).

Rape as an extreme response to the pressure of natural selection has a series of faulty premises. It suggests that only attractive women would be raped and only the genes of the rapist would be passed on by natural selection with the result that rape would be rewarded and become normalised as the dominant form of procreation (Burr, 2001; Coyne & Berry, 2000; Jasinski, 2001). This argues that the men who have survived are genetically predisposed to violence and bearing the "warrior gene" or the gene that promotes dominance, aggression and competitiveness (Klasios, 2019, p. 42) so rendering violence the dominant gene and breeding SGBV into the population. This biologises SGBV, with the implication that society will never be rid of it, while violent men pass on these genes ensuring the predominance of such behaviour (Klasios, 2019). That this has not happened suggests that this theory is invalid (Burr, 2001; Coyne & Berry, 2000).

Although SGBV and intimate partner violence are prevalent, perhaps these phenomena are brought about by societal and experiential backgrounds rather than genetics (Pina et al., 2009). The sexual promiscuity of men has generally been culturally acceptable, but women have been shunned for the same behaviour (Rudman & Glick, 2012). That men enjoy casual sex, never having suffered its negative consequences while women have, is a cultural phenomenon (Rudman & Glick, 2012).

Bravado, risk-taking, and aggression might also increase the chances of a man removing himself from the gene-pool through death by violence, which is problematic for natural and sexual selection (Archer, 2009). Men, especially young men, turn to violence and crime to impress women with their potentially successful access to status and resources (Klasios, 2019). Dominant provider men engage in the opposite action of what they should be doing to increase their chances of survival and progress their genes to the next generation (Archer, 2009). Evolutionary theory argues that survival is not as important to their offspring as it is to women who are not aggressive (Archer, 2009). Men are competitive not necessarily through biology, but rather as a reflection of cultural ideals of hegemonic masculinity, using physical bravery to

maintain ascendancy. For example, by discouraging bullying from other men (Rudman & Glick, 2012).

3. Criminal behaviour

Another weakness of this theory is that if an individual is genetically wired to be violent then no rehabilitation or education to change this behaviour would succeed suggesting that society must manage potentially risky individuals to ensure the safety of the community (Rose, 2000). The evolutionary theory trivialises SGBV by classifying it as a naturally occurring phenomenon or as a result of a “few skewed proclivities in some men”, and hiding the actual gravity of SGBV (Pina et al., 2009, p. 133). This ignores the normative *cultural* (rather than biological) context of SGBV (Pina et al., 2009), which is that the majority of offenders are ordinary men who would benefit from this rehabilitation and education (Rose, 2000).

b. Psychopathology

Psychopathology, despite the controversy around the definition, is the study of maladaptive behaviour in individuals (Cloninger, 1999). Behaviour and relationship problems that lead to violent behaviour and pathologies stem from a reaction to relationships with childhood caregivers, which is why psychoanalysis forms part of psychopathology (Frosh, 2012). For example, childhood sexual or physical abuse can lead to later pathologies (Frosh, 2012). Psychoanalytic theory explains behaviour, especially sexuality and desire, by establishing that early childhood experiences of caregiver relationships can pave the way for the development of adult personality and have consequences for the unconscious motivation of behaviours (Frosh, 2012). The unconscious does not mean the unknown, but rather the deep-seated, foundational personality and relational dynamics that are modelled on the experiences and quality of early caregiver relationships (Frosh, 2012).

1. Psychopathology and neurobiological factors

Psychopathology argues that rapists are mentally ill, have personality disorders, and engage in deviant behaviours due to these disorders (Jasinski, 2001; Lea & Auburn, 2001). While it could be argued that this reasoning is outdated, many media outlets have still been shown to use this

stereotype of rapists as deviant monsters, and not as ordinary men (O'Hara, 2012). This then is passed on to the public and supports rape myth acceptance around SGBV being an abnormality (O'Hara, 2012).

Jasinski (2001) argues that individuals who engage in SGBV do not have the same inhibitory capabilities for the prevention of violent behaviour. The thesis is that violent men are mentally unstable or that there is a neurobiological basis for why they commit SGBV and are violent towards women as the weak easy target (Mooney, 2000). Such pathologically violent men cannot express their anger, frustration, or sexuality through socially acceptable channels due to a lack of adequate communication skills (Mooney, 2000). Violence, a rare occurrence, is therefore understood as being due to an abnormal neurobiology (Jasinski, 2001). Some researchers, for example, refer to BPD, which interacts with learned behaviour, and can produce intense and violent anger (Jasinski, 2001). Yakeley (2009) states that trauma and violence that occur early on in life may unconsciously account for later violence and character abnormalities or psychosis, enacted through these violent behaviours (Mooney, 2000; Yakeley, 2009).

2. Attachment

It is argued that disorganised attachment in childhood, especially from mothers can lead to impaired personality development, which can in turn result in BPD and narcissism (Jewkes et al., 2011; Wekerle & Wolfe, 1999). Failure to provide adequate caregiving in childhood can create a lack of ability in the individual to regulate adult emotions (Yakeley, 2009). This impact on personality development is said to lower empathy levels which can result in an inclination towards rape or SGBV (Jewkes et al., 2011). This inadvertently blames the mother for raising a child inadequately and promotes rape myth acceptance by excusing the perpetrator's actions as a pathology in them being caused by his/her family environment or how he/she grew up (Jewkes et al., 2011). Most individuals who grow up in unstable households do not have mental pathologies (Jewkes et al., 2011).

Attachment is related to SGBV due to the Oedipal complex where in the psychosexual stages of development a boy child is said to develop feelings of desire for and possession of his mother and has jealousy and anger toward his father (Frosh, 2012). This is then about power and

possession of women, is patriarchal and potentially of significance to SGBV if the Oedipal conflict (which is understood as a normal part of every boy child's psychological development) is unresolved or resolved in a pathology-generating manner (Berezkei & Gyuris, 2009; Frosh, 2012). SGBV is then again seen as a deviance in the perpetrator and supports rape myth acceptance in the public (Berezkei & Gyuris, 2009; Frosh, 2012).

One of the processes of psychoanalysis is to consider the significance of unconscious phantasies as an underlying reason for violent behaviours (Yakeley, 2009). The role of the father in the child's life is significant: if the father is violent to the child or the mother, the child may have phantasies that promote the use of violence when the child is an adult as a defence mechanism in response to the early experience of shame and humiliation (Mooney, 2000; Yakeley, 2009).

3. Aggression

Aggression is understood by psychoanalysis to be an underlying cause of SGBV (Yakeley, 2009). The capacity for aggressive behaviour is innate, however, and aggression and violence can occur due to perceived internal or external threats to the self (Yakeley, 2009).

Two forms of violence are self-preservative and sadomasochistic violence (Yakeley, 2009).

Self-preservative violence is a primal response which occurs due to a threat to the physical or psychological self, such as fear of castration, attacks on one's self-esteem, frustration, humiliation or an insult directed to an individual's ideologies or opinions (Yakeley, 2009). This could include internal thoughts, such as a sadistic superego or rigid subconscious, the fear of loss of identity, and internal identity confusion (Yakeley, 2009). This form of violence is a way of trying to eliminate danger, geared towards another individual or the self, through self-harm or suicide (Yakeley, 2009).

Sadomasochistic violence, on the other hand, is the sexualisation of self-preservative violence, usually observed through pervasive behaviour (Yakeley, 2009). Individuals engage in SGBV and exhibit preferred and persistent deviant sexual behaviour reflecting an abnormality or deviance in the personality (Yakeley, 2009). The difference between self-preservative and

sadomasochistic violence is that self-preservative violence emerges from a perceived fear of danger from the object of the violence and that there is anxiety in the performance of the violence; whereas in a sadomasochistic attack, the tortured response of the victim is crucial to the perpetrator and pleasure is derived from this action (Yakeley, 2009). These types of violence occur on a continuum, and can range from sexual harassment to rape and murder (Yakeley, 2009). This promotes the idea of SGBV being a result of deviant individuals and a sadomasochistic attack (Yakeley, 2009). This supports rape myths of ordinary people not being capable of this act (Yakeley, 2009).

Psychoanalysis also deals with affective violence which is used as a defence mechanism, and with predatory violence involving calculation and lack of emotion perpetrated usually by a psychopathic character, many of whom engage in SGBV (Yakeley, 2009). This relates to what was said above about the sadomasochistic violence (Yakeley, 2009).

i. Evaluating psychoanalytic explanations for SGBV

This theory attaches itself to a particular ideology and defends it despite any evidence, such as sociological arguments that contradict it (Ferguson, 2009); one instance is the insistence upon permanent sex differences that have been disproven, as mentioned above.

The strengths of this theory lie in its delineations of mentally unstable individuals as being likely to engage in SGBV and pointing to potential perpetrator identification possibilities (García-Moreno et al., 2015; Luce et al., 2010; O'Hara, 2012). It does this by providing a theoretical basis upon which to identify a very specific set of risk factors for perpetration. Secondly, it categorises different forms of violence enabling identification of the particular acts of violence that occur (Yakeley, 2009). Lastly, it explores and explains childhood trauma as a risk factor in SGBV (Yakeley, 2009). These risk factors, however, have been proven to be more social in nature rather than pathological, especially due to the prevalence of perpetrators that engage in SGBV (García-Moreno et al., 2015; Jasinski, 2001; Lea & Auburn, 2001; Luce et al., 2010; O'Hara, 2012). This means that psychoanalysis arguing that SGBV is a result of a mental pathology that has occurred in the perpetrator due to their upbringing is perhaps not the right argument (García-Moreno et al., 2015; Jasinski, 2001; Lea & Auburn, 2001; Luce et al., 2010; O'Hara, 2012). These types of behaviours are rather learnt overtime through family

environment, schooling, friendships, the media, and societal norms (García-Moreno et al., 2015; Jasinski, 2001; Lea & Auburn, 2001; Luce et al., 2010; O'Hara, 2012). These behaviours are then not the result of individual psychopathology, but are rather a product of hegemonic masculinity, patriarchy, and gender stereotypes (García-Moreno et al., 2015; Jasinski, 2001; Lea & Auburn, 2001; Luce et al., 2010; O'Hara, 2012).

It highlights SGBV as a rare occurrence, only perpetrated by individuals who are severely mentally impaired, deviant or abnormal (Jasinski, 2001; Lea & Auburn, 2001). This is not feasible, however, as SGBV is too prevalent to be instigated only by the mentally unstable (García-Moreno et al., 2015; Jasinski, 2001; Lea & Auburn, 2001; Luce et al., 2010; O'Hara, 2012).

The theory is problematic in that it argues that those who did not have adequate care giving as children will grow up to have personality disorders and become violent because only a small number of violent individuals have disorganised attachment as a child, most do not develop personality disorders (Jasinski, 2001).

Each of these individual-level theories are not adequate for this research. This is because these theories do not allow room for intervention, which is what this study aims to achieve.

3.2.2. Psychosocial/cultural theories

These are social learning and gender role strain theory (GRST). They form the bridge between individual and socially focused explanations (Jasinski, 2001; Javaid, 2010; Kelly, 2013; Lea & Auburn, 2001; Muehlenhard & Kimes 1999; Rudman & Glick, 2012; Ryan, 2011; Sultana, 2010).

a. Social learning theory

Individuals learn behaviours through experience and the modelling of others (Ferguson & Beaver, 2009; Jasinski, 2001). Through socialisation, we observe, imitate and learn from other people about appropriate and inappropriate behaviours (Jasinski, 2001).

This theory argues that SGBV occurs due to violent individuals learning that violence is appropriate in the context of the family circumstances in which they grew up (Foshee et al., 2001; Jasinski, 2001; Wekerle & Wolfe, 1999). According to Jasinski (2001), Bandura suggested that violence is learned through family, culture, and also the influence of subculture, such as the centrality of the media in its being able to desensitize viewers to violence through repeated and taught methods of aggression (Jasinski, 2001; Wekerle & Wolfe, 1999). Rape, for example, is aggressive behaviour towards women which can be absorbed by the compulsion to imitate rape scenes and other acts of violence which are often found in the mass media (Jasinski, 2001). Individuals can associate sexuality with violence, because often the two are viewed together, and can be linked to the perpetuation of rape myths and the desensitizing views of responses to a particular perception of the pain, fear, and humiliation that comes with sexual aggression (Jasinski, 2001). This theory is possibly a better explanation for SGBV than the individualistic theories mentioned above, as it allows for intervention and the possibility of reform for perpetrators, while the above ones do not. It also helps to undermine rape myths, as it does not excuse sexual aggression as being innately part of the perpetrator, but as a taught behaviour (Jasinski, 2001). This means that emphasis is on perpetrators being socialised to behave a certain way, which means society is to blame for SGBV and not the victim (Jasinski, 2001). Intervention can then occur through trying to educate the perpetrator on why their behaviours are problematic (Jasinski, 2001). The public can also be taught about hegemonic masculinity, gender stereotypes, and patriarchal ideology, which promote rape myth acceptance and SGBV (Jasinski, 2001).

i. Evaluating social learning perspectives on SGBV

The social learning theory takes note of the problem in which individuals are desensitized to violence through the media particularly television (Jasinski, 2001; Van As & Ramanjam, 2008; Wekerle & Wolfe, 1999). This highlights the impact of the media on the behaviour of individuals worldwide (Browne & Hamilton-Giachritsis, 2005; Van As & Ramanjam, 2008). The study by Van As and Ramanjam (2008) identifies children's television programmes as having increasingly portrayed violent incidents over the years and children are particularly vulnerable to the effects of this experience because they tend to perceive cartoons and the fantasy television offerings as real. These children, becoming habituated to violence and cruelty by this persistent viewing, have a propensity for all forms of violence in adulthood,

which would include SGBV (Browne & Hamilton-Giachritsis, 2005; Van As & Ramanjam, 2008).

Another strength of this theory is that it does highlight how children learn behaviours from parents and their families and that this has a lasting influence on how they function later on in life (Van As & Ramanjam, 2008). The impact may not be as great as the theory suggests, however, it does have some merit in its explication of this as a risk factor (Van As & Ramanjam, 2008).

This theory is correct in establishing that some individuals can learn by example to behave violently, and that this is similar to what social constructionism argues regarding the way in which individuals are socialised through language and discourse to behave in a certain way (Eagly & Wood, 2013; Rudman & Glick, 2012; Van As & Ramanjam, 2008).

Jasinski (2001) states that this theory does not explain much about the phenomenon of violence against women and only deals with learned helplessness. The portrayal of women as submissive, inferior, and weak is reinforced by their being powerless to escape from abusive relationships so they are blamed for a passive inability actively to seek help in order to manage their own lives (Jasinski, 2001). Women are said to stay in violent and sexually violent relationships, according to the social learning theory, because of a learned helplessness through which they perceive abuse as being out of their ability to control and escape from (Jasinski, 2001).

This theory argues unsatisfactorily that anyone who was abused or saw violence as a child grows up to be violent, but the reality is that only a small percentage of violent individuals have been exposed to violence as a child (Jasinski, 2001). Social Learning should not be viewed narrowly as a simple process of observing and imitating behaviours seen in the immediate environment, but could rather be understood more along the lines of observing, internalising and enacting the value systems circulating in the broader socio-cultural context (Jasinski, 2001). The emphasis here is possibly misplaced slightly by this theory, as it is not only the family environment of the child that leads to behaviours that invoke SGBV, rather it is notions of hegemonic masculinity, patriarchy, gender stereotypes, schooling, communities and

societies that also play a role (Jasinski, 2001). Intervention is possible with regards to this theory, but it is perhaps too narrow minded to be used in this research study.

b. Gender role strain theory (GRST)

The GRST focuses on two aspects of gender: gender division of labour and gender-based hierarchy. Gender division of labour delineates the separate way in which responsibilities and roles are distributed among men and women in society (Eagly et al., 2000; Rudman & Glick, 2012). Gender-based hierarchy deals with instances in which men usually have more status and power than do women (Eagly et al., 2000; Rudman & Glick, 2012). Structural factors in society determine the ideas that inform socially shared beliefs about the roles of men and women in order to establish the structural shape observed in the gender differences attributed to personality, skill, and behaviour (Eagly et al., 2000; Rudman & Glick, 2012). The roles that individuals occupy are formed by the tasks designated to them in society, with women being assigned to child-rearing while men fill the roles of breadwinner, labourer, and leader (Eagly et al., 2000; Rudman & Glick, 2012). There are status differences between men and women because men, designated as the providers, are assigned a higher-status role than that of the homemaker, who, without the provider, would not survive (Eagly et al., 2000; Rudman & Glick, 2012).

The conventions of traditional masculine ideology influences society by encouraging, informing, and constraining men to conform to the norms of the male role which is achieved through interactions that result in learning reinforcement of behaviours and punishing forbidden behaviours through observation of other men (Fontaine, 2019; Levant & Richmond, 2016). This type of masculinity conforms to a single standard of the ideals of heterosexual, middle-class, white men of heterosexuality, dominance, aggression, and the willingness to exert power over others (Griffith et al., 2011). This refers to hegemonic masculinity (Griffith et al., 2011). When an individual does not conform to this norm then he often de-values his own sense of self as a man (Davis, 1987).

Women and men can be harmed by restrictive gender role assignment as Davis (1987) and Kassing et al. (2005) point out, because of the resulting emotions leading to anxiety and depression emanating from the controlling influence of society, concerns of power and

competition, homophobia, and the compulsion to perfection. The demands of socialisation often limit a man's potential for a full life (Davis, 1987), described by Kassing et al. (2005) as gender role conflict.

Conforming to these gender roles is a protection against the consequences of difference from the norm, against rejection or disapproval by the majority (Eagly et al., 2000; Rudman & Glick, 2012). If women and men were assigned equality in child rearing and homemaking, they would be granted equality of personality and skill in the workforce (Eagly et al., 2000; Rudman & Glick, 2012). So, it is societal judgment that determines gender roles, and not nature or innate or learned skills (Eagly et al., 2000; Rudman & Glick, 2012).

But that perspective has shifted overtime: roles have changed, and women have become increasingly active in the workforce. Even so, women continue to be the primary caregivers even when they hold a job, while most men's roles have remained statically the chief provider in a home where their contribution is usually limited (Rudman & Glick, 2012).

There were ten propositions formulated over 20 years ago in 1981 by Pleck that form the basis of research on the GRST (Jun, 2009). These propositions are sex-role stereotypes and norms and are usually contradictory and inconsistent. Characteristics of some sex roles are psychologically dysfunctional and as many of them violate these sex roles social outcasting and negative psychological consequences can follow; these are more severe for men than for women. Violation of these norms creates over-conforming to rigid gender roles. Sex-role strain, caused by historical and social change leads individuals to try to adhere to rigid gender norms that do not fit with the ever-changing needs of society (Jun, 2009). These propositions mean that because of these societal sex-role stereotypes and norms, which are usually unobtainable; men and women often fail to meet these expectations and this leads to low self-esteem and other negative psychological consequences (Jun, 2009). The over-conforming to these rigid gender roles also creates trauma for those who successfully follow them, as they are constrained by their role's rigidity and there is then no room for flexibility in their sense of self (Jun, 2009). These factors can cause aggressive behaviours due to low self-esteem, which can lead to violence or SGBV (Jun, 2009). These propositions have been fundamental to research around GRST and SGBV, and provide some understanding as to why men can behave in aberrant ways (Jun, 2009). The over-conforming to rigid gender roles, furthermore, promotes rape myth

acceptance, as hostility towards SGBV victims is caused by bias in favor of the perpetrator where the woman was seemingly asking for it or needed to be put in her place (Jun, 2009).

The fact that women are viewed as inferior and subordinate, makes them vulnerable to SGBV because their lower-status position underpins the power relations between men and women, and power informs violent behaviour (Jasinski, 2001; Rudman & Glick, 2012; Sultana, 2010; Yodanis, 2004). Social status also attaches to role positions, as status is understood as access to economic, social and political resources, and power (Jasinski, 2001; Rudman & Glick, 2012; Sultana, 2010; Yodanis, 2004). This has been apportioned disparately between the genders, leading to pervasive gender inequality (Jasinski, 2001; Rudman & Glick, 2012; Sultana, 2010; Yodanis, 2004). Men (as a social group) would therefore be invested in maintaining a privileged social status by reinforcing practices that maintain and support gender inequality (SGBV being one of them) (Jasinski, 2001; Rudman & Glick, 2012; Sultana, 2010; Yodanis, 2004). This is a very similar argument to feminist analyses of Patriarchy (Jasinski, 2001; Rudman & Glick, 2012; Sultana, 2010; Yodanis, 2004).

The gender role conflict that men experience from gender role strain is said to contribute to adherence of rape myths (Kassing et al., 2005). This theory is useful for understanding why some men accept violent behaviour against women while others who have rigid, sexist male views are likely to experience personal and relationship problems which contribute to their negative attitudes about women (McDermott et al., 2017). Men who fear femininity and validate ideologies that idealise power over women approve of violence against them which complies with the feminist theory argument against the norms of patriarchal society. Men committing intimate partner violence is then a symptom of a wider cultural acceptance of violence against women, related to a patriarchal society (McDermott et al., 2017).

The notion of violence as the ontological grounding of masculine subjectivity, is rooted in GRST and social constructionism. Violence is not a form of pathology in most men, but is a response to a need for masculinity to distance itself from the feminine identity (Pieck, 1976). Men have to create a grounding or foundational difference between what they perceive as masculine and as feminine (Pieck, 1976). They must kill off their feminine side and violence is a way of achieving this, not by not showing hurt and laughing off feelings, but by acting cruelly and violently towards others (Pieck, 1976). If masculine identity is grounded in this

way it is rendered symbolically and literally real in which case violence is understood as a social phenomenon rather than a pathological one (Pieck, 1976). This then relates to SGBV, as violence is a by-product of masculine subjectivity (Pieck, 1976).

It has been found that men in a patriarchal society have higher levels of masculine gender role stress than do male individuals in egalitarian gender systems which suggests that gender role strain may be part of a broader sexist, societal message about women (McDermott et al., 2017).

These factors mentioned above are more in line with this study's perspective, as firstly, they are getting more to the crux of why SGBV is so hard to eradicate and, secondly, how best to intervene against it. GRST establishes that SGBV occurs due to gender role stereotypes, hegemonic masculinity, and gender role strain, which means that it is seen as a social product that is brought about by broader cultural contexts that perpetuate it. This is important as an intervention to change dominant discursive constructions (hegemonic masculinity, gender stereotypes) to decrease rape myth acceptance and hopefully SGBV. This is what this study's aim is.

i. Evaluating GRST perspectives on SGBV

All the psychosocial/cultural theories mentioned above promote the social construction of gendered phenomena such as SGBV which is why they form the bridge between individually and socially focused explanations (Jasinski, 2001; Javaid, 2010; Kelly, 2013; Lea & Auburn, 2001; Muehlenhard & Kimes 1999; Rudman & Glick, 2012; Ryan, 2011; Sultana, 2010).

Another strength of the GRST is that it conforms to the bystander intervention standards, because it deals with changing culture and shifting attitudes towards tolerance of violence (McDermott et al., 2017). This is the primary level of the bystander intervention, which is the primary focus of this research.

A strength of this theory lies in its relation to social constructionism, which means that both theories support and strengthen one another's arguments. They both argue that society creates certain ideologies that people follow whether through language and discourse in relation to

social constructionism, or their social roles as described by social role theory (Burr, 2018; Jasinski, 2001; Javaid, 2016; Mooney, 2000; Rudman & Glick, 2012).

The theory, furthermore, relates to the feminist theory in that both theories refer to the subordination of women as being a cause for SGBV (Rudman & Glick, 2012; Sultana, 2010).

GRST concentrates on social conformity but does not question social policies, such as problems in politics, social services, legislation, living conditions of individuals in society, and it does not address matters of human agency or freedom (Jackson, 1998). This might be slightly problematic with regards to this theory.

Jackson (1998) considers GRST and that its description of socialisation lacks comprehensiveness because its acceptance of the disparate social roles apportioned to men and women is quite simplistic.

GRST has focused on men, their feelings and emotions, rather than on the desire for power over others and does not target compensation through alcohol or violence when men lack power (Jun, 2009). This means that men and their emotions, such as anger, fear, and anxiety supposedly perpetuate feelings of inferiority, which according to this theory cause behaviours such as aggression and in turn violence (Jun, 2009). There is argument, however, that power is more at play in relation to SGBV than feelings, as men are taught from an early age to believe that power and control are essential to their self-esteem and positive sense of self (Jun, 2009). Many men then become obsessed with obtaining power, status, and success, which brings about a need to control and manipulate others (Jun, 2009). When men lack power they may compensate for this through alcohol or violence in order to gain the sense of superiority and power over another (Jun, 2009). This is why gender role strain may be related to power and not just feelings or emotions of men (Jun, 2009). Men also maintain this power by repressing women (Jun, 2009).

It, furthermore, centralises men in relation to gender role strain and does not equally examine women (Jun, 2009). It is then argued that the voice against oppression of women is lost when theories and ideologies only focus on men because it does not establish the epistemological point of view of the subordinated, but centralises those in power who are men (Jun, 2009). The

GRST spends a lot of time on men and their gender role conflicts, and the relation between gender role strain and male power, but little to no time on how gender role strain and conflicts impact women (Jun, 2009).

GRST is then perhaps too simplistic in nature for this research study, as it does not take into account the power of men, patriarchy, and trivialises women as victims only really focusing on men. It starts to build on the argument for socialisation and gender role stereotypes being a factor in perpetuating SGBV, but it is not as comprehensive as social constructionism is in explaining the causal factors of SGBV. This is the next theory discussed and is the theory used in this research, as it is the most substantive theory emphasised for this research in this chapter.

3.2.3. Socio-structural theories

a. Social constructionism

Social constructionism and feminist theory, which falls underneath this, are socio-structural level theories and show how society and culture shape individual behaviours and create pre-conditions that perpetuate the potential for SGBV to occur (Burr, 2018; Jasinski, 2001; Lea & Auburn, 2001; Muehlenhard & Kimes, 1999).

Social constructionism is the idea that through language and communication meaning is created and shapes the way we experience the world (Burr, 2018). This means that the way we understand the world is determined by social processes (Andrews, 2012; Atkinson et al., 2000). An individual's role is comprehended through encounters with other individuals and learning from them how to adapt to society (Reed et al., 2010). Social constructionism originated from researchers attempting to make sense of the nature of reality (Andrews, 2012).

Social constructionism maintains that biological sex differences affect only a limited number of physical traits in humans, such as the physical appearance, build and structure, genitalia, and facial hair, but psychological differences between sexes are created by culture and not through biology (Rudman & Glick, 2012). A substantial body of research has shown that individual psychological variability between genders is in the moderate, small, or non-existent range, and that the majority of personality traits and behaviours are socially constructed (Travis, 2003). These differences are real only because society pressures individuals to adhere to them; masculine and feminine identities are learned and adopted through a process called

socialisation (Eagly & Wood, 2013; Rudman & Glick, 2012). The socialisation process of men and women has led to ideals about how genders should behave, dress, their occupations, and types of activity in which they should engage (Eagly & Wood, 2013; Rudman & Glick, 2012). Behaviours that are used to categorise men and women into different social groups and that result in unequal power relations between them are due to this process (Rudman & Glick, 2012). Heterosexuality is an example of a social norm to which individuals are required to adhere and is how individuals engage in cross-gender relationships (Caplan, 1989; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). When an individual does not partake in this dominant ideology then he or she may be stigmatised or marginalised because such aberrant behaviour threatens the social order (Caplan, 1989; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). Individuals are socialised to believe in the norm, and to reject anything outside of this (Caplan, 1989; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). This relates to behaviours that perpetuate SGBV, such as heteronormativity, hegemonic masculinity, patriarchy, rape myth acceptance, and gender stereotypes, which are all societal factors that are taught to the public. These were all discussed above in relation to the other theories, but this theory argues that all these factors are at play rather than just some of them or none of them (biological basis or pathology instead).

1. Gender roles/ideology

This theory emphasises the influence of social location on violence, such as social class, education, and income (Jasinski, 2001). Violence occurs due to social and cultural conditions that make it possible (Jasinski, 2001). For example, cultural acceptance of violence, such as female circumcision, patriarchy, alcohol and drug use, peer support of violence in areas such as university and structural stress; and there is also poverty which is a prevalent condition for violence (Foshee et al., 2001; Jasinski, 2001; Mooney, 2000).

Lea and Auburn (2001) understand violence from a social constructionist viewpoint and look beyond the personality traits of individual SGBV perpetrators to the practical ideologies that govern violent acts. This theory argues that aggressive, dominant behaviours and the act of rape, occur because of the social domains that perpetuate them (Lea & Auburn, 2001). Lea and Auburn (2001) explain that rape is constructed through discourse between men and women who follow certain ideologies such as rape myth acceptance. That people believe in rape myths allows for the justification and rationalisation of rape and the acceptance of or ignorance about

the behaviours and ideologies that underpin this violent act (Lea & Auburn, 2001; Ryan, 2011). Men are often violent due to the societal/cultural conditions that encourage this behaviour, such as television, media, advertisements, and pornographic magazines, which show women as subordinate objects created for men's pleasure, all of which socialise many men into believing that women are there to please and obey them (Mooney, 2000). When women do not comply with this image some men turn violent to gain what they desire (Mooney, 2000).

2. Historical/cultural contextual analyses

Violence is socially constructed according to this definition and various acts of sexual assault, sexual harassment, and rape have had varied definitions over time but always relate to the unequal power relations between individuals (Muehlenhard & Kimes, 1999). The terminology for sexual and domestic violence have not always included terms such as wife rape, date rape, wife-beating, and courtship violence all of which presently fall under the term SGBV (Muehlenhard & Kimes, 1999).

Those in power have the authority to exclude themselves from definitions that portray society in a negative light (Muehlenhard & Kimes, 1999) For example, when the media portrays rapists as mentally ill, this disassociates them from the ordinary individual, which makes them a mental health service problem and not a societal one (O'Hara, 2012). Society then does not have to deal with them to the same extent, which is why the media does this (O'Hara, 2012).

The individual that defines the act influences the manner in which it is portrayed to others because legislators, perpetrators, victims, and the media all portray SGBV in different ways (Muehlenhard & Kimes, 1999); the media portrays individuals responsible for SGBV as "incurable predators and outcasts of society" (Malinen et al., 2014, p. 535), and, because it represents one of the main sources of public information, most individuals will only have this perspective (Malinen et al., 2014). Other social sources that condemn sex offenders harshly are politicians and extreme religious groups, fusing the idea of paedophilia with violent sexual predators, while in reality the opportunistic, sexual addict, acquaintance rapist, and incest rapist make up most offenders (Quinn et al., 2004). This hides the truth about sexual predators, often known to the victim, who may not perceive them the way the media or extreme religious groups

do, and the victim's story is often not recognised by the legal justice system due to incomplete examination of the victim or evidence (Quinn et al., 2004).

Feminist theory, which falls under social constructionism argues that women are oppressed by men through the conventions of patriarchal structures in society (Jasinski, 2001; McNay, 2013; Sultana, 2010). Hegemonic masculinity is the ideal with which men strive to conform in many societies; and it is a dominant, aggressive, and oppressive manifestation of masculinity, especially towards women but also in order to impress peers and to assert a triumphant manhood (Sultana, 2010). This understanding is argued by feminist theory to underpin the inevitable oppression of women. Feminism fights for women liberation and equality between genders in order to eliminate the propensity for violence against women (Kelly, 2013; Sultana, 2010).

3. Patriarchy

Feminist theory, which is a branch of social constructionism, argues that the responsibility for the inferior status of women in society lies with patriarchal institutions and social relations (Fleming et al., 2015; Jasinski, 2001; McNay, 2013; Sultana, 2010; Yodanis, 2004). Feminist theorists' emphasise that violence is not defined solely by men's characters, behaviours, attitudes, or experiences but is linked to those patriarchal and social structures that tolerate, and even approve of, the dominance of men and reinforcement of hegemonic masculinity (Pina et al., 2009; Yodanis, 2004). Some are reflected in an imbalance of power and resources in marriages, and some in the approval of violence against women in cultures and societies, and also in childhood experiences of violence (Yodanis, 2004). Substance abuse, also, is often learned in the family along with violence (Yodanis, 2004).

The occupational and educational status of women in any country is linked often with the prevalence of violence; the propensity is that the higher earning status or position in the workplace of a woman, the lower are the rates of sexual violence (Pina et al., 2009; Nayak et al., 2003; Yodanis, 2004). Yodanis (2004) demonstrates that on an institutional level when more than half of the population in higher education or workplace settings are women, men may accept them as equal and competent colleagues. Women in that society may no longer be

perceived as a threat to their colleagues that are men, which is argued by feminist theoreticians as a possible reason why SGBV is less frequent in such an environment (Yodanis, 2004).

On the other hand, women with inferior positions in the workplace and society are often sexually harassed or assaulted (Pina et al., 2009). On the micro-level in an intimate relationship, a man may feel threatened by a woman's success, and may wish to ensure her dependence on him, which is why violence, to retain his power, may be used (Yodanis, 2004).

If, as has been demonstrated, sexual violence is related to the unequal power relations between victim and perpetrator not only in a particular situation but in the factors that perpetuate it, patriarchy subordinates' women through a belief in their inferiority; this results in hostile attitudes and behaviours towards independent women (Jewkes et al., 2011; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). Rape myth endorsement is therefore going to be stronger in men than it is in women (Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). Traditional norms that promote the superiority of men can lead to high rates of sexual violence, which in turn relate to racism, heterosexism, classism, and ageism (Krolikowski & Koyfman, 2012; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). Certain demographics can make a person vulnerable to sexual violence (Fedina et al., 2018) in circumstances in which certain races, classes, and sexes are believed to be inferior to others, so that unequal power relations will contribute to the incidence of sexual violence (Cromby et al., 2013; Luce et al., 2010; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011).

4. Socialisation

Socialisation is the process in which we learn from and internalise the value systems of the culture and society we grow up in (Grosholz & Kubrin, 2007; Muehlenhard, & Kimes, 1999). The role of socialisation in relation to SGBV is based around how boys and girls are raised into men and women, and the value systems about gender, such as hegemonic forms of masculinity and femininity that underpin these processes (Grosholz & Kubrin, 2007; Muehlenhard, & Kimes, 1999). GRST applies here, as it relates to how men and women are raised to conform to certain gender role stereotypes, as mentioned above (Grosholz & Kubrin, 2007; Muehlenhard, & Kimes, 1999). These are socially constructed in nature and are then mediated through discourse and social practices (Grosholz & Kubrin, 2007; Muehlenhard, & Kimes, 1999). This means that the family background of individuals, their schooling, friendship

groups, communities, and society all construct the gender roles and values systems people maintain (Grosholz & Kubrin, 2007; Muehlenhard, & Kimes, 1999). People are socialised to behave a certain way through the dominant discourses and social practices they grow up with (Grosholz & Kubrin, 2007; Muehlenhard, & Kimes, 1999).

Feminist theory is linked to social constructionism through its assertion that women and men are socialised in such a way that stereotyping becomes inevitable (Pina et al., 2009; Wood, 2001). This theory, furthermore, argues that if men believe that their violent behaviours are justified, women in that milieu will blame themselves for being victimised (Pina et al., 2009; Wood, 2001). SGBV, therefore begins to be seen as an unavoidable consequence of social and cultural experiences (Pina et al., 2009). For example, many women believe that SGBV occurs because “I deserved it”, “he didn’t mean it”, “it wasn’t the real him”, or “he was drinking” (Wood, 2001, p. 247).

The predominant ways in which SGBV is represented in the current social context is often shown by focus on extreme violence in the media, which means that subtle violence, such as emotional abuse becomes normalised and acceptable (Grosholz & Kubrin, 2007) which indicates the ways in which people interact with and discuss the topic of violence can influence public opinion (Muehlenhard & Kimes, 1999; Nayak et al., 2003). The social constructionist theory tries to identify this (Muehlenhard & Kimes, 1999) through a situation, such as male rape, as this topic is not usually the focus of westernised society; men must be strong, aggressive, powerful, and dominant so if a man is raped, there is often disassociation between the victim and prevalent ideas of hegemonic masculinity (Javaid, 2016). Communities, families and friends, firstly, may not believe that a man has been raped because it is inconceivable that a man could be overpowered, and, secondly, the implication is that if a man is overpowered, he is effeminate and therefore not a true representative of hegemonic masculinity, or thirdly, a man would be too ashamed to mention violence perpetrated against him in case he would be judged as less than a man (Javaid, 2016).

That women are incapable of rape is the argument offered by the opposite perspective on this topic which considers women to be too subordinate and submissive to be capable of overpowering another person (Javaid, 2016). But there are female sex offenders, a reality which

believes the perception of SGBV as only men targeting women, so there is an upholding of a one-sided impact of the crime (Javaid, 2016).

Those groups that tend to govern the vision of the interpersonal interactions that prevail, such as politicians and particular social groups, can influence significantly ways in which SGBV is constructed in the collective mind (Muehlenhard & Kimes, 1999; Nayak et al., 2003). There is literature and research that records the occurrence of male rape by women perpetrators, but society in general and the public media tend to avoid discussion of this topic (Javaid, 2016; O'Hara, 2012).

Men and the views about them regarding this topic is that they engage in SGBV because it is a social norm for men to be hurtful towards women or because she deserves whatever is done to her (Wood, 2001). Those outside the relationship tend to blame the woman and justify the man's behaviour by saying "but sometimes I think...they put themselves in the situation" or "I'm not a subscriber to the view that women do bring it on themselves, although sometimes I think people don't know when to stop and they don't know when to shut up" (Thapar-Björkert & Morgan, 2010, p. 41).

5. Male dominance

Inequality between men and women in a society can lead to the main reasons for rape being the underlying desire and need for control, power, and domination (Javaid, 2016; Lea & Auburn, 2001; Wekerle & Wolfe, 1999). The rape of men or of women is inevitable when the perpetrator rapes to gain power, no matter who the victim is (Javaid, 2016; Wekerle & Wolfe, 1999). Sexual assault is not a gender-specific crime, although the victim is always feminised (Javaid, 2016; Sultana, 2010). Feminist theory does take into account the fact that women occupy powerful positions nowadays, but even so, the male domination of social systems persists despite women's being accommodated in multiple ways. It is true that many arenas, though previously closed to or actively discouraging of, women's participation, have opened up to many successful women practitioners; but that there is persistent prejudice is undeniable, and the will to dominate and bully has not diminished entirely from societal structures, such as churches, educational institutions, and legal systems, so that this power base will inevitably lead to the perpetration of SGBV (Sultana, 2010).

Feminist theorists believe that fear is central to the process of maintaining patriarchy, and that women are controlled by men through fear (Yodanis, 2004). This does not mean that all men must be violent towards all women, but rather that the fear of knowing that some women are victims of SGBV is enough to keep women under control: the shadow of sexual violence hanging over a woman is enough to create a culture of fear in her so that she will curtail her movements quite extensively in some circumstances (Yodanis, 2004).

These factors mentioned above show why social constructionism is the most all-encompassing theory for causal factors of SGBV and is the most relevant theory for this study, as it allows for social intervention with the bystander intervention being central to this research.

i. Evaluating social constructionist perspectives on SGBV

A strength of the theory of social constructionism is that because it views social concepts around SGBV as ever-changing, it is readily progressed and can be improved to incorporate new ideas and challenges (Leeds-Hurwitz, 2006). This differs from the biological or evolutionary theories that view evidence on SGBV as fixed and unchanging (Leeds-Hurwitz, 2006). Researchers working with concepts of social constructionism develop an idea and make it concrete and even then, build on it, as dimensions of the concern may have been forgotten or may have changed over time (Leeds-Hurwitz, 2006).

Another strength of this theory is its demonstration of the extent to which evolutionary theories can be inaccurate in claims of gender-determined fixed physical and psychological traits; these scholars provide a considerable body of research disproving this notion and establishing these traits as socially created concepts (Rudman & Glick, 2012; Travis, 2003). This means that because these traits are not fixed intervention and rehabilitation is possible (Rudman & Glick, 2012; Travis, 2003).

Social constructionism argues that society is a contributing aspect of SGBV, and does not label sex offenders as sick or mentally unstable because SGBV does not occur only when the perpetrator is mentally unstable (Jewkes et al., 2011; Mooney, 2000; Yakeley, 2009). This indicates the extent to which SGBV is a matter of concern on a societal scale and worldwide and does not remove the extent of the problem to a definable category as does potentially the

evolutionary theory and psychopathology (García-Moreno et al., 2015; Jewkes et al., 2011; Luce et al., 2010; Mooney, 2000; O'Hara, 2012; Yakeley, 2009).

Feminist theory differs from biological or evolutionary theories when dealing with SGBV, in that it argues that because patriarchy is not biological but that it is unnatural means that it can be changed (Javaid, 2016; Jasinski, 2001; Sultana, 2010). Theories that support the supremacy of men, such as, in general terms, those of Freud or Aristotle have been shown to have no scientific or historical evidence for the assertion that men are superior to women (Sultana, 2010). Feminist theory highlights the historical processes, societal rules, and developed social relations that have created this notion; social structures determine gender-specific roles for men and women and socialise them into acceptance of the social constructs of the supremacy of men (Javaid, 2016; Sultana, 2010). Feminist theory's argument concludes that structural inequality must be changed in order to eliminate SGBV (Yodanis, 2004). Another strength of this theory is that its thesis linking SGBV to gender inequality and the subordination of women has been confirmed by many studies (Yodanis, 2004).

A potential weakness of feminist theory is its emphasis on the victimhood of women and its ignoring of the abuse of men who are, if less often, also subject to SGBV and should not be excluded from concern (Javaid, 2016). An important counter-argument is feminist insight into patriarchy of which both genders are victims; inherent in feminist theory is the claim that the victim no matter who they are, is at risk and does not discredit men but affirms the positive importance of equality between the genders because SGBV is a gendered phenomenon (Yodanis, 2004).

Social constructionism and the feminist theory are more accurate than the individual-level theories, and less simplistic than the psychosocial/cultural theories in understanding SGBV, which is why social constructionism is the best theory to use in this research. There are, furthermore, not any substantial errors with the basic premise of a social constructionist analysis that locates the root of SGBV patterns in social practices and the ideologies/value systems about gender that underpin them, such as hegemonic masculinity, patriarchy, socialisation and gender stereotypes being factors that perpetuate this, as shown in the arguments above. The social constructionist school of thought makes sense in terms of the potential causal factors of SGBV.

3.2.4. Integrative theories

The ecological theory is discussed under integrative theories and is the last perspective which deals with SGBV on an individual and sociological level; it is slightly different from social constructionism and feminism, as it is multifaceted and works at an integrative level (Heise, 1998).

a. Ecological theory

The multifaceted ecological theory argues that an individual is influenced by many different factors notably by their psychology, the community, and society (Heise, 1998; Smith Slep et al., 2014). This perspective looks further than do evolutionary or psychopathology theories in its examination of more than just individual-level predictors of behaviour; it explores such factors as social-environment predictors, peer, family, and social environments, neighbourhood, culture, and social class, or norms (Foshee et al., 2001). It also looks into individual-level predictors, such as personal competency, involvement in other problematic behaviours, and also demographic characteristics all of which can help psychologists to understand why an individual engages in certain behaviours (Foshee et al., 2001).

SGBV is a multifaceted phenomenon motivated by personal, situational, and sociocultural factors reflecting individual behaviour and mental health, family, workplace, social class, culture, social norms, peer environment, and community all of which factors are seen by this theory to have an impact on or potentially cause SGBV (Foshee et al., 2001; Heise, 1998; Smith Slep et al., 2014). Personal qualities that are believed to prevent SGBV would be high self-esteem, successful conflict resolution abilities, adequate communication skills, positive affect, strong interpersonal skills, and academic skills (Foshee et al., 2001). When individuals lack such qualities they can demonstrate a propensity for SGBV (Foshee et al., 2001).

Peer or friend involvement in SGBV also correlates with individuals in a friendship group who engage in this behaviour (Foshee et al., 2001).

This theory does have merit when establishing causal factors of SGBV as being multifaceted (Terry, 2014). It is a comprehensive way to integrate multiple theories in order to explain SGBV (Terry, 2014). This model speaks about violence being caused by individual or intrapersonal, assault, microsystem or interpersonal, exosystem or social networks and

community, macrosystem or society, and chronosystem, which is the interaction of all these environments and how they impact the individual (Terry, 2014).

i. Evaluating ecological theory perspective on SGBV

The ecological theory, together with social constructionism and feminism relates alcohol and peer involvement specifically to SGBV, both of which have been established in the literature as risk factors for SGBV (Fedina et al., 2018; Martin, 2016).

This theory argues that there is evidence that parental violence and battering in childhood, directly and indirectly, influence levels of SGBV (Foshee et al., 2001; Silverman & Williamson, 1997). There is also evidence that an individual's having witnessed domestic violence in childhood and the trauma could lead to later association with male peers who abuse their partners, and who support relationship violence and SGBV (Silverman & Williamson, 1997). That family violence, though a factor, only leads to a small percentage of violent individuals engaging in SGBV, suggests that childhood trauma may not be a substantial risk factor in the perpetrator (Jasinski, 2001).

This theory does support individual-level theories as well, which have been established above to have faulty basic premises to them and very well-established counter arguments by the psychosocial/cultural theories and social constructionism, which is why the ecological theory is not being used in this research (Terry, 2014).

This theory's strength is that it does integrate many theories to argue causes of SGBV, however, there could be justification that this theory makes things overly complicated for this research study in particular, as if intervention using the ecological theory is appropriate then those trying to intervene against SGBV would have to tackle every area that is argued to cause SGBV. This means the individual level, microsystem, exosystem macrosystem, and chronosystem, which would be incredibly time consuming, and costly. While, this is definitely a factor that should be considered for future research around intervention, it is perhaps too broad for this research study. This is why social constructionism and tackling social factors that perpetuate SGBV and participant responses to social intervention is central to this research.

3.3. Discussion of the theory chosen in this research

This research is theoretically situated with social constructionism. SGBV is understood as caused by a multitude of factors that are usually social, such as rape myths, patriarchy, hegemonic masculinity, poverty, and alcohol use (Belknap, 2010; Fedina et al., 2018; McMahan, 2010; O'Hara, 2012), all of which were discussed in the literature chapter.

The theories with which this research agrees are those that consider socio-structural concerns, such as social constructionist and feminist theories both of which conclude that SGBV is caused by societal factors (Burr, 2018; Rudman & Glick, 2012).

For the purposes of this thesis, it has been shown above that the individualistic theories have too many weaknesses relating to this research which could hamper its progress (Pina et al., 2009; Jewkes et al., 2011; Mooney, 2000; Rudman & Glick, 2012; Yakeley, 2009).

While the ecological theory has potential merit for this project, there are many criticisms of it in relation to the individualistic theories so would not cohere here (Heise, 1998).

The bystander intervention would have potential from a primary level were social constructionism to underpin it because the primary level of this intervention deals with changing the social constructions or discourses of individuals (McMahan & Banyard, 2012). Social constructionism analyses language and ways in which social relations create and maintain all social practices and phenomena (Burr, 2018). Human behaviour is shaped by social interaction, which is the primary purpose of the bystander intervention. If there were to be a change in the way social interaction around SGBV occurs this change could be instrumental in preventing its happening (Burr, 2018). The individual-level theories would not be helpful from a bystander intervention perspective as they under-estimate the extent that SGBV occurs (Mooney, 2000; Rudman & Glick, 2012). This would mean that interventions to change social attitudes would be ineffectual because the assumption is that SGBV is an aspect of pathology and biological make-up of an individual so can never be changed but only managed (García-Moreno et al., 2015; Luce et al., 2010; O'Hara, 2012).

Social constructionism has been chosen, after careful consideration, as being most appropriate for the purposes of this research project. This study was undertaken from a qualitative perspective and used structured interviews with carefully designed open-ended questions in written form; these were distributed to students in order to collect and assess the discourse emanating from anti-rape poster campaigns. The intention was to glean and analyse responses of individuals to the posters and to collect their thoughts and language on this subject. The particular focus of social constructionism was therefore helpful (Burr, 2018).

3.4. Conclusion

This chapter investigated prospective theories that relate to SGBV and to this research. Each theory was discussed in terms of its strengths and weaknesses. Social constructionism was confirmed, after this evaluation, as the most accurate and appropriate for this study. The next chapter explains the methodology.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1. Introduction

This chapter of the thesis focuses on the aim of the study, the research question, design, and paradigm. The sampling method is described, followed by the data collection process, and then analysis of the data. Matters pertaining to ethical considerations, such as informed consent, are discussed. The validity, purpose, and usefulness of this study are then addressed, as are its limitations.

4.2. Aim of this study

The aim of this research was to establish student responses to anti-rape poster campaigns, using the standpoint of a bystander intervention programme. There was a comparison made between a non-bystander intervention approach to SGBV (poster one) and the bystander intervention (poster two) (Ricardo et al., 2011). This was to indicate the potential usefulness of the bystander intervention in a South African context. The focus of the study was a university setting, Rhodes University in particular. Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA) was used to analyse the findings. The analysis follows a social constructionist paradigm which is central to this research.

4.3. Research statements

4.3.1. Main research statement

The main focus of this research is to investigate the discursive positioning of target audiences in the South African university context in relation to bystander intervention public awareness poster campaigns.

The research focuses on identifying the discursive resources drawn on by audiences in their constructions of the messages about perpetrators, victims, and observers depicted by the posters.

The manner in which intended audiences positioned themselves in relation to the poster messages was ascertained.

These discursive strategies were examined in order to estimate the impact and consequences of the poster campaign upon student responses.

4.4. Research paradigm

4.4.1. The social constructionist paradigm

The social constructionist perspective perceives human experience and knowledge about the world as being produced through thought and language and not through external, observed environments or reality (Burr, 2018). Without language there would be no meaning, through which reality becomes sensical (Andrews, 2012). Language and social interactions are important in understanding why individuals experience events in the ways they do (Andrews, 2012). The social relations of human beings create and maintain social practices and phenomena so that their interactions create society and culture, and shape human experiences and behaviours (Burr, 2018).

Social constructionist researchers, therefore, are interested in how social practices and structures are reproduced in talk and the ways in which broad social practices shape what is said, thought, and experienced (Andrews, 2012). Social practices limit experience because convention requires conformity; this means that communities are not altogether active agents of experience, but are responsive to social practices already in place (Andrew, 2012). This version of social constructionism is focused in its understanding that modes of social organisation determine the point of view that dominates in a society. That there is no absolute freedom to make sense of the world is because communities are limited by society and the languages it generates to create a collective experience (Andrews, 2012). These conventions structure and limit an individual's subjectivity and interpretation of the social world so that both individuals and groups of people define the reality of which they form a part (Andrews, 2012). Knowledge becomes significant through the interactions of individuals and the language used when speaking to each other (Andrews, 2012). In other words, what individuals say, the societies formed, the rules made, the language used to pass on knowledge and the interactions experienced with others all go towards forming the reality people inhabit (Andrews, 2012).

This is the ideal theory for a research project concerned with ascertaining individual responses to anti-rape posters in terms of bystander interventions. The researcher needed to analyse what was said in response to viewing these posters, how responders felt when viewing the posters as conveyed in the structured interviews of open-ended questions in written form, as well as the types of discourses in spoken or written communication that emerged as being dominant in relation to the posters. The study, furthermore, focused on the individual constructions and talk about the posters and the discursive positions he or she took up in relation to them (Andrews, 2012; Burr, 2018).

4.5. Research design

This study used a qualitative research design and was concerned with the thoughts and language of individuals and communities and how they socially fit into the world (Bless et al., 2013). Qualitative researchers focus on subjectivity and the wish to understand, interpret, and capture peoples' views and socially mediated accounts of the world; quantitative research applies measurement and numerical value to ascertain results (Bless et al., 2013). Sekeran and Bougie (2010) note that qualitative research is in the form of words, which means interview notes, transcripts, answers to open-ended questions, and news articles. This approach works well when trying to understand and make sense of social observations (Babbie, 2010).

Qualitative research was chosen for this study because it is concerned with individuals and their responses to anti-rape poster campaigns. The individual's views of the poster campaigns and interventions was vital to understanding whether these could be useful and contextually relevant or not, and why (Babbie, 2010; Bless et al., 2013). Qualitative research provides rich detail for the researcher, which is helpful in this instance, as not enough knowledge has been accumulated about bystander interventions, especially in a university context in South Africa (Babbie, 2010; Bless et al., 2013).

4.6. Definition of Discourse and Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis, although there is no single definition, is rooted in linguistics, which is a study of language and which argues that knowledge is socially constructed (Atkinson et al., 2000; Bless et al., 2013). Willig (2003) describes discourse analysis as a way of reading a text:

the study of conversation, interaction between people, and the meaning behind this is useful for gaining an understanding more about how people see the world (Bless et al., 2013; Parker, 1999).

Discourse, which is spoken or written communication, has a social meaning (Hook, 2001). Woofitt (2005) notes that “discourse is a system of statements which constructs an object” (p. 145) and is the reproduction of social systems through action and choice (Hook, 2001). The actions and choices individuals make when they speak or write can reinforce social ideas and can also subordinate others (McMahon, 2010; O’Hara, 2012). Discourse often establishes how people use texts and communication, for instance, to evade blame and responsibility as when a researcher examines whether individuals attack others or defend themselves in texts or conversations; this material is then analysed to understand why such opinions occur (Smith, 2015).

Discourse analysis focuses on the contexts of conversations, types of language, and the choice of words people use; it examines social practices, language, and learning in educational, psychological, and, often, sociological settings (Gee & Green, 1998). This type of analysis focuses on talk and text in relation to these social practices (Smith, 2015). The reason that discourse analysis focuses on language and how individuals make use of it is because as linguists agree, language is created by, creates, and, over time, recreates social contexts (Christie & Martin, 2005).

This study worked from the perspective of discourse analysis; this is because rape and sexual violence are informed by dominant cultural and societal discourses, which include the patriarchal nature of society, rape myth acceptance, racism, classism, and ageism, among other elements as referred to in the literature chapter (Jewkes et al., 2011; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011).

4.7. Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA)

This study specifically used FDA, because it is concerned with the political intent of language and its role in the construction of social and psychological life (Hook, 2001; Parker, 2002; Willig, 2003; Woofitt, 2005). It demonstrates that what is being said, where when, and by whom is supported, limited, permitted, and constrained by the nature of the discourse (Willig,

2003). Power is central to FDA in its understanding that dominant discourses legitimate a social reality that has existing power relations and social structures which have become common sense and entrenched in society (Parker, 2002; Willig, 2003).

Even those discourses that challenge power can be used by other oppressive discourses (Parker, 2002) as in the instance of the bystander intervention potentially falling into the trap of creating the impression that women are victims of harassment or violence and need to be saved because they cannot manage the situation themselves and effective intervention can only come from men (Laner et al., 2001). Laner et al. (2001) have shown that women are just as likely to intervene, even though they themselves are the victims of SGBV. Men can intervene due to the common perception of superior strength and capability; but women would intervene less if the situation requires physical strength (Laner et al., 2001). This is potentially a critique of the bystander intervention, in that the woman being harassed is not granted the independent skills that could enable her to resist harassment; and it is not challenging men who are doing the harassing; but it is a challenge to anyone witnessing the SGBV situation to intervene (Laner et al., 2001). The bystander intervention forces people to take collective responsibility but does not allow women to resist independently and does not hold perpetrators fully responsible; this then, calls for improvement (Laner et al., 2001) in that it is constrained by and/or mixed up in dominant and oppressive discourses which vocabularies limit the ways we act and think about the world (Woofitt, 2005).

FDA, furthermore, analyses the history of how a discourse has occurred through systems of meanings that reflect power relations and are a consequence of the material and economic infrastructure of society (Woofitt, 2005).

The main reason why this study has chosen FDA is because of its constructions of subjects, objects, and the ways in which they position themselves in relation to dominant social structures and power relations; it is particularly apt for rape myths, patriarchy, and ideas of hegemonic masculinity (Parker, 2002; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011; Willig, 2008; Willig, 2003). The analysis of student responses to anti-rape posters demonstrated to the researcher whether the dominant discourses constrained the thoughts and language of the target audience or whether the posters had an impact on them that was positive or if it weakened/challenged

dominant social discourses; an understanding of this would mean that the bystander intervention could be useful in a South African university context.

4.8. Sampling

The target population for this research were the students at Rhodes University due to student responses to anti-rape poster campaigns being central to analysis (Bless et al., 2013). The sampling method has to be representative of the population, which in this instance is a person over the age of 18 who studies full-time, either living on or off campus.

An invitation to participate in the research was distributed to the first-year Psychology class through email; the full class is approximately 975 students. A decision was made to select 20% of this population for possible recruitment through convenience sampling, which means 180 students were sent the recruiting email. The actual sample drawn was the 45 students who responded to the recruiting email (which is a response rate of 25%). The large size of the first-year Psychology class was chosen because its students were registered in multiple faculties and various years of study, and therefore adequately represented the undergraduate student body on campus. This sample size was optimal in order to gain a sense of the socially circulating discourses that surround SGBV in the particular research context.

Structured questionnaires made use of open-ended questions in written form and had to be self-reported because of the COVID-19 lockdown; these were sent out to the 45 student participants. The structured questionnaires had two posters attached to them that students were required to answer questions about. Poster one (a non-bystander intervention) was taken from a UK perspective created by the Manchester Police Department. Poster two (bystander intervention) was taken from an American perspective and was created by the Missoula Intervention action project from the state of Montana. These posters do not reflect a South African context, as the idea behind this study was to bring posters in from other countries to see if they could be useful here. Furthermore, the bystander intervention has not really been taken up in a South African context so bringing in analysis from an international perspective is acceptable in this instance. Rhodes University has not focused on the bystander intervention, which is why it was valid to bring posters from other countries. It is then good to compare the overseas bystander intervention to other overseas interventions and bring them to a local setting, as the researcher wanted to see the local response to this material. These posters were chosen because they both

specifically focus on alcohol consumption in relation to university students. This aligns closely with the target population of this study. The bystander intervention was focused on because these posters, from the primary intervention perspective, target audiences to take action in order to prevent a SGBV situation, which is what the bystander poster in this study does (McMahon & Banyard, 2012). The non-bystander intervention poster targeted the perpetrator in this instance, which is why it is not a bystander intervention.

The literature review went into detail regarding alcohol consumption and how this has a role to play in the perpetuation of SGBV with university students (Clowes et al., 2009). Poster one is not a bystander intervention because it targets the potential perpetrator of the rape victim, while poster two is a reflection of the bystander intervention because it targets witnesses to a potential SGBV situation to intervene before it occurs. The data collection process had to be altered when the COVID-19 pandemic required restrictions. The research was originally planned to include focus groups to allow for inter-personal interaction as the ideal data collection process for this study. In the event, structured questionnaires had to be used to avoid the health risks attached to inter-personal communication. This was discussed with the researcher's supervisor, and it was established that online questionnaires would be adequate for the research at hand. It was decided that zoom meetings or online focus groups were not possible due to the sensitive nature of the topic. The questionnaires did not change the nature of the aims of the study, as the main argument behind the bystander intervention was still possible to establish through written responses. This being the idea of collective responsibility of the bystanders in intervening against SGBV situations (Chen et al., 2020; Foubert et al., 2010; McMahon, 2010). The structured questionnaires, furthermore, are still a discourse method, as they are a textual analysis. This does not allow for the same depth of analysis as focus groups; however, it still gives us data that is in the participants own words and is about their socially circulating discourses.

Convenience sampling was used, drawing on individuals who voluntarily chose to participate (Sekaran & Bougie, 2010). It aimed for gender and ethnic diversity, which was in fact impossible to control due to the type of sampling method (Sekaran & Bougie, 2010). It was impossible to control because those who voluntarily chose to participate were mostly women (39) and men (6). The ethnicity of the participants was not asked for. This is because it was not

relevant to the study around student responses to anti-rape posters. There was more focus on the different perspectives of men and women.

Vulnerable parties were excluded by drawing from a non-clinical population and those who felt the study was potentially distressing to them had the opportunity to self-select to opt out of participation. Individuals that had experienced SGBV first-hand were among those excluded. Email recruiting advertisements stated the potentially distressing nature of some of the discussion material and advised potential participants to consider this before volunteering.

i. Confidentiality and informed consent

There are certain ethical matters that needed to be considered when conducting this type of research, in particular protecting participants from emotional harm because rape is a sensitive and potentially triggering subject (Babbie, 2011; de Vos et al., 2011). Voluntary agreement and informed consent are granted by the students at the point at which they click on the link to the structured interview (Babbie, 2010).

An information sheet providing the risks and the possibility for potential distress was attached for each student (Babbie, 2010). That participants would be anonymous is guaranteed as the structured interview does not require information about the participant. Informing the participants before the research was undertaken was vital and allowed them to withdraw at any point if they felt uncomfortable (de Vos et al., 2011). The researcher tried to eliminate vulnerable parties, such as those previously victimised, before the study began, by highlighting potentially triggering material with the advice not to partake if distressed. Arguably, participants feeling some discomfort is justified if the results of the study is designed to better their circumstances as was this study in its attempt to understand and improve anti-rape campaigns and interventions (de Vos et al., 2011).

That the researcher must not deliberately mislead participants, particularly through misrepresenting facts or withholding information was accounted for as the study was outlined fully before informed consent was given (de Vos et al., 2011).

4.9. Data collection

The data collection method used primary data allowing the researcher to raise specific questions appropriate to the study and asked students to answer them (Bless et al., 2013; Sekeran & Bougie, 2010). This allows for the least bias in the study and individuals give the researcher information through interviews, focus groups, and surveys (Sekaran, & Bougie, 2010).

The structured interviews were drafted in order to provide fixed questions which would gain information from the respondents and would ascertain underlying value systems about the topic (Bless et al., 2013). These structured interviews were identical for each respondent in order to ensure an unbiased and reliable response (Bless et al., 2013).

Participants were asked to articulate their position on anti-rape poster stimulus materials by means of a series of thematically organised questions about the posters to focus responses on the constructions of SGBV in these posters. The questions were designed to induce individual thoughts reflected in language in order most successfully to apply discourse analysis (Willig, 2003).

The posters concentrated specifically on university students and on the consumption of alcohol as a significant contributor to SGBV, as detailed in this study's literature review (Clowes et al., 2009). Poster-based intervention-campaigns are frequent on college campuses as a simple and effective way to spread messages and raise awareness of social problems, so are a satisfactory way of ascertaining student responses (Potter et al., 2009).

Because the study was voluntary and informed consent was given when administering the structured interviews in written form by email in order to guarantee that, the research was ethical. Confidentiality and anonymity were adhered to, as the structured interviews did not ask for any identifying information from participants.

4.10. Data analysis

FDA benefitted through enabling the researcher to establish dominant power discourses on SGBV to expose how these shaped individual constructions and talk around the anti-rape posters.

There were different aspects of the analysis.

Step one was discursive constructions to sort the data, focusing on unpacking the content of the structured interviews (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2003). The data was then placed into a corpus of statements appropriate to the research question to include a variety of discourse samples and potential answers to the research statements along with those that were historically variable (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2008; Willig, 2003). Samples being historically variable means they may have had a different meaning in the past (Willig, 2008; Willig, 2003). SGBV was discussed in the theory chapter as a social construct because what constitutes these acts has changed over time and the same acts may have slightly different meanings now (Muehlenhard & Kimes, 1999). The diversity of the discourse is reflected on, and whether it has transformed over time or not is acknowledged (Willig, 2008; Willig, 2003). The text needs some form of spatiality and social practice, political discourse, expert discourse, social interaction, or autobiographical accounts (Willig, 2008; Willig, 2003). Because individuals offered their own views, thoughts, and opinions, this project is defined by autobiographical accounts (Willig, 2008; Willig, 2003).

Step two was the researcher assessing problems that prompted the thought or discourse, so particular underlying problems motivated a corpus of statements (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2008; Willig, 2003). The researcher established the wider politics of the statement to assess how these constructions were produced and contested because discourses can be constructed in different ways in overarching discourses (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2008; Willig, 2003). These broader discourses about SGBV were matters, such as rape myth acceptance, patriarchy, classism, and poverty (Foshee et al., 2001; Jasinski, 2001; Mooney, 2000).

Step three was action orientation; this is the discursive contexts that surround the statements being examined as is in the investigation of what was gained in constructing a statement and the function it provided for the individual (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2003). There are many

different discourses, some of which are biomedical, romantic, and psychological discourse (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2003).

Step four was about positioning the subjects in relation to the statement they have made, in response to the questions asked (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2003). This is complex, as we are all made up of multiple identities and one person's response to a question or interaction would be unique to that person and no life experiences is the same as any other (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2003). An example would be a woman's answer about fear of SGBV being unique to her (Gordon & Collins, 2013).

Step five dealt with practice and how the discursive constructions or broader discourses reflected the subject positions/individual's experiences of either closing down or opening up an opportunity for action (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2003). When an individual places him or herself and others in a discourse, which has particular constructions of the world, the nature of that discourse potentially limits what can be said or done (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2003). The question is, would statements in the structured interview lead to solutions or would problem discourses limit the individual's view of SGBV (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2003). For example, rape myth acceptance would offer a discourse that limits an individual's view of SGBV (Gordon & Collins, 2013; Grubb & Turner, 2012).

Step six is concerned with the discourse of subjectivity (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2003). Discourse or the ways of seeing and living in the world, the participants' social and psychological realities and how these are constructed and linked together were examined (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2003). Evaluation of how the participants' own experiences of SGBV, their overall value systems, and social norms were reflected on in the broad discourses around SGBV (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2003). This step involves, and attempts to, elaborate on what picture of the world is created by these particular discourses and it relates to ideology: this means looking into the ideas that are formed by individuals based on dominant economic, social, and/or political views (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2003). The participants occupy available spaces in response to the dominant discourses: from a bystander intervention perspective, for example, the subject position would be of the intervener or victim in response to a SGBV situation. Questions were raised around what type of person or subject an individual has to be in order to be accepted into the world in a way that adheres to the dominant discourse

that particular individuals inhabit (Willig, 2003). The discursive impact of bystander anti-rape poster campaigns was tested to see if they were substantial enough interventions to break these dominant discourses or whether adherence to the familiar and known had become so entrenched that they could not be shifted, which could mean that the system of bystander intervention could not be useful in a South African context after all.

4.11. Validation

The considerations of validation relevant to this study are credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Bless et al., 2013).

De Vos et al. (2011) explain credibility or authenticity in the research as an adequate description and identification of the subject under question (Bless et al., 2013; de Vos et al., 2011). Ways to increase credibility include in depth and persistent observation in the field, triangulation of different methods, peer review, and participant checks (de Vos et al., 2011).

Transferability describes the different contexts in which a project can be deployed so that future studies in different settings could apply the same process (Bless et al., 2013; de Vos et al., 2011). If a researcher provides details of the context in which data was collected, this could be helpful to future researchers who could use this work to compare their own research with this study (Bless et al., 2013).

Dependability means that a comprehensive and rigorous research strategy has been used ensuring that each step of this research was completed thoroughly by showing exactly how data was collected, recorded, coded, and analysed (Bless et al., 2013). Where changes occurred in the phenomenon, which are the subjects under observation during the study, then this is reported on (de Vos et al., 2011). Changes made in the design for refinement purposes during the research process must, in addition, have been reported (de Vos et al., 2011). This allows for transparency (Bless et al., 2013; de Vos et al., 2011).

Confirmability, which is similar to dependability, describes the process by which research achieves similar results or findings by following an equivalent research process in a related context (Bless et al., 2013). A critical evaluation of methodology, producing clear and concise

results enables other researchers to benefit from knowing what, why, and in what context the research study was carried out (Bless et al., 2013).

This research had credibility, as a variety of methods were used, such as social constructionism, FDA, and structured interviews (Bless et al., 2013). This study is potentially transferable: having drawn on the bystander intervention from an international context and placing it in a South African context; this strongly implies that similar studies could be undertaken in other universities in both South Africa and elsewhere. Other projects would have provided the knowledge to draw upon regarding details of the participants, the context, and the focus of participants. The researcher demonstrated data collection methods through written structured interviews which are coded and analysed using FDA. Changes made in the study were explained in the analysis section of the study for the sake of transparency (Bless et al., 2013). Confirmability enables the potential for similar studies in other universities in South Africa.

4.11.1. Coherence

Meaningful coherence is achieved through method and procedure to lead to fulfilment of the goal which can interlink literature, the focus of the research questions, results, and the interpretation thereof; this relates to and informs previous studies, so that the overall project balances the intention of the research and the theory it employs successfully to achieve the purpose of the research (Tracy, 2010).

One particularly useful connection between design, data, and analysis with theory and purpose is that in which social constructionism works well with FDA and with SGBV. Social constructionism and FDA both focus on social matters by means of an emphasis on the language, discourse, and thoughts of participants, and are particularly apt for a study of anti-rape interventions for SGBV.

4.11.2. Reflexivity

Reflexivity is another important aspect of ethical competence and is key to making research critically engaging (Jootun et al., 2009). It is a reflection of the research and the research process which is that of the researcher's own social position, such as age, gender, and sexual

orientation in relation to those in the study (Berger, 2015). The researcher's own bias, particularly if there has been similar experiences to the research participants, may have an impact on the way the results of the study are written up (Berger, 2015). This is why the research process throughout the study has been careful to ensure that the research is as neutral and as unbiased as possible (Morrow, 2005). Reflexivity therefore is a marker for self-reflection by the researcher (Morrow, 2005) who needs to consider how much influence has been imposed on the findings, either directly or indirectly (Jootun et al., 2009).

4.12. Limitations of research

There were limitations: qualitative research is dependent on the researcher's skills and is often influenced by personal biases and characteristics (Anderson, 2010). This is a difficult problem which is overcome through the use of reflexivity and the researcher's having accounted for potential biases (Berger, 2015). The data analysed in qualitative research is time consuming to interpret because of its large volume and the possibility of mistakes or of data in the study having to be deleted if it becomes too long, and so double checks were carefully applied (Anderson, 2010). Rigour is more difficult to assess, maintain, and demonstrate when qualitative data is used rather than quantitative data; qualitative data is supposedly less scientific for which reason the ethical steps were carefully adhered to (Anderson, 2010).

Another limitation of the research is that the data collection process had to be altered when the COVID-19 pandemic required restrictions. The research was originally planned to include focus groups to allow for inter-personal interaction as the ideal data collection process for this study. In the event, structured interviews had to be used to avoid the health risks attached to inter-personal communication.

4.13. Conclusion

To conclude this chapter addressed the research question, design, and paradigm. The sampling method was discussed followed by the data collection and data analysis. Thereafter, matters pertaining to validity and ethical considerations, such as coherence and reflexivity were described. Limitations of the study were outlined.

CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

5.1. Introduction

The researcher collected qualitative data from participants using structured interviews with open-ended questions in written form. These were self-reported because of COVID-19 and sent out via email; the study received 45 responses from students. The collected data was comprised of individual participant responses to two anti-SGBV posters included in the structured interviews. The first poster was an example of a non-bystander intervention approach to SGBV, while the second poster was based on the bystander intervention (Ricardo et al., 2011). The analysis of participant responses involved the application of six steps of FDA with the focus on establishing how the discourses drawn on by participants worked together to produce and reproduce particular constructions of SGBV situations; of perpetrators and victims, as well as of how participants used these discursive themes to create subject positions for themselves when considering the phenomenon of SGBV (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2008; Willig, 2003). Several discursive themes emerged from participant responses in the structured interviews. The discursive constructions of SGBV potentially reproduced particular theoretical understandings of the phenomenon so that part of the focus of the analysis was to identify these understandings, and their traditions and history.

There is an interconnectedness between the various discourses that have been identified as operating in participant responses to the posters (figure one and figure two). These discourses inform/scaffold each other in ways that make a particular set of subject positions available for participants to step into. Each discourse will be discussed in detail, and it is important to establish that they can complement and collaborate with each other. This chapter will acknowledge instances in which the discourses link to each other.

Below is a systematic discussion of the discursive themes that emerged from the analytic process.

5.2. Figure. 1.



The first poster (figure one, above) depicts a non-bystander intervention that aims to reduce the potential for SGBV. This approach to intervention typically targets potential perpetrators or victims in a university setting that involves alcohol (Ricardo et al., 2011) and is usually focused on the transmission of prohibitive messages aimed at increasing the awareness of the threat of committing SGBV, or of falling victim to it (Carline et al., 2018). The desired result is usually an increase in the self-regulation of behaviour on the part of both potential perpetrators and victims. Neither of these two possible outcomes is wholly satisfactory because, on the one hand, SGBV is portrayed as an accidental mistake by a perpetrator who does not know better, or as the fault of the potential victim for not managing the risk of exposure to violence effectively (Carline et al., 2018). The focus then is often on providing safety and awareness messages to women and this places responsibility for the offence on the women and not on the perpetrator (Carline et al., 2018). Several different discursive themes emerge in participant responses to this poster.

5.2.1. Poster one (figure one) and its link to individual-level theories regarding SGBV

Discursive constructions of SGBV used by poster one potentially reproduce particular theoretical understandings of the phenomenon of SGBV. These theoretical understandings link to individual-level theories and construct responsibility for SGBV as residing with the potential perpetrator. It explicitly targets the person who is at risk of committing SGBV, stating that if someone is too intoxicated to consent then it must be assumed she has not given it. Individual-level theories for SGBV explore the physical and psychological make-up of the individual, and argue that SGBV is due to something inherently wrong with perpetrators (Jasinski, 2001; Jewkes et al., 2011; Mooney, 2000; Yakeley, 2009). Poster one focuses specifically on the behaviour of the possible perpetrator and what he should not do in a situation that could lead to SGBV, which is why it is individualistic. It does not argue that intervention is everyone's collective responsibility which aligns more with psychosocial/cultural theories and socio-structural theories. Another instance of discursive strategy in poster one of individualism is its explicit focus on individual decision-making and responsibility and not on the broader socio-structural conditions that cause SGBV. Specifically these are, the predominant social constructions of gender and heterosexuality and unequal power relations in terms of sexual agency that support or make SGBV possible (Jasinski, 2001; Jewkes et al., 2011; Mooney, 2000; Yakeley, 2009).

5.2.2. Discourse of gender roles and gendered constructions

Discourse of gender roles and gendered constructions are associated with how women and men are viewed according to their gender in society. They are shaped by society to conform to certain gender roles whereby men are socialised to be more dominant and women passive (Eagly et al., 2000; Grubb & Turner, 2012; Rudman & Glick, 2012).

Traditional gender role stereotypes render men as aggressive and powerful creating restrictive gender roles which lead men to try and conform to the ideal of hegemonic masculinity of straight, white men who hold the dominant position in society (Eagly et al., 2000; Grubb & Turner, 2012; Rudman & Glick, 2012). They also engage in toxic masculinity or an idea of manhood defined by violence, sex, status, and aggression, and both men and women comply with gender role stereotypes such as rape myth acceptance, victim-blaming, and a restricted

view of femininity because of the roles allotted to them (Griffith et al., 2011; Jordan et al., 2018). Men must appear to be feminine and strive for control, should present themselves as tough and unemotional, and take risks that adhere to traditional gender roles (Berkowitz, 1992). Adverse responses to rape victims are a consequence of this perception (Grubb & Turner, 2012).

Women have to fit the complementary construction of femininity in order to adhere to the description of hegemonic masculinity in this particularly heteronormative discursive framework. This means women are also restricted by gender role stereotypes and are deemed, in relation to hegemonic masculinity, to be weak, innocent, and fragile (Eagly et al., 2000; Grubb & Turner, 2012; Rudman & Glick, 2012). Cast as the victims, women are seen to be dominated by men so that gendered power relationships set up sexual agency by establishing men as aggressive hunters on the lookout for a score, and women as their submissive prey (Hollway, 1984; Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). The woman's role is then to avoid becoming prey for as long as she can until she wants to get caught by a man (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). The idea is that men want sex and women give it to them (Gavey, 2018). This type of discourse lays the foundation for women to be viewed as the submissive gatekeepers of the sexuality of men (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013).

Feminist theory can be applied here to demonstrate how gender roles and gendered constructions relate to ways in which men and women are viewed in society based on gender and the determining of gender roles as required by the patriarchy (Eagly et al., 2000; Grubb & Turner, 2012; Rudman & Glick, 2012).

Examples of traditional gender roles could be seen in participant responses to questions about poster one and these were:

Extract 1: "I think the poster is conveying the **innocence of these women**, showing the message that being drunk or wearing an outfit does not give consent" (woman).

Extract 2: "**the girls are responsible** because they are drinking" (woman).

Extract 3: “the group of young women **seem to be responsible** as they are in their own group and it seems like a **‘typical girls’ night out**” (woman).

Extract 4: “some males may try to have sex with **these girls** because them being drunk gives them **easy access**” (woman).

These link to constructions of traditional, heteronormative gender roles; Extracts 1 and 4 describe women as innocent or fragile, and accessible because alcohol has increased their vulnerability. Extracts 2, 3, and 4 mention “girls” instead of women thereby depicting a passive role, whereas none of the participants in the study refer to men as “boys”. This reflects gendered constructions and the extent to which discourse opens up or closes down the opportunity for action (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2008; Willig, 2003). It must be noted that all the participants quoted above are women, and that this highlights how deeply entrenched stereotypical gender roles are.

The poster produced responses from the participants that assign a passive role to women as if the predator is lying in wait for her at a bar while she innocently has fun and is supposedly vulnerable because she has had too much to drink. This poster provides a problematic discourse, reproduced by the participants, as it upholds stereotypical gender roles and gendered constructions. As a result, the poster and its reproduction of the discourse of gender roles and gendered constructions leads onto participants engaging in the other discourses that will be mentioned below in its portrayal of a situation in which women are the main target of SGBV. The poster does not explicitly state that the potential perpetrator is a man, however, its use of “she” reflects the assumption of the perpetrator’s being a man.

5.2.3. Discourse of victim-blaming

The discourse of victim-blaming involves articulations of judgment, attribution of blame and responsibility to women/other individuals because they are victims of SGBV (Grubb & Turner, 2012). This discourse views victims as responsible for their victimisation and therefore as deserving of it (Grubb & Turner, 2012). There is research that establishes that women victim-blame women as a defence mechanism against the pervasive threat of SGBV (Grubb & Turner, 2012). This strategy allows women to reason that if they avoid doing what victims of SGBV did in that situation, then they will not be subjected to the same fate (Gordon & Collins, 2013;

Grubb & Turner, 2012). This is known as the Defensive Attribution Hypothesis (Grubb & Turner, 2012).

Rape myth acceptance occurs, together with victim-blaming, to encourage men to engage in SGBV against women and to perpetuate victim-blaming (Grubb & Turner, 2012). It does this by trivialising, denying, distorting, and justifying sexual aggression while minimising the seriousness of SGBV offences by perpetrators (Grubb & Turner, 2012; Ryan, 2011). An example from previous literature is when people say “she was asking for it” or “he didn’t mean it” (Grubb & Turner, 2012, p. 445; Ryan, 2011, p. 775).

Women who consume alcohol are viewed as guilty of contributory negligence and therefore responsible for their victimisation because it is believed that women drinking alcohol facilitates their rape (Gordon & Collins, 2013; Grubb & Turner, 2012).

This study found that many participants, especially when responding to poster one, engaged in the discourse of victim-blaming. Some examples of this are:

Extract 5: “the women are doing nothing wrong. **It could be argued that they should not be opening themselves up to the possibility of being assaulted,** but it is ultimately the male perpetrator that decides to assault them” (woman).

Extract 6: “some males may try to have sex with these girls because them **being drunk gives them easy access**” (woman).

Extract 7: “young women are drinking on a night out, making them **vulnerable targets** for rape” (woman).

Extract 8: “typically when out people **enjoy drinking quite a lot** and this may lead to these ladies being very drunk and not fully aware of their **surroundings or be unable to control their decisions and actions** in the environment around them. **This poses a threat because a man could take advantage and see that a girl is unable to defend herself**” (man).

Extract 9: “however, responsibility is shared with the women in the picture and the reader - **that when they're on a night out they ought to be wary of who they're with, the decisions they make and the repercussions thereof**” (woman).

These participant responses correspond with the literature that is based around examples of victim-blaming; other examples associated with this relate to the victim's needing either to be more aware of her surroundings and circumstances or more in control of her behaviours and/or her disposition (Sleath & Bull, 2010). The discourse of victim-blaming in this study establishes problems created by the discourses drawn on and reproduced in poster one, demonstrating that victim-blaming is a problematic discourse prevalent in society (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2008; Willig, 2003).

The statements that these participants made range from a mild form of victim-blaming (extract 5) to extracts 6 and 7 in which there is blatant victim-blaming. Potentially, this could indicate that some participants, aware of what victim-blaming means, try to soften their responses and attempt to position themselves away from it. Participants may be trying to resist and to oppose this discourse by half agreeing with it, while emphasising that perpetrators are responsible for SGBV. This suggests that participants are thinking critically about the poster and about SGBV but that the ambiguity of their responses may suggest that the poster itself may not convey the right message and may not be persuasive enough to lead participants away from this type of discourse.

Interestingly, poster one (figure one) states that “drinking is not a crime, rape is” and “it doesn't matter what she's wearing, how much she's had to drink or whether you've kissed...sex without consent is rape. If she's too drunk to consent, assume she hasn't given it”, which, if interpreted from one perspective, implies that the perpetrator is at fault if he engages in SGBV in that the poster is seemingly targeting the one initiating the SGBV. Yet the message that many participants took from this, as seen in extract 6 above, is that the victim is responsible because drinking irresponsibly gives the perpetrator “easy access”; therefore both the victim and perpetrator are accountable. Those participants who blatantly victim-blamed receive the message from poster one (figure one) that there needs to be an increase in the self-regulation of behaviour on the part of both potential perpetrators and of their victims (Knowles, 2016).

The tension lies in the fact that poster one (figure one) explicitly tries to target and undermine typical rape myth justifications for SGBV, part of which are attempts to blame victims. Participants seem to miss this message because the poster itself is unclear and confusing, or because of the impact of other discourses upon which the participants also draw (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). These discourses are constructions of gender, gender roles, and the type of heterosexuality that normalises the man as the predator and the woman as the gatekeeper of sex (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013).

The conclusion that can be drawn is that this discursive theme of victim-blaming can be the consequence of other discourses and constructions of gender and sexuality. This demonstrates how several discursive themes work in relation to each other. For example, if the dominant construction of heterosexuality is one of active and aggressive men who pursue women and passive women who try to manage men's sexual attentions then this positions women as the gatekeepers of sex (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). Responsibility for decision-making is put onto women, responsibility for risk-management rests with women, and communicating consent is constructed as a woman's job in sexual interactions (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). Consequently, there is a continued focus on the culpable behaviour of the potential victim of SGBV and a resulting discourse of victim-blaming which connects with a discourse of female responsibility, risk management, and consent. Poster one (figure one) has an explicit message that challenges rape myths, but it does so without troubling the deeper underlying discourses about and constructions of gender and sexuality that underpin them. This is possibly why participants did not take the explicit anti-rape myth message to heart.

The discourse of victim-blaming, the discourse of female responsibility and the discourse of risk management all interlink around the perpetrator and victim, and the safety measures the victim is obliged to take as the one who is responsible for her own negligence and in turn for being the victim of SGBV (Gordon & Collins, 2013; Grubb & Turner, 2012). These links will be discussed in more detail below.

5.2.4. Discourse of female responsibility and risk management

The discourse of female responsibility goes hand in hand with the discourse of victim-blaming, as it sees women as responsible for taking prevention measures against SGBV by developing safety strategies, such as not walking alone at night, refraining from drinking too much alcohol,

not wearing revealing clothing, not flirting with men, and not drinking with men (Gordon & Collins, 2013). These strategies are not only developed by women to shield themselves from potential victimisation and to disassociate themselves from SGBV, but also by men who seek to excuse their behaviours by holding women responsible (Gordon & Collins, 2013). The idea is that women then provoke or instigate the attack so that perpetrators who are men are not seen as responsible for the SGBV (Gordon & Collins, 2013). Women must follow the safety rules and make themselves as quiet and inconspicuous as possible to avoid SGBV, otherwise, they are believed to be responsible for what happens to them (Gordon & Collins, 2013).

The discourse of victim-blaming and of female responsibility occur together with the discourse of risk management, as many individuals feel that women should take on risk management to avoid SGBV (Jordan et al., 2018). If women do this then they will not be blamed or held responsible for their victimisation because it will supposedly not happen to them (Jordan et al., 2018). For example, even when a woman goes out and has fun at a nightclub, she must keep safe by going with a group, keeping her friends close, and by never going anywhere alone (Jordan et al., 2018). Women may, furthermore, ignore certain behaviours by men or try and avoid them, rather than challenge persistent and unwelcome attention or micro aggression, as this is a safer and more effective way of escaping the situation rather than fighting it (Jordan et al., 2018). The expectations placed on women are there to manage the pervasive risk of victimisation by changing, controlling, and inhibiting their behaviour (Jordan et al., 2018).

This research found that many of the participants, especially in response to questions about poster one (figure one), engage in the discourse of female responsibility and risk management.

The reasons are:

Extract 10: “**the girls are responsible** because they are drinking” (woman).

Extract 11: “**women are of course responsible** for their choices about their bodies, and **responsible for how much they drink**, knowing that drinking to excess may **cause an impairment in motor/cognitive function for that time**” (woman).

Extract 12: “**that drink responsibly is needed by everyone** as it alters your brain chemistry and decisions made” (woman).

Extract 13: “**the women are responsible?** It appears they are enjoying themselves and hence must have wanted to party” (man).

Extract 14: The women are doing nothing wrong. **It could be argued that they should not be opening themselves up to the possibility of being assaulted** but, it is ultimately the male perpetrator that decides to assault them. The situation the women are in should have nothing to do with it” (woman).

Extract 15: “**responsibility is shared with the women in the picture** and the reader - that when they're on a night out they're ought to be **wary of who they're with, the decisions** they make and the **repercussions thereof**” (woman).

Extracts 10 to 13 convey what the literature has said about female responsibility to travel in groups and keep alcohol to a minimum (Gordon & Collins, 2013). Those women who have had alcohol before an attack receive higher levels of blame than those who are not intoxicated (Gordon & Collins, 2013). This highlights problems created through the discourse and how the common discourse prevails in non-bystander poster interventions against SGBV (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2008; Willig, 2003). Female responsibility relates to victim-blaming, and when a woman drinks, this means she is taking responsibility for herself; if she is not in a group or if she flirts with men, she is to blame for being the victim of SGBV; this is exactly what victim-blaming is (Gordon & Collins, 2013; Grubb & Turner, 2012).

Feminist theory argues that violence and sexism occur because of the patriarchal nature of society and socialisation practices (Fleming et al., 2015; Kelly, 2013; Jasinski, 200; Lea & Auburn, 2001). Rape myth acceptance, victim-blaming, an emphasis on female responsibility, and risk management are ideological discourses that allow for the justification and rationalisation of rape and the acceptance of the behaviours that underpin this violent act (Lea & Auburn, 2001; Ryan, 2011). For example, aggressive and violent behaviour by men is justified in a society accepting of social norms that dictate that this behaviour is acceptable because of the “boys will be boys” mentality central to this. Victims of SGBV, if they do not engage in safety measures, are responsible for it. Men cannot stop aggressive behaviours because this is how they have been brought up to behave and this means that a vulnerable

woman is in fact asking to be attacked. Patriarchy and inequality between genders are established by feminist theory as being the underlying factors that perpetuate SGBV.

The participants' responses were shaped by the poster that conveys the notion that women are responsible for their actions and that to remain free of SGBV they should drink responsibly, and remain in a group to discourage the perpetrator who preys on intoxicated women in a bar. The women are wearing revealing clothing and drinking to excess, and this implies that they are vulnerable. The intervention of the poster cannot dissuade participants from victim-blaming.

There is some resistance to the dominant discourse, as extract 13 argues that “the women are responsible?”, thereby questioning the dominant discourse.

Extracts 14 and 15 relate to the discourse of risk management, as the women in the extracts are being blamed for their decisions, for their companions, and for being in a certain type of crowd without friends to support them demonstrating that participant responses around female responsibility flow from constructions of women as being responsible for rape if they do not manage the risks involved in drinking and not staying in large trustworthy groups (Jordan et al., 2018). Taken together the joint consequence of both of these sub-themes is the reproduction of victim-blaming and a focus on the behaviour of victims of SGBV, rather than the behaviour of perpetrators.

5.2.5. Discourse of fear

The discourse of fear connects with many discourses such as victim-blaming, female responsibility and risk management, gender roles, and gender constructions, the construction of the perpetrator, and deviance. Fear is not only associated with how women view the perpetrator, especially if he is seen as a sexual deviant, exploitative predator, or opportunistic monster, but also how a woman views other women, how risks associated with SGBV, are managed, and how they experience everyday life (Berkowitz, 1992; Ferguson & Beaver, 2009; Rose, 2000). Women more often than men think about, for example, the dangers associated with walking alone at night, which is one element of risk management (Gordon & Collins, 2013). Women who do walk alone at night or go to bars or clubs alone are likely to be associated with victim-blaming and female responsibility (Gordon & Collins, 2013). Women

may have a fear of how others view them, so undertake risk management because of the response they may receive from becoming a victim of SGBV (Grubb & Turner, 2012). Victim-blaming occurs due to women dissociating from the fear that comes with being a victim of SGBV as well (Grubb & Turner, 2012). Discourse of fear also means that women understand the danger they believe men usually represent and therefore anticipate SGBV and see it as inevitable (Gordon & Collins, 2013). They believe it is always possible to experience this in the course of their daily lives, especially in South Africa (Dosekun, 2011).

This study found that women at Rhodes University do fear SGBV as is conveyed by responses to poster one (figure one):

Extract 16: “very **disheartening and frightening** because rape has become our new normal. Women are always living in fear, because they never know if they may be a next gender-based-violence victim” (woman).

Extract 17: “I constantly **feel angry, it is not fair**” (woman).

It must be noted that the men in this study did not comment on SGBV from the same perspective as did the women, as they did not fear being subjected to SGBV themselves, which suggests that SGBV is constructed as a gendered phenomenon and is about gendered power and inequality (Gordon & Collins, 2013). This could link to the construction of the perpetrator who is usually seen as a man due to the prevalence of men committing SGBV against women and societal constructions of the perpetrator being a man (Gordon & Collins, 2013).

5.2.6. Construction of the perpetrator

Constructions of the perpetrator reveals how individuals view the person who commits the act of SGBV (Ryan, 2011). Usually, the perpetrator is constructed by society as being a man and the victim as a woman (Ryan, 2011). But, that the perpetrator is not seen to be “a normal man” diminishes the significance of the reality, that it is usually someone entirely ordinary who engages in SGBV (Berkowitz, 1992; Ryan, 2011). There are rape myths for example, that husbands “cannot” rape their wives, and that strangers, and not acquaintances, are responsible for SGBV (Ryan, 2011). The ordinary man will engage in SGBV as a result of gender norms, toxic ideas of masculinity, peer pressure, alcohol, and drug use, and negative attitudes of men

towards women (Peacock & Barker, 2014). There is, however, still this disassociation between society seeing rapists as ordinary and not sexual deviants (Jasinski, 2001; Lea & Auburn, 2001). Rapists are believed to engage in SGBV because of sexual craving or obsession, but it has been shown that this is about power and not desire (García-Moreno et al., 2015; Jasinski, 2001; Lea & Auburn, 2001; Luce et al., 2010; O’Hara, 2012).

The construction of the perpetrator and how participants dissociate from the ordinary man in the study is highlighted by the use of strong language when speaking about the perpetrator in poster one (figure one) as “the rapist”, which suggests they do not associate him with an ordinary man, but rather with a deviant one.

Some instances in which the construction of the perpetrator is at play with the participants are:

Extract 18: “**the rapist**. It is always the **rapists** fault” (woman).

Extract 19: “the **rapist** is responsible for the rape. As said before, the events portrayed in the poster show a simple scene of young women drinking and enjoying themselves. It is the actions of the **rapist or abuser** that results in the upsetting situation of a rape; of an **accused and accuser**” (woman).

Extract 20: “I think the poster is aiming against rape and the reasons **that the people who rape** justify themselves with in order to escape their wrongness” (woman).

5.2.7. Discourse of deviance

A discourse of deviance explains the construction of the perpetrator who is seen as genetically at risk of engaging in antisocial behaviour (Berkowitz, 1992; Ferguson & Beaver, 2009; Rose, 2000). The idea is that this person has an abnormality that leads to the act of SGBV (Ferguson & Beaver, 2009; Rose, 2000). Rapists are viewed by society as abnormal individuals who have personality disorders and are seen as sexual deviants or monsters (Berkowitz, 1992; Jasinski, 2001; Lea & Auburn, 2001). This notion contributes to the argument that SGBV is not frequent as discussed in the literature review and theory chapter (Jasinski, 2001; Lea & Auburn, 2001).

The discourse of deviance is considered next; there were some participants in the study who felt that perpetrators fit into this discourse. Some examples of where this is at play with the participants are:

Extract 21: “I however feel that the optimal way to ensure people’s safety on campus is to **screen students before they are admitted for tendencies towards this type of behaviour**” (woman).

Extract 22: “the message the poster is trying to convey is that women should be able to enjoy themselves in an intoxicated state without being **targeted or preyed upon** for sexual purposes” (woman).

Extract 23: “I think we need to stop thinking that rapists are these men in the shadows that prey on vulnerable women, they are your friends and cousins and more emphasis need to be put on how not to rape...not trying to convince people that drinking isn't a crime” (woman).

It is clear here that the woman quoted in extract 21 feels that this is a behaviour that does not occur in everyone. Likewise, the second statement argues that perpetrators “prey upon vulnerable women”, which follows on from the deviant or monster theory (Berkowitz, 1992; Ferguson & Beaver, 2009; Rose, 2000). The third statement resists this dominant discourse but indicates that this line of thinking still occurs. These responses emphasise the manner in which the comprehension of a troublesome episode of deviance is dependent upon familiar discourses and ideas that may not reflect reality, but which are prevalent in the public mind (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2008; Willig, 2003). Some of the participants, as reflected in extract 23 above, demonstrate, therefore, that there is a movement away from the conventional line of thinking associated with SGBV, which is that perpetrators are deviant.

The poster does not give clarity on the identity of the perpetrator but merely uses the word “you” to establish that it refers to the person committing the SGBV. This could lead to ambiguity and may be the reason why the women participants could disassociate from the line of thinking that the perpetrator is an ordinary man. The participants who are men could also distance themselves from the focus of the poster by emphasising that they would not do

something like that, and it could only ever be another man, and this indeed is what most of their responses indicated. That the poster does not engage men directly allows for men observers of the poster to sidestep responsibility and distance themselves from the constructions of the perpetrator in the poster. This calls attention to the fact that the poster is not clear enough about who it is targeting therefore producing responses in the viewers that the perpetrator is someone alien who preys on drunk women in a bar, and whose motives are deviant. The bystander intervention poster (figure two), on the other hand, would promote a different response in this instance, in that it makes it clear that it is targeting everyone who could be a witness to a SGBV situation (Foubert et al., 2010).

5.2.8. Links to the evolutionary theory and psychopathology

Poster one participant responses in relation to the discourse of deviance is aligned with evolutionary theory and constructions of psychopathology (Ferguson, 2009; Jasinski, 2001; Klasios, 2019; Lea & Auburn, 2001). Poster two conveys similar themes that emerge with the construction of the perpetrator and deviance, however, there is a slight perspective change in that the perpetrator is regarded as a stranger or an ordinary man, and not, as in poster one, as a deviant monster.

Participant responses to poster one reflect constructions of the perpetrator as someone who is not ordinary (Ferguson, 2009; Klasios, 2019). For example, an extract from responses to poster one highlights constructions of innate deviance, “I however feel that the optimal way to ensure people’s safety on campus is to screen students before they are admitted for tendencies towards this type of behaviour”. The theories that underpin the school of thought that rapists are abnormal are then the evolutionary theory and psychopathology (Klasios, 2019; Ferguson, 2009).

5.2.9. Discourse of risk management

The variation in the discourse of risk management as it relates to men/potential perpetrators refers to their managing the risk of being accused of committing SGBV (Jordan et al., 2018).

Some examples of where the discourse of risk management is at play with the participants who are men are:

Extract 24: “yes. **To the very ignorant it can serve as an informer. Those who think kissing for example is an invitation for sex even without consent can see this poster and learn**” (man).

Extract 25: “it’s basically saying that, even though you might be having fun during your night out and you might have gotten physical (kissing or hugging), **if she is too drunk and hasn’t given you consent to go home and be even more physical it is considered rape**” (man).

Extract 26: “you must attain consent before any sexual or physical intimacy. **Consent is required even for non-physical vocal advances. Alcohol can make a woman lose control of their bearings, but this isn't an invitation or an excuse to validate a rape advance**” (man).

The examples from men in response to poster one (figure one) show that they are establishing what they should not do about intimacy with a woman. For example, kissing is not an invitation for sexual intercourse and alcohol intoxication does not mean consent. These responses show the subjectivity with which participants manage social realities and their ways of seeing and living in the world (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2003). They examine the compulsion to adhere to the dominant discourse (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2003). In these examples, men must maintain certain socially acceptable actions concerning intimacy with women through behaving in a manner which will not lead to SGBV. This is potentially challenging in that the mindset is not concerned with treating women with respect because it is the right thing to do, but rather to find a way to avoid having to bear the consequences of their actions (Jordan et al., 2018). Men can engage in micro aggression such as touching a woman inappropriately at a club or catcalling because it will not warrant serious consequences or arrest (Jordan et al., 2018). The discourse is ambiguous and perhaps immature in its denial of moral responsibility.

The message conveyed by poster one (figure one) is not targeting its audience in the right way, but creates a checklist for men on what not to do in order to avoid having their actions declared wrongful (Jordan et al., 2018). This does not fulfil the goal of primary interventions, which is to change social attitudes around SGBV, but rather gives men an easy escape from being “forced” to understand why their actions are wrongful. The bystander intervention poster (figure two) might provide a better intervention in this instance, because it holds the community

and everyone in it accountable, rather than a select few individuals or just the perpetrator and the victim. Changes in social attitudes become possible and there is a decrease in the chance of victim-blaming, and in the discourses of female responsibility and risk management (Banyard et al., 2004).

The purpose of this discourse was to establish also that men engage in risk management by pinpointing what they should do in order not to be declared a perpetrator of SGBV (Berkowitz, 1992). Men often find ways to justify the rape with accusatory excuses such as; she went to his apartment, he paid for the date, the woman led him on, a woman could not claim she was raped if there were no bruises, and when she said “no” she really meant “yes” (Berkowitz, 1992; Iconis, 2008). This creates a coercive relationship, as the man tries to convince the woman into the situation (Berkowitz, 1992). Men are also deemed less responsible for SGBV if they have been drinking, but, if a woman has been drinking, she is deemed responsible (Berkowitz, 1992).

The men did not seem fearful of the repercussions of this poster. Their response was, rather, to remove their own accountability from the situation by stating that they would never do something like this or engage in this type of behaviour. The poster then fails to create accountability from the gender who is supposedly most at fault (Ryan, 2011). The poster therefore fails to intervene against SGBV. The bystander intervention poster (figure two), on the other hand, is more successful than poster one because the responses from both men and women participants held themselves and others to be accountable thereby demonstrating a sense of collective responsibility.

5.2.10. Discourse of consent

The discourse of consent is about what people believe consent is and when and where they feel there has been consent in a situation, as is discussed in the literature review (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013).

There were three matters raised in relation to consent in the responses to questions about the posters. These were, firstly, that the power and responsibility to consent resides with the woman or the potential victim and this particular understanding of how consent should work reproduces constructions of women as bearing the responsibility for being the gatekeepers of sex which ties in with traditional constructions of gender (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013).

Secondly, seeking consent is often construed as more or less a once-off event in sexual interactions, and involves one party's ability to say "no", as opposed to an active and enthusiastic construction of consent that revolves around a positive "yes" (du Toit, 2008). This means that once consent is given the first time sexual intercourse occurs with a particular partner then in every other instance in which this happens consent is no longer necessary. Thirdly, when there is a focus on consent as the defining feature of whether or not an act constitutes SGBV then this ignores the issue of gendered power relations and the fact that coercive circumstances can often render saying "no" impossible, or can undermine the authenticity of a "yes" (du Toit, 2008). For example, people can often give in to pressure to have sexual intercourse because of the situational or social pressures surrounding their circumstances (du Toit, 2008).

Consent as represented in poster one (figure one) reproduces a particular picture or definition of SGBV and does not consider the complexities that may be involved in coercive sexual encounters nor does it convey a full understanding of SGBV as a gendered power matter. For example, poster one (figure one) only refers to one type of situation that relates to consent and only when there is alcohol intoxication. It targets the perpetrator with information about what a woman is wearing, how much she has had to drink, and that kissing does not mean that she has consented to sexual intercourse. It does not account for whether the perpetrator is a stranger or an acquaintance, whether the SGBV is happening between people who are in a relationship, whether it is between two men, or whether it is between women and men, or people of different races, all of which would demonstrate power and dominance (García-Moreno et al., 2015). The poster puts forward its own, and limited, idea of what constitutes SGBV and does not account for other instances where this might occur. It also only shows young, pretty, white women in the picture, which reproduces a particular stock representation around SGBV and does not portray other SGBV situations (Griffith et al., 2011; Jordan et al., 2018). This poster was originally made for a UK audience, which means that the context could be different, however, the matters around consent also apply to the participant audience in this study.

Some examples of the discourse of consent for the participants are:

Extract 27: “a group of women are drinking at a party. **They are drunk and therefore unable to consent to sex.** A man is committing rape if he proceeds to sleep with one of the women because she cannot say yes” (woman).

Extract 28: “the story the poster is telling **that if a girl is too drunk to consent, she hasn't given her consent and any 'sex' you would have would be rape**” (woman).

Extract 29: “it’s basically saying that, even though you might be having fun during your night out and you might have gotten physical (kissing or hugging), **if she is too drunk and hasn't given you consent to go home and be even more physical it is considered rape**” (man).

Extract 30: “you must attain consent before any sexual or physical intimacy. Consent is required even for non-physical vocal advances. **Alcohol can make a woman lose control of their bearings, but this isn't an invitation or an excuse to validate a rape advance**” (man).

In response to the poster, participants placed the majority of the power and responsibility for consent with the woman or the potential victim, as seen in extracts 27 to 30 above so that the potential victim becomes the sexual gatekeeper (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013).

It was difficult to establish the second matter raised in relation to consent and SGBV which is that seeking consent is often construed as more or less a once-off event in sexual interactions, but the nature of the poster makes it difficult to ascertain from participant responses because the context of the poster is that it is set in a bar or club (du Toit, 2008). The ambiguity is that we do not have a background to the sexual encounter and can only assume that consent must be given before it, but it does not specifically mention how many times consent must be ascertained in the poster just that it must be given. The third matter that is important about the participant responses, above, is the matter of focus on consent as the defining feature of whether or not an act constitutes SGBV. The participants responded by saying consent is needed before sexual intercourse and if there is no consent this is the defining factor of what constitutes SGBV, as seen in extracts 29 “if she is too drunk and hasn't given you consent to go home and be even more physical it is considered rape” and in extract 28 “that if a girl is too drunk to consent, she hasn't given her consent and any 'sex' you would have would be rape”. These extracts ignore gendered power relations and coercive circumstances that may render saying “no” impossible or could undermine the authenticity of a “yes” (du Toit, 2008). The

participants stated that consent is the defining factor in any instance in which SGBV takes place, but this ignores the social and societal pressures, such as being pressured by friends to engage in alcohol consumption or being pressured by a boyfriend/friend to go home with him while under the influence of alcohol. In essence, the participants placed responsibility with the woman, the potential victim, to decide when and how consent is given, which leads to a range of other problematic discourses, such as female responsibility and risk management, and ignores the potential perpetrator's role in, and responsibility for, matters related to consent.

Stereotypes around men's and women's roles in sexual intercourse also still occur (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). Feminist theory argues that the persistence of these stereotypes is due to the portrayal of men as superior and women as inferior in society (Fleming et al., 2015; Kelly, 2013; Jasinski, 200; Lea & Auburn, 2001). Men believe women have a passive role sexually, which is possibly a reason why they continue the intercourse even if a woman has not explicitly consented to it, or even against her explicit wishes; this is discussed in the theory chapter (Fleming et al., 2015; Kelly, 2013; Jasinski, 200; Lea & Auburn, 2001).

In contrast to the discourses just examined are the resistance of the dominant discourses and permissiveness and freedom.

The discourse of victim-blaming, female responsibility, and risk management connect to the discourse of gender roles and constructions because these are a consequence of ways in which stereotypical gender norms and the patriarchal nature of society are played out (Eagly et al., 2000; Grubb & Turner, 2012; Rudman & Glick, 2012). The discourse of fear relates to gender roles and constructions because women and their fear of men is the result of hegemonic masculinity and the patriarchy's established unequal power relations between men and women (Eagly et al., 2000; Grubb & Turner, 2012; Rudman & Glick, 2012). The perpetrator is constructed in a certain way because of the stereotypical nature of gender norms which means that men are more likely to be viewed as the perpetrator because of their supposed aggression, dominance, and propensity for violence (Eagly et al., 2000; Grubb & Turner, 2012; Rudman & Glick, 2012). The discourse of consent flows from how stereotypical gender constructions in society portray women as submissive and men as controlling (Eagly et al., 2000; Grubb & Turner, 2012; Rudman & Glick, 2012). This shows a collaboration between the different discourses mentioned above.

5.2.11. Resistance to dominant discursive constructions

Resistance to dominant discursive constructions should be noted; some participants did not comply with the status quo about poster one and what it was portraying which suggests that individuals do not necessarily bow to master narratives or agree with the traditional worldview but can and do critically analyse and question cultural and societal norms (Talbot, 1996).

Participants did not always accept the dominant discursive constructions, as they questioned poster one and what it stood for.

Some examples of participant resistance to dominant discourses are:

Extract 31: “I would have a eye catching photo that includes all woman because **rape does not only happen to pretty white girls** - not trying to be liberal. I just think it will hit home for more people if they can relate” (woman).

Extract 32: “**maybe woman of colour too?** that don't all look the same so more people look at the poster and don't feel like it does not speak to them” (woman).

Extract 33: “the message is a biased one, in favour of women as victims - **other genders are also subjected; does not reflect the reality that this affects all races**” (woman).

Extract 34: “the fact that **men too can be raped under vulnerable conditions, and that the rapist can be male, female or any other gender orientation**” (woman).

Extract 35: “while women are victims of sexual assault more often, men and **non-binary person** are as well - I think it would be beneficial to consider them in these kinds of adverts as well. **Potentially using non-gendered language to be inclusive**” (woman).

The fact that the poster shows only one perspective on SGBV establishes that it is not necessarily doing enough to unpack the complexities of consent and gendered power matters. It does not engage with the inclusion of men, non-binary people, or men and women of colour even in relation to bars, clubs, and alcohol, as is clear in extracts 31 and 32. This means that

even though this study targeted a young audience in relation to alcohol intoxication in a bar or a club, the participants who took part were anonymous and could have included different races, genders, and ethnicities. These different groups would not have been accounted for by the poster's message so that the purpose is very limited. This is noticeable in the response suggesting "maybe woman of colour too? that don't all look the same so more people look at the poster and don't feel like it does not speak to them" (woman).

The poster excluded situations in which SGBV can occur, such as between husband and wife, in a home environment, and between men; there are, inevitably, other situations too (Ryan, 2011). The research does, however, purposefully use posters that target a university setting in which alcohol is involved. Even so, participants demonstrate resistance to dominant discourses reflected in the poster and can pinpoint how another type of intervention may improve the poster's shortcomings. Many of the participants did not blindly follow the poster's message, whereby it is showing white attractive females, smiling and young with no blemishes who are potential victims of SGBV. That there are no women of colour is an established problem with anti-rape posters which often mimic commercial advertising and then exclude certain social groups (Murphy, 2009).

The context of production for the original poster being made for a UK audience must be noted, however, in its pointing to the need to develop and adapt locally appropriate and applicable versions of intervention campaigns, as opposed simply to taking them out of other environments and reproducing them in South Africa without appropriate adjustments because the potential effect of doing this is to allow target audiences to distance themselves from the message. This is because it will not seem to apply to them if it does not acknowledge or speak to their context or experience.

5.2.12. Discourse of permissiveness and freedom

Discourses of permissiveness and freedom potentially connects to resistance to the dominant discursive constructions of gender and gender roles in relation to SGBV because these challenge the constructions that underpin status quo assumptions that women must behave in a certain way to avoid SGBV. Notions of permissiveness and freedom mean that women should be free to wear whatever they wish, do what they want to do, such as drink alcohol and party, and go where they want to go (Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2004; Ryan, 2011). There is a

prevalent contradictory view, however, that women should be allowed such freedoms of dress, movement, and behaviour without fearing SGBV, but they should drink responsibly, only party in big groups, make sure they do not go home alone with someone they do not know, and be sure to make rational and clear decisions, otherwise, they will make themselves vulnerable targets for SGBV (Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2004; Ryan, 2011).

This is an important term for a very specifically defined set of discursive constructions regarding gender roles and heterosexuality. It was first used by Wendy Hollway in 1984 in a discussion of a discourse of permissiveness which is a relatively recent change in the construction of women's heterosexuality (Hollway, 1984). The idea is, she argued in 1984, that a discourse of permissiveness and freedom recasts women's sexuality as active and urge-driven and that she is not merely a passive complement to active, biologically-driven men's heterosexuality (Hollway, 1984). This may appear progressive and liberatory on the surface, however, the consequences of such constructions of women's heterosexuality entrench notions of biological determinism, reinforce the discourse around men's sex drives, and cast heterosexual interactions as part of a game in which both men and women are players on an even competitive footing (Hollway, 1984). This not only ignores gendered power differences, but also reinforces discourses displaying women's responsibility for managing the risk of SGBV (Hollway, 1984). For example, if men and women are deemed to be on an equal footing then women (and also men) who wear what they please, drink as they want to, and go to clubs and bars must, according to this line of thinking, not complain if this activity results in SGBV. Another example from literature that deals with this is a quote by Meyer (2010), which states "if a woman goes out half-dressed, exchanges raunchy sexual banter with eager young men, drinks ten large vodka and Red Bulls, takes someone home and snogs him enthusiastically, she should not be staggered if he gets the wrong idea" (p.23). This then explains why, when the discourses of permissiveness and freedom are used, demurs and cautions are often appended such as "drink, but do so responsibly", "party, but not too hard", and "wear what you like, but within reason". This means that when participants and anti-SGBV posters potentially use a discourse of permissiveness, they not only emphasise women's freedom to behave as they wish but are also to some extent pushing the hidden tagline of accepting the consequences of one's choices without complaint. The discourse, therefore, is a limited one.

Many participants engaged in the discourse of permissiveness and freedom, particularly in response to poster one. Some examples of this are:

Extract 36: “the message that the poster conveyed to me was a reiteration that women deserve to be able to engage in activities with the intention of simple fun without reservations regarding the intentions of others. Personally, **I also feel that this poster portrays responsibility on both the parts of men and women**” (man).

Extract 37: “they also address the stereotypes that women face after being raped. My only issue is the part where they mention drinking. I feel that drinking should be discouraged as well because rape and sexual harassment is also prevalent in spaces where alcohol is being consumed. **Also alcohol gets changed your state of mind, you’re not fully conscious so you’re not aware of your decisions, I’d rather they also discourage drinking**” (man)

Extract 38: “the story I think this poster is trying to tell is highlighting the mentality of **'she made herself vulnerable' by being intoxicated or wearing skimpy clothes**, this should not be the case” (woman).

The first two statements (extracts 36 and 37) are both contradictory in their argument that women should be allowed to have fun and that the typical stereotypes of women “asking for it” is wrong, and yet go on strongly to imply that the women are indeed responsible for the behaviour of their men that have attacked them because the women have consumed alcohol. These two extracts demonstrate the hidden tagline of the permissive discourse. Alternatively, they might also be read as a recognition of the tension between an ideal situation and the realities of the gendered inequalities prevalent in the real world. In other words, women should have the freedom to choose their behaviour but gendered inequalities determine that women will be seen as inferior and as targets for SGBV so their freedom of behaviour and action is often prevented. The third statement (extract 38) highlights the fact that the participant understood that the poster was focused on an ambiguous discourse, which adheres to the view that women are “asking for it”, drink “too much”, and wear alluring clothes, all of which suggests a persistent resistance to the discourse.

The contradiction that occurs in some of the participant statements (extracts 36 and 37) could arise because the poster (figure one) has given participants the idea that the women in the poster are wearing revealing clothing (“doesn’t matter what she’s wearing”) and drinking to excess

(“if she’s too drunk to consent, assume she hasn’t given it”), while a man lies in wait for her at a bar or a club. This could lead to contradictory thoughts that if these men do lie in wait for women in this environment, then participants may be concerned for the women’s safety and thus move towards seeing her as vulnerable. But this response not only shifts the thought process towards deviance and away from ordinary men, it assumes that SGBV is a lot less common than it is and the blame must be imposed on the victim, not the perpetrator. Poster two (figure two) evokes a different response because it draws its focus away from the perpetrator and victim to that of the bystander which changes the point of accountability from being between the perpetrator and victim to its being a matter of community awareness and responsibility.

The discourse of permissiveness and freedom may compete with the discourse of fear and could be another reason why participants have contradictory responses to the message they take away from poster one. This is because although they may wish for women to be free to do whatever they please they are also fearful of the consequences of doing this liberty. This is because SGBV tends to be prevalent in places like bars and where alcohol is sold (Gordon & Collins, 2013). The participants are therefore shaped by their fear of SGBV but may also be agreeing to some extent with the discourse of permissiveness and freedom. Poster two (figure two) may be helpful in this situation in its implication that if everyone becomes involved in intervening against SGBV, there may be less fear regarding safety due to the fact that there is a sense of community care and of people trying to protect each other.

The participants are, furthermore, not only emphasising women’s freedom and right to behave as they wish but also agree with the hidden tagline that women must bear the consequences of their actions without complaint. The discourse of permissiveness that prevails in the poster is, therefore, not without fault.

5.3. Figure 2.



Poster two (figure two above) is based on the perspective of bystander intervention in response to SGBV, and has the intention of targeting the potential bystanders to a SGBV situation that involves alcohol and is in a university setting (Ricardo et al., 2011). It is based on the bystander intervention because it targets witnesses to a potential SGBV situation to help the victim to safety before the act occurs, as mentioned in the methodology section. Since it explicitly adopts a bystander orientation towards intervention, poster two argues for collective responsibility in respect of SGBV and aligns strongly with psychosocial, cultural and socio-structural level theories and understandings of the causes of SGBV. Such understandings tend to explore how society and social conditions create the situations in which it is possible for SGBV to occur, and to explore possible solutions to this problem at the level of collective, or group, interventions. The bystander approach does not focus on just the potential SGBV perpetrator and victim, but includes everyone else who could be standing by in a situation that leads to SGBV, making it a societal problem in which everyone has a moral and social duty to try to prevent.

Different discourses emerged in participant responses to this poster.

5.3.1. Discourse of gender roles and gendered constructions

Examples of the participant responses to poster two in relation to gender roles and gender constructions include:

Extract 39: “some **girls** were at a party and a man was annoying one **girl** so they all left, because they thought their friend was drunk and probably wouldn't make a good decision” (woman).

Extract 40: “**there is a power play at work**, even if it is subconscious, which makes this sort of violence the man's responsibility” (woman).

Extract 41: “I would design a poster that teaches men that they should not conform to the **hegemonic masculinity standards that society has set for them**. Cause in my opinion that is the real issue, more than what women wear or whether they are drunk or not, the issue of consent or anything else. The previous advertisements I feel are not addressing the real roots of the problems of gender-based violence. **Men already know that they should not take advantage of drunk women but they still do**. I think we should instead look at why do these men continue to do so? Why do they not help victims who are in threatening situations?” (woman).

These link up with traditional gender roles; as the first statement refers to women as girls; the second statement looks at the power play between genders; and the third statement refers to hegemonic masculinity and with which society has raised men to comply. This again creates a discussion around gendered constructions (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2008; Willig, 2003).

Responses from the participants evoked by poster two (figure two) were very different from those evoked by poster one (figure one). Extracts 40 and 41 resisted the discourse of gendered constructions by stating that there is a power play at work and also mentions hegemonic masculinity and the responsibility of men. There is little referencing of women as “girls”, except for extract 39, and reflect a prominent focus on collective responsibility. This could be due to the fact that the people portrayed in the poster are active agents of intervention against

SGBV, assumed by many of the participants to be a group of women. The poster could have guided the women participants towards believing that women could become part of the solution against SGBV allowing them to have less of a passive role and which deviates from the idea that women are fragile and innocent (Eagly et al., 2000; Grubb & Turner, 2012; Rudman & Glick, 2012). Poster two (figure two) is more effective in this regard than is poster one (figure one).

5.3.2. Discourse of victim-blaming

Examples in response to poster two in which participants engage in the discourse of victim-blaming are:

Extract 42: “I feel that the message portrayed highlights the **sadness and inconvenience that such a situation would put people in, especially those who didn't even know the drunk woman but still acted on her behalf and for her safety's sake**” (man).

Extract 43: “it conveys how men take advantage of women that are **vulnerable** and who are **easy targets**” (woman).

Extract 44: “also an individual must also be **responsible for their life as well so if they know that they are not responsible with their alcohol intake, then they should stop, or be in a safer environment when drinking. As a Christian, I don't agree with alcohol and drunkenness but that is just me.** And for parties that could be the possible perpetrators, don't take advantage of a helpless human being” (woman).

These responses follow on from the commentary on poster one (figure one) which is evocative of the discourse of victim-blaming in that the characters in poster one seem to be being blamed for needing either to be more aware of current surroundings, the reality of their situation or to be in control of their behaviour by not drinking too much (Sleath & Bull, 2010). Another interesting aspect that can be established from participants' statements is that one of the men participants considers that the SGBV victim is an inconvenience and becomes a burden to the bystanders who have to help her get out of her situation; this is symptomatic of a problematic but common discourse in society (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2008; Willig, 2003). The challenge with poster two (figure two) is that it has not eliminated victim-blaming. There is a shift in

focus, however, between poster one and poster two; poster two points to collective responsibility and poster one does not, which participants did pick up on and recognise and to which there is a positive response. Poster two (figure two), furthermore, evokes responses in the participants that allows for less victim-blaming than does poster one (figure one), in that its focus is not directly on the perpetrator or on the victim (Ricardo et al., 2011). It emphasises a different perspective while drawing participants away from the discourse of victim-blaming and the supposed negligence of the victim by using bystanders as the central target instead.

5.3.3. Discourse of female responsibility and risk management

The discourse of female responsibility and risk management are highlighted in response to poster two in statements that follow:

Extract 45: “each of us has a **responsibility to exert control of ourselves especially when we are intoxicated. If you feel too intoxicated, go home**” (woman).

Extract 46: “also an individual must also be **responsible for their life as well so if they know that they are not responsible with their alcohol intake, then they should stop, or be in a safer environment when drinking. As a Christian, I don't agree with alcohol and drunkenness but that is just me**” (woman).

Extract 47: “**I want to say that women are (to a certain extent) responsible for making sure they are safe and aware of their surroundings**” (woman).

The participants quoted above believe that women must be responsible for themselves, be aware of their surroundings, and should not drink to excess. This shows that problems that are created through thought or discourse are influenced by dominant discourses, and which emerge in interpretations of interventions such as the two posters discussed in this thesis as interventions against SGBV. The upshot of such prejudices is that women will be deemed responsible for SGBV attacks perpetrated upon them (Buchanan, 2008; Willig, 2008; Willig, 2003). Poster two (figure two) does produce commentary that persists in the opinion that women are responsible, as participants still felt it was the victim's responsibility and not just the bystanders. Participants did, however, rely less on the conviction of victim responsibility. Commentary by participants shows that poster two evokes discourse around collective rather

than only female responsibility, and is considered to have a more positive influence on its viewers than that evoked by poster one (figure one).

The discourse of risk management in response to poster two is less than that in response to poster one but some participants do retain a victim-blaming perspective.

For example:

Extract 48: “I agree with the idea. **No one should not go to clubs at night alone, If one of the group members has gone to the dance floor, another group member(s) should guard their drink at the bar, The group has to consist of at least one non-drinker so that they can drive everyone home safely.** Therefore, this is a collective responsibility” (woman).

Extract 49: “that situations like this should not even be necessary. People should be able to go out and be safe. **Therefore emphasis on responsible drinking**” (woman).

That the women commenting on poster two feel that women should keep themselves, and also each other, safe from SGBV points to the notion of the need for risk management (Jordan et al., 2018).

Extract 48 deals with collective responsibility even though taking account of risk management, which shows that the message of poster two (figure two) implies that everyone is responsible for intervening against potential SGBV situations, and not the victim alone. Extract 48 refers to “a group” when commenting on potential SGBV victims suggesting a shift in perspective from its being the victim’s responsibility to its being more than one person’s responsibility to manage the situation portrayed in the poster. That the second poster succeeded in evoking such a perception suggests that its message is more effective than is that of poster one (figure one).

Extract 49, however, does suggest that because this participant leans towards the discourse of risk management, the second poster does not sufficiently influence the observer to move her viewpoint away from victim-blaming. The conclusion is, therefore, that the bystander intervention poster could be reconsidered regarding its perspective though reactions to the

second poster rely less on victim blaming than do those of the first one, so its effectiveness is appropriately more effective than poster one (figure one).

5.3.4. Discourse of fear

Women participants engaged in a discourse of fear in response to both posters as exemplified below in three comments offered by women:

Extract 50: “mad, men are evolving to be **disgusting and scary creatures**” (woman).

Extract 51: “GBV is one of the most evil things ever to exist in human nature. Yes, the fight is for everyone and together we can win this fight. Everyone should be involved in order for change. It starts with one person and multiplies to many” (woman).

Extract 52: “**We can’t be afraid anymore.** Too many of us have paid the price” (woman).

Notably, and throughout this study, only the women participants partook in the discourse of fear that is vividly conveyed in the extracts quoted above thereby confirming the extent to which SGBV and fear coincide for many women. It is essential, however, that there is an increasing awareness in the general public of how widespread and unsafe the world is for everyone, and not just women, regarding this sensitive topic of SGBV (White, 2015). That the men do not fear SGBV in the same way, or to the same extent, as do women is evident in their responses to this poster, and to poster one; this fact calls attention to the discourse of fear as being, demonstrably, a gendered phenomenon (Gordon & Collins, 2013).

5.3.5. Construction of the perpetrator

Importantly, when responding to poster two (figure two), many of the participants referred to the perpetrator as a stranger, in which case they comply with the notion of rape myth acceptance which propounds the notion that stranger rape is ubiquitous and that acquaintance rape is rare and perhaps even unknown in some quarters (Grubb & Turner, 2012; Martin, 2016). The participants diverge from the discourse of deviance but then refer to the perpetrator as someone unknown to the victim rather than as the possibility of his being an acquaintance.

For example:

Extract 53: “a woman and her friends went out to a party. She drank too much alcohol and became highly intoxicated. A **stranger** was making flirtatious advances towards her and her friends noticed. They decided to leave the party and took the woman with them because they cared for her and wanted her to be safe at home” (woman).

Extract 54: “**the stranger** who attempted to lure the girl away and he was taking advantage of her intoxicated state” (woman).

The participants responding to poster two refer to the perpetrator as a man which suggests they see the perpetrator as ordinary and moves away from the discourse of deviance (Jasinski, 2001; Lea & Auburn, 2001).

For example:

Extract 55: “UGH NO IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE **MEN OR PEOPLE WHO ARE DOING THE VIOLENCE AND RAPE.**” (woman).

Extract 56: “**target men**, and appeal to them to make better choices, and to support each other in making better choices. For example, one where friends of **a guy** see that he is drunk and acting inappropriately towards a woman and remove him from the situation to prevent him from making a bad choice (raping a woman)” (woman).

The poster may have shaped the opinions of the participants quoted above towards the discourse of viewing the perpetrator as a stranger and results from the stereotype of rape myth acceptance upholding the view that strangers, and not acquaintances, are guilty of rape (Iconis, 2008). This could convey a flaw in the poster’s perspective in that it portrays a situation in a bar or a club in which “some dude is hanging all over her”, so it makes the clear assumption that the perpetrator is a stranger.

The use of “dude” does invite participants to see the perpetrator as an ordinary man and not a sexual deviant, but also as a stranger, not an acquaintance which he may well be. This may show that poster two is more effective than poster one, as it is specific in its target. Poster one

(figure one) uses the word “you”, which is quite vague and leads to many participants responding to the poster with the understanding that the perpetrator is deviant.

5.3.6. Discourse of deviance

Participants resort to the discourse of deviance when they respond to poster two (figure two) in these terms:

Extract 57: “I wouldn't do a poster, **men need very serious therapy, they are very sick**” (woman).

Extract 58: “**well men or rather the "predators" not always men**” (woman).

Extract 59: “honestly, I don't even know where to start. Probably **would need to understand the mind of men/rapists so that I could target their thoughts or their “norms”** (woman).

On the other hand, more participants in response to poster two refer to the perpetrator as “**a dude**” (woman) or, indeed, as an ordinary man:

Extract 60: “I would put the emphasis on men's responsibilities and **also how average men also commit GBV**” (woman).

This was a fascinating response, in that while some respondents use a discourse of deviance to understand poster two (extracts 58 and 59), others understand the message to target ordinary men (extract 60). Extract 57 calls upon the need for men in general needing therapy which could relate to underlying anger from this participant towards men and does not communicate a discourse of deviance. Extracts 58 and 59, however, do describe SGBV as being a form of deviance, which leads the researcher to the question of whether the poster does enough to move observers away from this discourse and towards seeing perpetrators as ordinary men. The poster's use of the word “dude” suggests a specific reference to men who are not seen as deviant because it is a colloquial term meaning “a guy”, “a chap” or a “bloke”. Some participants may have overlooked this.

Poster two (figure two) once again, show itself to be more effective than poster one (figure one), as it produces responses from participants that move away from a discourse of deviance and towards seeing the perpetrator as an ordinary man.

5.3.7. Discourse of consent

Consent concerning poster two (figure two) is emphasised by certain participants:

Extract 61: “It should emphasise that even if she said “yes” initially she can, and is **entitled to say “no” or “stop”** before sex actually happens or even during” (woman).

Extract 62: “It is telling a story of friends assisting a drunk girl to leave when someone clearly attempting to make sexual advances towards her **does not care that she may not be able to consent**” (woman).

Extract 63: “The party was responsible for her, when she was in a vulnerable position; **unable to give consent**” (woman)

Extract 64: “I don’t fully understand the message but I’ll try interpret it as best as I can. I don’t know who took her but I assume it’s a group of men. They had a feeling that a dude they didn’t trust was around her. They were worried for her so they took it upon themselves to leave with her even though she was drunk. **She did not give consent for them to leave with her because she was drunk. She does not know what happened**” (man).

Extracts 61 to 63 show participant responses that highlight the responsibility of consent as residing with the woman or potential victim; and responses are similar to those made to poster one in establishing women as the gatekeepers of sex (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). The extracts place consent firmly in the hands of the potential victim as she is “unable to give consent”, and “she may not be able to consent”. There is not as much focus on consent in relation to the other two reactions to poster one which are that consent is a once-off matter, and is the defining feature of whether or not an act constitutes SGBV (du Toit, 2008). This is perhaps because the focus of the poster is not the same as that of poster one which focuses on consent as its main discourse that it wants to change, while poster two focuses on the collective

responsibility and involvement of others who are present in the club or bar to try to prevent SGBV.

Extract 64, however, is an interesting response to poster two (figure two) in that the participant's having highlighted the potential problem as being that of the people who help the girl leave the club or bar, and may do so without her consent, especially if she is intoxicated. This shows the complexity of consent and the extent to which this poster may not demonstrate every angle related to this discourse.

Poster two (figure two) has a slightly different perspective on a situation that involves SGBV, which is to target the bystander instead of the perpetrator or victim. The participants then respond with the following comments:

Extract 65: "So basically what happened was the guy was all over some girl and she was too drunk to do anything about it but she didn't feel comfortable. **So I believe some other girls left with her to make sure she was safe**" (woman).

Extract 66: "A man was trying to harass a drunk woman, **so a group of people took her home to make sure she was safe**" (woman).

Many of the participants in response to poster two (figure two) withdraw from anything that emphasises consent between the perpetrator and victim because the focus of the poster is not on this. The poster rather emphasises the responsibility of the whole group and this has an impact on participant responses in order to ensure that the woman needing help is "safe" without any emphasis on or consideration of the discourse of consent.

5.3.8. Resistance to dominant discursive constructions

Some participants do not agree with the dominant discursive constructions in poster two, as they feel the demographics are incorrect (Suarez & Gadalla, 2011).

For example:

Extract 67: "I think that they could of used a **woman of colour**" (woman).

Extract 68: “I would have a eye catching photo that includes all woman because **rape does not only happen to pretty white girls** - not trying to be liberal. I just think it will hit home for more people if they can relate” (woman).

These participants, furthermore, suggest that a poster at a university would not prevent SGBV, as they believe it is more helpful if children are taught by parents and schools about this.

For example:

Extract 69: “I think it is the **responsibility of parents/family and like institutions to get rid of toxic masculinity**. Rape and gbv is not the womens fault. **If we families could find a better way of dealing with problems in a non-violent way, they should instil communication as a way of dealing with emotions**. Teach them that violence is not the answer. **Teach kids from a young age that they need consent, it might reduce gbv and rape**” (woman).

The participants do pick up on an area that needs improvement in poster two (figure two), as it is not inclusive enough in portrayal of only a “pretty white girl” in the poster. It needs be representative of racial and ethnic diversity to show the real span of who SGBV affects. This similarity is noted in both posters one (figure one) and two (figure two) and may demonstrate a potential weakness in poster intervention campaigns and how they adhere to commercial advertising, rather than attempting a considered representation of real needs and the actual demography of society (Fedina et al., 2018; Luce et al., 2010; Murphy, 2009; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). Many participants have thought critically about the poster and the message it portrays and do not just blindly accept its presumptions. Poster two replicates an American perspective, so it is not possible to reproduce this environment from a South African perspective without appropriately adapting it to reflect local realities; the same comment is made about poster one, which originates in the UK, as is mentioned above.

The participant quoted in extract 68 may have misunderstood the image in the poster, which does not depict a potential victim, but rather a potential bystander. This could be a problem in the poster design.

The participants point to the significance of family involvement and schooling as being more effective in helping intervene against SGBV than is possible for a poster. This is possibly because they feel it would not be effective in preventing SGBV because it has a limited influence on behaviour; participant responses indicate that parental guidance and school education is where the avoidance of SGBV should be placed, and not in a poster, whatever its hoped-for influence, or excellence of construction. This could be an area the thesis of bystander intervention could investigate. In this study, however, the target audience is university students in a situation in which alcohol is involved, which is why the posters have this particular focus.

The potential construction of SGBV that is reproduced in participant statements about family involvement and schooling seem to relate to the psychopathology theory in that behaviour and relationship problems that lead to violent behaviour and pathologies are understood by this theory to stem from a reaction to relationships within the family, to parents, or to childhood caregivers (Frosh, 2012). The discourse being reproduced here presents problems if the participants feel that it is family involvement that is the source of behaviours associated with SGBV (Jasinski, 2001). It must be recognised by participants that pathologies are often the result of many different social conditions, such as family background, poverty, and the environment in which a person grows up (García-Moreno et al., 2015; Jasinski, 2001; Lea & Auburn, 2001; Luce et al., 2010; O'Hara, 2012). On the other hand, family and schooling having a large impact on how men or potential perpetrators behave later in life could also be argued to be the stance participants are taking, which coincides with social learning theory (García-Moreno et al., 2015; Jasinski, 2001; Lea & Auburn, 2001; Luce et al., 2010; O'Hara, 2012). This theory understands SGBV to be learnt behaviour, socially taught, and not pathological in nature (García-Moreno et al., 2015; Jasinski, 2001; Lea & Auburn, 2001; Luce et al., 2010; O'Hara, 2012). The key here is the way the participant in extract 69 has phrased her line of thinking. The participant resists the problematic discourse of pathology as being caused by family when she claims that "it is the responsibility of parents/family and like institutions to get rid of toxic masculinity"; her argument is that society can intervene against toxic masculinity and that SGBV is a social matter. On the other hand, the participant also argues that SGBV behaviours stem from childhoods in which the experience of family violence results in adult violent behaviour, as in this claim "if we families could find a better way of dealing with problems in a non-violent way, they should instil communication as a way of dealing with emotions. Teach them that violence is not the answer." The conclusion resulting

from participants having offered such contradictory discourses and even in response to the poster that represents the bystander intervention is ambiguous. The bystander intervention could perhaps initiate this type of dialogue because it is arguing for a collective responsibility which would include family and school involvement and not just involvement from friends in order to prevent SGBV.

Resistance to the dominant discourse alongside the discourse of collective responsibility could be brought to cohere with each other, as they are both questioning the stereotypical ways in which people respond to SGBV, such as blaming the victim instead of seeing the prevention of SGBV as being a collective responsibility.

5.3.9. Discourse of collective responsibility

Discourse of collective responsibility centres on the use of the bystander intervention and whether individuals do believe that prevention of SGBV is the responsibility of the collective community (Banyard et al., 2007). Due to the success rates of the bystander intervention thus far, individuals believing that it is the collective responsibility of everyone means that bystander intervention poster campaigns have achieved their goal in sending the message that we can all do something to intervene against SGBV (Banyard et al., 2007). The discourse of collective responsibility seeks to change social attitudes towards SGBV from maintaining that the crime is only the encounter between the perpetrator and the victim, to a realistic perception of SGBV as the collective responsibility of everyone in the community and of society at large (Banyard et al., 2007).

Some examples from this study wherein poster two has proven to be effective in producing participant responses that resist the dominant discourses are:

Extract 70: “a man was trying to harass a drunk woman, **so a group of people took her home to make sure she was safe**” (woman).

Extract 71: “a person was trying to conduct in a sexual act with a woman but she was drunk and thus couldn't consent to it **so her friends left with her as they didn't trust him**” (man).

Extract 72: “I think in the above poster there’s a man that is hanging around a drunk woman, perhaps with the intentions of sleeping with her or making similar advances. People that were in the same area saw what **was going on and convinced the woman to leave with them because they didn’t trust that she was safe around the man**” (woman).

Extract 73: “good. Friends should **look out for one another**” (man).

The majority of the participants in the study agreed with the bystander intervention message of collective responsibility.

It was interesting to note that one participant in the study felt that the group of people taking the intoxicated woman away in poster two (figure two) is a problem:

Extract 74: “**the group of people that took her are responsible. They were not supposed to take her while she’s drunk. She does not know them and she can’t make a conscious decision in the state that she is in. They should have rather tried to either find friends or take her to a security guard**” (man).

The ethics of the question comes down to whether the group of bystanders convinced the woman to leave the bar with them or whether they forced her to do so, but an understanding of the precise context of the situation is lacking. It also depends on the perspective of community concerning what is better for the greater good, or what is in the best interests of the woman, and whether these diverge or not.

It is clear that poster two (figure two) shapes the majority of participants to agree with its message that it is the collective responsibility of bystanders to help intervene in a situation that could lead to an attack. The poster can be thought to be effective in having drawn attention to the message it seeks to illustrate. The participants respond to this message with less resistance than they do to that conveyed by poster one (figure one).

5.3.10. Discourse of permissiveness and freedom

Discourses of permissiveness and freedom are engaged in by participants in relation to poster two (figure two), as can be seen in their statements regarding women being able to do what they want to do, but also being safe, result in ambiguous judgements (Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2004; Ryan, 2011). What is said, to the contrary, about poster one (figure one) and quoted above arrives at the conclusion that there are underlying problems with this discourse (Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2004; Ryan, 2011).

For example:

Extract 75: “I want to say that women are (to a certain extent) **responsible for making sure they are safe and aware of their surroundings, but they shouldn’t have to dress or act a certain way just to avoid being raped because it's not their fault**” (woman).

Extract 76: “that situations like this should not even be necessary. People should be able to go out and be safe. **Therefore emphasis on responsible drinking**” (woman).

Extract 77: “I think it’s **really sad that women have to be so aware of their surroundings** and have to make sure **they are safe and in groups to avoid men taking advantage of them.** there shouldn't be the need for a group of people to feel they need to protect her, but unfortunately there are people out there that are generally bad, **but also people who are drinking that make terrible decisions and being aware of that is important**” (woman).

The participants’ concern with women having to be responsible and safe, is uppermost, yet, on the other hand, women being allowed to wear what they want to wear, drink as they please, and go where they choose, are not to be judged as culpable if a SGBV attack is made on them. The ambiguity of the judgement is palpable, if the emphasis on the freedom of women is, at the same time, set alongside the hidden tagline that women must bear the consequences of their actions without complaint. The conclusion has to be, in the end, that the discourse of permissiveness, highlighted in both poster one and poster two, is flawed.

There may be some contradiction in participants’ statements in response to both posters, because there is a considerable level of discourse of fear at play in both posters. This could be

due to the sensitivity of these topics and of their bringing to the forefront of everyone's mind just how unsafe people, especially women, are regarding SGBV (Gordon & Collins, 2013). The contradiction is the result of the thought process of participants and induced by the posters that women should be able to be free to do what they wish, yet, because of how society is constructed, this may not be safe.

The participants do discuss being in groups (extract 77) and highlight the importance of bystanders in helping to intervene against SGBV. This could imply a reliance on the bystander intervention that is constructive, as it not only creates the idea of collective responsibility but also moulds participants to think of the safety of everyone and protection of each other.

5.4. The similarities and differences between poster one (figure. 1.) and poster two (figure. 2).

Both similarities and differences emerged between the two posters.

5.4.1. Similarities:

Firstly, in response to both posters, there are some stereotypical gender constructions, such as women being seen as "girls" and taking a passive role.

Secondly, responses to both poster one (figure one) and to poster two (figure two) use the discourse of victim-blaming and other sub-themes of related discourses. There do seem to be fewer of these responses to poster two than to poster one, as the focus shifts in poster two from the perpetrator and victim to the bystander regarding the potential SGBV situation. The message coming from both posters is not strong enough to eradicate victim-blaming and rape myth acceptance. The message in poster two is more powerful than that in poster one, because of its focus on the collective responsibility of all parties and on the whole community playing a part in the prevention of SGBV.

Thirdly, the response that both posters evoke from participants about the construction of the perpetrator evidence the discourse of deviance. In response to poster two, however, participants use less emotive language when referring to the perpetrator, such as they're not using the word

“rapist” but use instead “man” or “guy”. When responding to poster two students refer to stranger rape, but responses to poster one make no mention of this at all. In response to both posters rape myth acceptance persists, because comments on the first poster dissociate from the perpetrator as an ordinary man, while in poster two participants see rape as being perpetrated by a stranger and much less often than by an acquaintance (Grubb & Turner, 2012; Ryan, 2011). When participants respond to poster two the perpetrator is judged to be less of a deviant monster and more as a stranger, suggesting less disassociation. A discourse of fear is established in the women participants in response to both posters, but the men respondents do not share this perspective on either poster.

Fourthly, similarities between the two posters regarding consent indicate an agreement among participants that women are the gatekeepers of consent in relation to sexual intercourse. Both posters produce responses that deal with a very specific SGBV situation regarding consent while not really managing to consider the complexities that are involved in coercive sexual encounters nor is there any indication of a full understanding that SGBV is a gendered power problem.

Lastly, both sets of posters create participant resistance to the dominant discourse, in that responses record commentary noting that there is no indication of the place of women of colour, victims that are men, or non-binary persons in these posters. A slightly different focus in response to poster two points to the significance of upbringing as having a large part to play in the incidence of SGBV and a concern that there should be interventions at schooling and in the home rather than at a tertiary education level; this concern is not expressed in responses to poster one.

5.4.2. Differences

The biggest difference between poster one and two is that poster two (figure two) highlights collective responsibility to prevent SGBV while poster one (figure one) highlights perpetrator responsibility. It would seem that, based on student reactions to the posters, poster two’s message has more potential, as the majority of participants understand and agree that it is everyone’s responsibility to intervene against SGBV. Poster one evokes contradictory responses, agreeing and disagreeing with the poster’s message; there is victim-blaming, emphasis on female responsibility, of individuals viewing the perpetrator as deviant, and

stereotypical gender roles are adhered to. Poster two summons a different perspective, which shifts the focus from the perpetrator and victim to bystanders, and participant feedback to poster two has more potential for reflection and contestation than poster one in encouraging participants to question the dominant discourses and to portray the unconventional message that bystanders could comprehend.

The conclusion is that the bystander intervention has potential in a South African university context, as it allows for more reflection and contestation than the non-bystander intervention poster.

It must be noted, once again, that neither poster is persuasive enough to eradicate the ideologies that usually accompany SGBV, such as victim-blaming, rape myth acceptance, and sexism (Gordon & Collins, 2013; Grubb & Turner, 2012). This could be a limitation of poster campaigns in general and the bystander intervention in particular.

5.5. Conclusion

This chapter analysed and discussed the data established from the responses of participants. It detailed different theoretical discourses around SGBV and how these inform participant responses. It outlined the similarities and differences found in participant feedback on SGBV between poster one (figure one) and poster two (figure two) with participant feedback on SGBV and linked these back to the theory chapter. The final chapter of this research concludes the study.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

6. Introduction

This chapter summarises the findings of this research, discusses the limits that emerged during the study, and considers the improvements that would be necessary for research undertaken in the future on the subject of the bystander intervention.

6.1. Summary of findings

This research focused on the bystander intervention compared with a non-bystander intervention approach that were apparent in SGBV awareness posters. This was to establish whether the bystander intervention could be cross-culturally relevant and useful in a university setting in a South African context and in particular at Rhodes University on which the study concentrates (Malamuth et al., 2018). The research compared the two types of interventions to establish whether one is better equipped to promote SGBV awareness than is the other.

The researcher used structured interviews making use of open-ended questions in written form, self-reported because of COVID-19, which were sent out via email to 45 student participants. The students' discursive positioning was crucial to the researcher's interpretation as the study wanted to establish what responses the audience constructed in relation to the perpetrators, victims, and observers illustrated by the posters. These were then analysed to ascertain the usefulness of the bystander intervention (Malamuth et al., 2018). The research followed FDA when analysing the text because it adhered to the six FDA steps (Parker, 2002; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011; Willig, 2008; Willig, 2003).

There were different discourses that emerged from the analysis in response to the posters, which means the students' responses were influenced by them. In relation to poster one (figure one) discourse of gender roles/gendered constructions was the first theme that emerged. A discourse of victim-blaming was the second theme and it entailed a discourse of female responsibility and risk management. The third theme dealt with the construction of the perpetrator and it reproduced the ideas of a discourse of deviance and fear. Discourse of consent was the fourth theme. Resistance of the dominant discourse was the final theme that emerged

in response to poster one (figure one) and this entailed a discourse of permissiveness and freedom.

In relation to poster two (figure two) similar themes to poster one emerged and a distinctive difference was the discourse of collective responsibility which was added in relation to the resistance of the dominant discourse.

The posters and the themes mentioned above were linked back to the theory chapter and it was established that social constructionism underpinned responses to both posters. Poster one (figure one) was supported by the individual-level theories such as the evolutionary theory and psychopathology (Jasinski, 2001; Jewkes et al., 2011; Mooney, 2000; Yakeley, 2009).

6.2. Similarities and differences in the posters

- Poster one (figure one)

Each of these themes and theories showed similarities and differences between the two posters.

Participant responses to the structured interview questions after exposure to poster one (figure one) reflected discursive constructions of SGBV, built upon by the use of discourse of victim blaming, female responsibility, risk management, deviance, fear, consent, and gender constructions. These discursive constructions are a problem when it comes to challenging tolerance to SGBV because they promote participant adherence to dominant discourses and do not change attitudes to rape myth acceptance, sexism, victim blaming, and patriarchal viewpoints, but may indeed perpetuate them (Knowles, 2016). While the use of these discursive constructions by participants may reflect pre-existing understandings of the phenomenon, they could also be the direct result of the constructions of SGBV presented in the poster. At the very least, the participant responses to the first poster suggest that perhaps it is not doing enough to challenge dominant social constructions of SGBV.

There was resistance to the dominant discourse in response to poster one (figure one), but not enough to change the problematic perspectives mentioned above. The non-bystander intervention, potentially unknowingly, perpetuates the problematic discourses (Knowles, 2016). Non-bystander intervention posters that reproduce the dominant discourses around SGBV may prompt audiences to believe that there needs to be an increase in the self-regulation

of behaviour on the part both of potential perpetrators and their victims (Knowles, 2016), as indicated in the participant responses in this study, and this means that the message that this poster (figure one) is portraying may be flawed as a result of the perspective of the assumed negligence of the victim that continues to be viewed as part of the problem (Knowles, 2016).

The similarities between the two posters were around discourses of victim blaming, female responsibility, risk management, fear, deviance, consent, and gender constructions which also reflected a lack of diversity in race, gender, and class in the images portrayed. The key difference was around collective responsibility as is discussed in the following paragraph about poster two (figure two).

- **Poster two (figure two)**

The primary aim of the bystander intervention and poster two (figure two) is to encourage an understanding of the phenomenon of SGBV that is different from the predominant view in society, and to inculcate different thinking and speaking on the subject (Malamuth et al., 2018). The secondary prevention aim of this intervention is to motivate behavioural change to support the idea of collective responsibility for SGBV prevention by motivating individuals to become actively involved in preventing potential SGBV situations (Malamuth et al., 2018). The objectives of this intervention would be achieved if and when both aims have been reached.

The results of this study in relation to poster two (figure two) suggest that some aspects of the primary prevention aims had been met as it had fewer problematic responses than for poster one (figure one) because the dominant discourses mentioned above were resisted through the introduction of the new idea that allowed for the improved discourse of collective responsibility. There could have been potential for secondary prevention behaviours as a result of the study but such an assessment is beyond the scope of this research and is a suggested direction for future researchers to establish links between attitudes, intentions, and behaviours of participants in response to the study and the ways in which poster two (figure two) shifted them.

Poster two (figure two) reduced the use and impact of discourses, such as victim blaming, female responsibility, and traditional gender constructions by creating a different angle or perspective for participants to follow; this angle led to a change in how participants expressed

their attitudes, perceptions, opinions, and understandings of SGBV. For example, poster two led participants to use the terms “group”, “helping out a friend” and “looking out for one another” to describe situations that infringe on the safety of the victim in a SGBV situation, while poster one (figure one) maintained the idea that SGBV is a matter only between the perpetrator and victim. Poster two shifted the perspective of participants from highlighting what the victim could have done differently to avoid SGBV, which poster one responses emphasised, to stating that a group of friends could help to intervene to prevent a potential SGBV situation. The primary aim of the bystander intervention was mostly met by poster two, as the participants understood the phenomenon and spoke differently about SGBV, shifting opinions of participants from their perception of victim and perpetrator to one of group responsibility. Problematic discourses were still present in responses to poster two, however, which means that this poster did not completely change participant attitudes around SGBV. This too may be an area to explore in future research.

The results of the analysis suggest that the bystander intervention (figure two) produced discursive responses from participants in the study that differed qualitatively from their responses to the non-bystander intervention poster (figure one). The chief difference in participant discourse produced by the bystander intervention was that the focus of poster two was about using the community or groups of people to intervene against SGBV while poster one was about targeting the perpetrator, and the victim (Bless et al., 2013). The bystander intervention/poster two (figure two) does not emphasise self-regulation on the part of the perpetrator and victim, but rather shifts it to how bystanders can help prevent or intervene against SGBV. This makes it everyone’s responsibility and moves away from attention on the victim so it has more potential than non-bystander intervention posters in resisting accustomed discourses around SGBV, and reflecting and contesting them (Banyard et al., 2007).

6.3. Limitations of research

The data in this research was exploratory, qualitative, and dependent on the researcher’s skills in interpreting the analysis. The researcher tried to remain impartial when evaluating responses of participants. This was by backing up analysis carefully with existing knowledge and references regarding SGBV.

The data collection process had to be changed due to COVID-19. The original research plan was to include focus groups allowing for inter-personal interaction. This would have been an ideal data collection process for this study but structured self-report interviews making use of open-ended questions in written form were used because inter-personal communication was not safe during this time. This allowed for an interestingly wide range of responses from participants, but the results demonstrated that the data was skewed to the extent that there were 39 women participants and only 6 men. A more accurate representation may have occurred with equal participant genders, but the imbalance came about because this study used convenience sampling (Sekaran & Bougie, 2010). Future studies may need to ensure that there are more or less equal gender divisions among participants.

There was, furthermore, a relatively small sample size, which was taken from the particular context of the university setting. The participants came from a specific type of audience to whom the content of the posters was aimed such as in the context of a bar or a club with alcohol involved and young adult women being targeted (Clowes et al., 2009). This is not representative of all situations in which SGBV occurs. The outcome is that this research cannot really make general claims, which would render the study transferable (Bless et al., 2013; de Vos et al., 2011). This could be a suggestion for future research, whereby the target audience could be slightly different and more inclusive of other genders, ethnicities, and classes or of other possible SGBV situations in the home or work environment (Fedina et al., 2018; Luce et al., 2010; Murphy, 2009; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011).

The participants in the study commented that neither poster was inclusive enough of race, gender, ethnicity, or class (Fedina et al., 2018; Luce et al., 2010; Murphy, 2009; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). The individuals portrayed in the poster were all described as pretty, white women, which, as this does not target all population groups is problematic, especially in relation to the bystander intervention approach which is concerned with collective responsibility of and for the whole community and should not target any individual group (Fedina et al., 2018; Luce et al., 2010; Murphy, 2009; Suarez & Gadalla, 2011). This could be improved upon by both bystander interventions and the non-bystander intervention approaches. It was established that the two posters were taken from an international perspective, and would have to be modified to fit a local perspective if they are to be useful in South Africa. The participants also stated that educating the community in schools and at a younger age would be

wise in relation to the bystander intervention approach. This too may be a fruitful subject for future research.

6.4. Recommendations for future research

More research could be done on comparing bystander intervention posters to other kinds of non-bystander poster interventions in order to ascertain whether there is consistency in the discursive effects or results produced by posters using the bystander intervention approach when compared to a range of other non-bystander intervention posters drawn up in relation to SGBV.

Future research in a South African context could look into instances in which participants or bystanders in the same context as is this study would find it difficult to intervene due to barriers such as a lack of skills in dealing with a SGBV situation, which would have a negative impact on the outcome of the bystander intervention approach (Yule & Grych, 2020). Yule and Grych (2020) recently conducted a study on this topic in the USA and found that solutions of how to overcome these barriers could be helpful.

The bystander intervention poster (figure two) did not completely eradicate the dominant discourses mentioned above which means improvements could be made to these types of posters. Some of these improvements include making the poster culturally relevant by using different genders and races, being specific in the language used and making sure the message is clear because some participants found the setup of the poster difficult to understand; also accounting for acquaintance rape, as well as stranger rape, would be helpful because there is still a confused understanding of this, as is established in the analysis (Iconis, 2008). Because many participants saw the perpetrator as a stranger, a movement towards rape myth acceptance means a failure to identify the reality (Iconis, 2008). The poster's having used the wording, "some dude" may account for participants having viewed the perpetrator always as a stranger. In such a case, specific language is significant in shaping participants views positively.

6.5. Conclusion

Overall, the bystander intervention poster (figure two) created more positive attitude change in relation to the SGBV poster than did the non-bystander intervention poster (figure one). The

conclusion then is the establishment of the positive potential for the bystander intervention in helping to prevent SGBV in a South African context.

REFERENCES

- Abrahams, N., Jewkes, R., & Mathews, S. (2010). Guns and gender-based violence in South Africa. *SAMJ: South African Medical Journal*, *100*(9), 586-588.
- Alegría-Flores, K., Raker, K., Pleasants, R. K., Weaver, M. A., & Weinberger, M. (2017). Preventing interpersonal violence on college campuses: the effect of one act training on bystander intervention. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, *32*(7), 1103-1126, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515587666>
- Anderson, C. (2010). Presenting and evaluating qualitative research. *American journal of pharmaceutical education*, *74*(8), 141, <https://doi.org/10.5688/aj7408141>
- Andrews, T. (2012). What is social constructionism. *Grounded theory review*, *11*(1), 39-46.
- Archer, J. (2009). Does sexual selection explain human sex differences in aggression?. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, *32*(3-4), 249-266, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X09990951>
- Atkinson, P., Bauer, M. W., & Gaskell, G. (Eds.). (2000). *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound: a practical handbook for social research*. Sage, <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781849209731>
- Avery, E. (2020). THE'EFFECTIVE DECRIMINALISATION'OF ACQUAINTANCE RAPE: RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE, SECONDARY VICTIMISATION AND ANTI-RAPE CAMPAIGNS. *Plymouth Law & Criminal Justice Review*, *12*.
- Babbie, E. (2010). Introduction to social research. Chapman University: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Baker, C. N., & Bevacqua, M. (2018). Challenging narratives of the anti-rape movement's decline. *Violence against women*, *24*(3), 350-376, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1077801216689164>
- Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Plante, E. G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of community psychology*, *35*(4), 463-481, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20159>
- Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2004). Bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of community psychology*, *32*(1), 61-79, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.10078>
- Barkow, J. H., Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (Eds.). (1995). *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Bedard-Gilligan, M., Kaysen, D., Desai, S., & Lee, C. M. (2011). Alcohol-involved assault: Associations with posttrauma alcohol use, consequences, and expectancies. *Addictive behaviors*, *36*(11), 1076-1082, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2011.07.001>

- Belknap, J. (2010). Rape: Too hard to report and too easy to discredit victims. *Violence Against Women*, 16(12), 1335-1344, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801210387749>
- Benbouriche, M., & Parent, G. (2018). Sexual coercion: Thinking and understanding sexual violence beyond sexual offenders. *Sexologies*, 27, e15 – e19, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sexol.2018.02.001>
- Berezkei, T., & Gyuris, P. (2009). Oedipus complex, mate choice, imprinting; an evolutionary reconsideration of a Freudian concept based on empirical studies. *Mankind quarterly*, 50(1), 71, <http://doi.org/10.46469/mq.2009.50.1.3>
- Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative research*, 15(2), 219-234, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794112468475>
- Berkowitz, A. (1992). College men as perpetrators of acquaintance rape and sexual assault: A review of recent research. *Journal of American College Health*, 40(4), 175-181, <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.1992.9936279>
- Bhana, D., & Mayeza, E. (2016). We don't play with gays, they're not real boys... they can't fight: Hegemonic masculinity and (homophobic) violence in the primary years of schooling. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 51, 36-42, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2016.08.002>
- Bird, E. R., Gilmore, A. K., George, W. H., & Lewis, M. A. (2016). The role of social drinking factors in the relationship between incapacitated sexual assault and drinking before sexual activity. *Addictive behaviors*, 52, 28-33, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2015.08.001>
- Bless, C. Higson-Smith, C. & Sithole, SL (2013). *Fundamentals of social research methods: An African perspective*.
- Boonzaier, F., & De La Rey, C. (2003). "He's a man, and I'm a woman" cultural constructions of masculinity and femininity in south African Women's narratives of violence. *Violence against women*, 9(8), 1003-1029, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801203255133>
- Browne, K. D., & Hamilton-Giachritsis, C. (2005). The influence of violent media on children and adolescents: a public-health approach. *The Lancet*, 365(9460), 702-710, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(05\)17952-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(05)17952-5)
- Buchanan, June (2008). Using Foucauldian critical discourse analysis as a methodology in marketing. *Australia and New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference 2008 : marketing : shifting the focus from mainstream to offbeat* (1 - 3 December 2008: Sydney).
- Burr, V. (2018). *Social constructionism* (pp. 1-16). Springer Singapore.

- Burr, J. (2001). Women have it. Men want if. What is it?: Counstructions of sexuality in rape discourse. *Psychology, Evolution & Gender*, 3(1), 103-105, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1080/14616660110049618>
- Burt, M. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(2), 217-230, <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.38.2.217>
- Byrne, S., & Hart, P. S. (2016). The boomerang effect a synthesis of findings and a preliminary theoretical framework. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 33(1), 3-37, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1080/23808985.2009.11679083>
- Caplan, P. (Ed.). (1989). *The cultural construction of sexuality* (Vol. 353). Psychology Press.
- Carline, A., Gunby, C., & Taylor, S. (2018). Too drunk to consent? Exploring the contestations and disruptions in male-focused sexual violence prevention interventions. *Social & Legal Studies*, 27(3), 299-322, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/0964663917713346>
- Carlisle, A. (2018). Rhodes University knew of Khensani Maseko's rape. Retrieved 3 April, 2019 from <https://www.timeslive.co.za/news/south-africa/2018-08-07-rhodes-university-knew-of-khensani-masekos-rape/>
- Carlisle, A., & Macgregor, D. (2016) Rhodes University Reacts to "Reference List". Retrieved 3 April, 2019 from <https://www.dispatchlive.co.za/news/2016-04-18-rhodes-university-reacts-to-reference-list/>
- Chen, H., Huang, Q., & Jiang, M. (2020). Empowering chinese college students to prevent sexual assault in post-MeToo era: an empirical study of the bystander intervention approach. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/0886260520917515>
- Chester, C., & Sigal, J. (2018). Sexual harassment. *Biobehavioral Psychology*, Elsevier.
- Christie, F., & Martin, J. R. (2005). *Genre and institutions: Social processes in the workplace and school*. A&C Black.
- Cloninger, C. R. (Ed.). (1999). *Personality and psychopathology*. American Psychiatric Pub.
- Clowes, L., Shefer, T., Fouten, E., Vergnani, T., & Jacobs, J. (2009). Coercive sexual practices and gender-based violence on a university campus. *Agenda*, 23(80), 22-32.
- Coker, A. L., Cook-Craig, P. G., Williams, C. M., Fisher, B. S., Clear, E. R., Garcia, L. S., & Hegge, L. M. (2011). Evaluation of Green Dot: An active bystander intervention to reduce sexual violence on college campuses. *Violence against women*, 17(6), 777-796, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1077801211410264>
- Cook, R. J. (Ed.). (2012). *Human rights of women: National and international perspectives*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Coyne, J. A., & Berry, A. (2000). Rape as an adaptation. *Nature*, 404(6774), 121-122.
- Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 2007*, no. 32 (SA.).
- Cromby, J., Harper, D., & Reavey, P. (2013). *Psychology, mental health and distress*. China: Palgrave Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Cybulska, B., & Forster, G. (2010). Sexual assault: examination of the victim. *Medicine*, 38(5), 235-238, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mpmmed.2010.01.005>
- Davis, F. (1987). *Antecedents and consequents of gender role conflict: An empirical test of sex role strain analysis* (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University).
- DeGue, S., Valle, L. A., Holt, M. K., Massetti, G. M., Matjasko, J. L., & Tharp, A. T. (2014). A systematic review of primary prevention strategies for sexual violence perpetration. *Aggression and violent behavior*, 19(4), 346-362, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2014.05.004>
- Devries, K. M., & Meinck, F. (2018). Sexual violence against children and adolescents in South Africa: making the invisible visible. *The Lancet Global Health*, 6(4), e367-e368, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(18\)30106-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30106-2)
- Diamond, M. J. (2004). The shaping of masculinity: Revisioning boys turning away from their mothers to construct male gender identity. *The international journal of psychoanalysis*, 85(2), 359-379.
- DiMuccio, S. H., & Knowles, E. D. (2020). The political significance of fragile masculinity. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 34, 25-28, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2019.11.010>
- Dlamini, J. B., Rugbeer, H., Naidoo, G. M., Metso, R. M., & Moodley, P. (2012). The effects of alcohol consumption on student life at a rural campus. *Inkanyiso: Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 49-57.
- Dosekun, S. (2011). 'We live in fear, we feel very unsafe': imagining and fearing rape in South Africa. *Agenda*, 21(74), 89-99.
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (2013). The nature–nurture debates: 25 years of challenges in understanding the psychology of gender. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 8(3), 340-357, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691613484767>
- Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekmann, A. B. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. *The developmental social psychology of gender*, 12, 174.
- Elias-Lambert, N., & Black, B. M. (2015). Bystander sexual violence prevention program: Outcomes for high-and low-risk university men. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 31(19), 3211-3235, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515584346>

- Fairbairn, J. (2020). Before# MeToo: Violence against women social media work, bystander intervention, and social change. *Societies*, 10(3), 51, <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc10030051>
- Fedina, L., Holmes, J. L., & Backes, B. L. (2018). Campus sexual assault: A systematic review of prevalence research from 2000 to 2015. *Trauma, violence, & abuse*, 19(1), 76-93, <https://doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1524838016631129>
- Ferguson, C. J. (Ed.). (2009). *Violent crime: Clinical and social implications*. Sage Publications.
- Ferguson, C. J., & Beaver, K. M. (2009). Natural born killers: The genetic origins of extreme violence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 14(5), 286-294, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2009.03.005>
- Fleming, P. J., Gruskin, S., Rojo, F., & Dworkin, S. L. (2015). Men's violence against women and men are inter-related: Recommendations for simultaneous intervention. *Social science & medicine*, 146, 249-256, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.10.021>
- Flood, M. (2015). Work with men to end violence against women: a critical stocktake. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 17(sup2), 159-176, <https://doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1080/13691058.2015.1070435>
- Fontaine, A. L. (2019). Integrating General Strain Theory and the Gender Role Strain Paradigm: Initial Considerations. *Journal of Theoretical & Philosophical Criminology*, 11.
- Foshee, V. A., Linder, F., MacDougall, J. E., & Bangdiwala, S. (2001). Gender differences in the longitudinal predictors of adolescent dating violence. *Preventive medicine*, 32(2), 128-141, <https://doi.org/10.1006/pmed.2000.0793>
- Foubert, J. D., Godin, E. E., & Tatum, J. L. (2010). In their own words: Sophomore college men describe attitude and behavior changes resulting from a rape prevention program 2 years after their participation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(12), 2237-2257, <https://doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/0886260509354881>
- Friedman, E. (2018). Women's human rights: The emergence of a movement. In *Women's Rights, Human Rights* (pp. 18-35). Routledge.
- Frosh, S. (2012). *A brief introduction to psychoanalytic theory*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gallagher, A. (1997). Ending the marginalization: Strategies for incorporating women into the United Nations human rights system. *Hum. Rts. Q.*, 19, 283.
- García-Moreno, C., Zimmerman, C., Morris-Gehring, A., Heise, L., Amin, A., Abrahams, N., ... & Watts, C. (2015). Addressing violence against women: a call to action. *The Lancet*, 385(9978), 1685-1695, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(14\)61830-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61830-4)

- García-Moreno, C., Hegarty, K., d'Oliveira, A. F. L., Koziol-McLain, J., Colombini, M., & Feder, G. (2015). The health-systems response to violence against women. *The Lancet*, 385(9977), 1567-1579, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(14\)61837-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61837-7)
- Gavey, N. (2018). *Just sex?: The cultural scaffolding of rape*. Routledge.
- Gavey, N., & Schmidt, J. (2011). "Trauma of rape" discourse: A double-edged template for everyday understandings of the impact of rape?. *Violence Against Women*, 17(4), 433-456, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1077801211404194>
- Gee, J. P., & Green, J. L. (1998). Chapter 4: Discourse analysis, learning, and social practice: A methodological study. *Review of research in education*, 23(1), 119-169, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.3102/0091732X023001119>
- Gibbs, A., Jewkes, R., Sikweyiya, Y., & Willan, S. (2015). Reconstructing masculinity? A qualitative evaluation of the Stepping Stones and Creating Futures interventions in urban informal settlements in South Africa. *Culture, health & sexuality*, 17(2), 208-222, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1080/13691058.2014.966150>
- Gidycz, C. A., Orchowski, L. M., & Berkowitz, A. D. (2011). Preventing sexual aggression among college men: An evaluation of a social norms and bystander intervention program. *Violence against women*, 17(6), 720-742, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1077801211409727>
- Gollan, J. K., Lee, R., & Coccaro, E. F. (2005). Developmental psychopathology and neurobiology of aggression. *Development and psychopathology*, 17(4), 1151-1171.
- Gordon, S. F., & Collins, A. (2013). "We face rape. We face all things": Understandings of gender-based violence amongst female students at a South African university. *African Safety Promotion: A Journal of Injury and Violence Prevention*, 11(2), 93-106.
- Gouws, A. (2018). # EndRapeCulture Campaign in South Africa: Resisting Sexual Violence Through Protest and the Politics of Experience. *Politikon*, 45(1), 3-15, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1080/02589346.2018.1418201>
- Gray, H. (2018). Rape and Sexual Assault in Japan: Potential Gender Bias in Pre-Trial Procedures. *Reinvention: An International Journal of Undergraduate Research*, 11(1).
- Griffith, D. M., Gunter, K., & Allen, J. O. (2011). Male gender role strain as a barrier to African American men's physical activity. *Health Education & Behavior*, 38(5), 482-491, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1090198110383660>
- Grosholz, J., & Kubrin, C. (2007). Crime in the news: How crimes, offenders and victims are portrayed in the media. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture*, 14, 59-83.
- Gross, A. M., Winslett, A., Roberts, M., & Gohm, C. L. (2006). An Examination of Sexual Violence Against College Women. *Violence against women*, 12(3), 288-300, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801205277358>

- Grubb, A., & Turner, E. (2012). Attribution of blame in rape cases: A review of the impact of rape myth acceptance, gender role conformity and substance use on victim blaming. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 17*(5), 443-452, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.06.002>
- Gruber, A. (2016). Consent confusion. *Cardozo L. Rev.*, 38, 415.
- Gruber, A. (2009). Rape, feminism, and the war on crime. *Washington Law Review, 84*. 581-660.
- Hardies, K. (2019). Personality, social norms, and sexual harassment in the workplace. *Personality and Individual Differences, Elsevier*. 151. 1-5, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.07.006>
- Hariri, A. R. (2009). Psychological Science Agenda| November 2009. *Psychological Science*.
- Hearn, J., Nordberg, M., Andersson, K., Balkmar, D., Gottzén, L., Klinth, R., ... & Sandberg, L. (2012). Hegemonic masculinity and beyond: 40 years of research in Sweden. *Men and masculinities, 15*(1), 31-55, <https://doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1097184X11432113>
- Heise, L. L. (1998). Violence against women: an integrated, ecological framework. *Violence against women, 4*(3), 262-290, <https://doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1077801298004003002>
- Hollway, W. (1984, January). Women's power in heterosexual sex. In *Women's studies international forum* (Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 63-68). Pergamon.
- Hook, D. (2001). Discourse, Knowledge, Materiality, History. *Foucault and Discourse Analysis, Vol. 11*(4), 521-547, https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230592322_4
- Iconis, R. (2008). Rape myth acceptance in college students: A literature review. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research (CIER), 1*(2), 47-52, <https://doi.org/10.19030/cier.v1i2.1201>
- Immorality Act 1957*, no. 23 (SA.).
- Ikeda, N., & Rosser, E. (2010). You Be Vigilant! Don't Rape! Reclaiming Space and Security at York University. *Canadian Woman Studies, 28*(1).
- Jackson, S. (2006). Interchanges: Gender, sexuality and heterosexuality: The complexity (and limits) of heteronormativity. *Feminist theory, 7*(1), 105-121, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700106061462>
- Jackson, J. (1998). Contemporary criticisms of role theory. *Journal of Occupational Science, 5*(2), 49-55, <https://doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1080/14427591.1998.9686433>
- Jasinski, J. L. (2001). Theoretical explanations for violence against women. *Sourcebook on violence against women, 5-21*.

- Javaid, A. (2016). Feminism, masculinity and male rape: bringing male rape 'out of the closet'. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 25(3), 283-293, <https://doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1080/09589236.2014.959479>
- Jewkes, R., Morrell, R., Hearn, J., Lundqvist, E., Blackbeard, D., Lindegger, G., ... & Gottzén, L. (2015). Hegemonic masculinity: combining theory and practice in gender interventions. *Culture, health & sexuality*, 17(sup2), 112-127, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2015.1085094>
- Jewkes, R., Sikweyiya, Y., Morrell, R., & Dunkle, K. (2011). Gender inequitable masculinity and sexual entitlement in rape perpetration South Africa: findings of a cross-sectional study. *PloS one*, 6(12), e29590, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0029590>
- Jewkes, R., Vetten, L., Jina, R., Christofides, N., Sigsworth, R., & Loots, L. (2012). What we know-and what we don't: Single and multiple perpetrator rape in South Africa. *South African Crime Quarterly*, 41, 11-19, <https://doi.org/10.17159/2413-3108/2012/v0i41a835>
- Jootun, D., McGhee, G., & Marland, G. R. (2009). Reflexivity: promoting rigour in qualitative research. *Nursing Standard (through 2013)*, 23(23), 42.
- Jordan, A., Anitha, S., Jameson, J., & Davy, Z. (2018). Understanding student responses to gender based violence on campus: negotiation, reinscription and resistance. *Gender Based Violence in University Communities: Policy, Prevention and Educational Initiatives*, 189.
- Jozkowski, K. N., & Peterson, Z. D. (2013). College students and sexual consent: Unique insights. *Journal of sex research*, 50(6), 517-523, <https://doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1080/00224499.2012.700739>
- Jozkowski, K. N., & Wiersma, J. D. (2015). Does drinking alcohol prior to sexual activity influence college students' consent?. *International Journal of Sexual Health*, 27(2), 156-174, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19317611.2014.951505>
- Jun, D. C. (2009). "*Male gender role strain*": a pastoral assessment (Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch).
- Kassing, L. R., Beesley, D., & Frey, L. L. (2005). Gender role conflict, homophobia, age, and education as predictors of male rape myth acceptance. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 27(4), 311-328, <https://doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.17744/mehc.27.4.9wfm24f52kqgav37>
- Kaysen, D., Neighbors, C., Martell, J., Fossos, N., & Larimer, M. E. (2006). Incapacitated rape and alcohol use: A prospective analysis. *Addictive behaviors*, 31(10), 1820-1832, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2005.12.025>
- Kelly, L. (2013). *Surviving sexual violence*. John Wiley & Sons.

- Kheswa, J. G., & Hoho, V. N. (2017). Exploring the factors and effects of alcohol abuse on the behaviour of university female students at one South African University Campus. *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 9(1), 291-300, <https://dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v9n1.29>
- Kiss, L., Schraiber, L. B., Heise, L., Zimmerman, C., Gouveia, N., & Watts, C. (2012). Gender-based violence and socioeconomic inequalities: Does living in more deprived neighbourhoods increase women's risk of intimate partner violence?. *Social science & medicine*, 74(8), 1172-1179, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.11.033>
- Klasios, J. (2019). Aggression among men: An integrated evolutionary explanation. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 47, 29-45, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2019.02.015>
- Knowles, G. (2016). *Looking at Rape Prevention: An Analysis of the Representations of Sexuality, Gender and Rape Myth in Rape Prevention Poster Campaigns* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Otago).
- Krolikowski, A. M., & Koyfman, A. (2012). Emergency Centre care for sexual assault victims. *African Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 2(1), 24-30, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.afjem.2011.12.005>
- Kruttschnitt, C., Kalsbeek, W. D., & House, C. C. (Eds.). (2014). *Estimating the incidence of rape and sexual assault* (pp. 48109-1382). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Lahiri, M. (2011). Crimes and corrections: Bride burners, corrective rapists, and other black misogynists.
- Laner, M. R., Benin, M. H., & Ventrone, N. A. (2001). Bystander attitudes toward victims of violence: Who's worth helping?. *Deviant Behavior*, 22(1), 23-42, <https://doi.org/10.1080/016396201750065793>
- Lea, S., & Auburn, T. (2001). The social construction of rape in the talk of a convicted rapist. *Feminism & Psychology*, 11(1), 11-33, <https://doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/0959353501011001002>
- Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (2006). Social theories: Social constructionism and symbolic interactionism. *Engaging theories in family communication: Multiple perspectives*, 229-242.
- Levant, R. F., & Richmond, K. (2016). The gender role strain paradigm and masculinity ideologies.
- Livingston, J. A., Testa, M., Windle, M., & Bay-Cheng, L. Y. (2015). Sexual risk at first coitus: Does alcohol make a difference?. *Journal of adolescence*, 43, 148-158, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2015.05.018>

- Lorenz, K., & Ullman, S. E. (2016). Alcohol and sexual assault victimization: Research findings and future directions. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 31*, 82-94, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2016.08.001>
- Low, B. S. (2003). Ecological and social complexities. *Monogamy: Mating strategies and partnerships in birds, humans and other mammals*, 161.
- Luce, H., Schrage, S., & Gilchrist, V. (2010). Sexual assault of women. *American family physician, 81*(4), 489-495.
- Lutya, T. M. (2009). Epi-criminological responses to human trafficking of young women and girls for involuntary prostitution in South Africa. *Journal of Scandinavian studies in criminology and crime prevention, 10*(S1), 59-78, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1080/14043850903316196>
- Maluleke, R (2018) Crime against Women in South Africa. Retrieved 1 June 2021 from <https://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/Report-03-40-05/Report-03-40-05June2018.pdf>
- Mlaba, K. (2020). South Africa's New Gender-Based Violence Laws: What you Should Know and How to Have your Say. Retrieved 17 February, 2021 from <https://www.globalcitizen.org/en/content/south-africa-new-laws-gender-violence-what-to-know/>
- Macleod, C. I., Böhmke, W., Mavuso, J., Barker, K., & Chiweshe, M. (2018). Contesting sexual violence policies in higher education: the case of Rhodes University. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research, 10*(2), 83-92, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JACPR-05-2017-0295>
- Malamuth, N., Hupp, M., & Linz, D. (2018). Sexual assault interventions may be doing more harm than good with high-risk males. *Aggression and violent behaviour, 10*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.05.010>
- Malinen, S., Willis, G. M., & Johnston, L. (2014). Might informative media reporting of sexual offending influence community members' attitudes towards sex offenders?. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 20*(6), 535-552, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1080/1068316X.2013.793770>
- Martin, P. Y. (2016). The rape prone culture of academic contexts: Fraternities and athletics. *Gender & Society, 30*(1), 30-43, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/0891243215612708>
- Mathews, S., Abrahams, N., Jewkes, R., Martin, L. J., Lombard, C., & Vetten, L. (2008). Intimate femicide-suicide in South Africa: a cross-sectional study. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 86*, 542-558.
- Matthews, S., Benvenuti, P., & Mathews, S. (2014). Violence against children in South Africa: developing a prevention agenda. *South African Child Gauge, 1*, 26-34.

- McDermott, R. C., Naylor, P. D., McKelvey, D., & Kantra, L. (2017). College men's and women's masculine gender role strain and dating violence acceptance attitudes: Testing sex as a moderator. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 18(2), 99, <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000044>
- McGlynn, C. (2011). Feminism, rape and the search for justice. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 31(4), 825-842, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1093/ojls/gqr025>
- McMahon, S. (2010). Rape myth beliefs and bystander attitudes among incoming college students. *Journal of American college health*, 59(1), 3-11, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1080/07448481.2010.483715>
- McMahon, S., & Banyard, V. L. (2012). When can I help? A conceptual framework for the prevention of sexual violence through bystander intervention. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 13(1), 3-14, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1524838011426015>
- McNay, L. (2013). *Gender and agency: Reconfiguring the subject in feminist and social theory*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Messerschmidt, J. W., & Messner, M. A. (2018). Hegemonic, nonhegemonic, and 'new' masculinities. *Gender reckonings: New social theory and research*, 35-56.
- Meyer, A. (2010). "Too Drunk To Say No" Binge drinking, rape and the Daily Mail. *Feminist media studies*, 10(1), 19-34, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1080/14680770903457071>
- Michau, L., Horn, J., Bank, A., Dutt, M., & Zimmerman, C. (2015). Prevention of violence against women and girls: lessons from practice. *The Lancet*, 385(9978), 1672-1684, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(14\)61797-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61797-9)
- Mittal, S., & Singh, T. (2020). Gender-based violence during COVID-19 pandemic: a mini-review. *Frontiers in Global Women's Health*, 1, 4, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fgwh.2020.00004>
- Mlaba, K. (2020). South Africa's New Gender-Based Violence Laws: What you Should Know and How to Have your Say. Retrieved 17 February, 2021 from <https://www.globalcitizen.org/en/content/south-africa-new-laws-gender-violence-what-to-know/>
- Monk, L., & Jones, A. (2014). Alcohol consumption as a risk factor for sexual assault: A retrospective analysis. *Journal of forensic and legal medicine*, 23, 55-61, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jflm.2014.01.015>
- Morrell, R., Jewkes, R., & Lindegger, G. (2012). Hegemonic masculinity/masculinities in South Africa: Culture, power, and gender politics. *Men and masculinities*, 15(1), 11-30, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1097184X12438001>
- Mooney, J. (2000). *Gender, violence and the social order*. Springer.

- Morrell, R., Jewkes, R., & Lindegger, G. (2012). Hegemonic masculinity/masculinities in South Africa: Culture, power, and gender politics. *Men and masculinities*, 15(1), 11-30, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1097184X12438001>
- Morrow, S. L. (2005). Quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research in counseling psychology. *Journal of counseling psychology*, 52(2), 250.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Kimes, L. A. (1999). The social construction of violence: The case of sexual and domestic violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3(3), 234-245, https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1207/s15327957pspr0303_6
- Murphy, M. J. (2009). Can “Men” Stop Rape? Visualizing Gender in the “My Strength is Not for Hurting” Rape Prevention Campaign. *Men and Masculinities*, 12(1), 113-130, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1097184X09331752>
- Mwambene, L., & Sloth-Nielsen, J. (2011). Benign accommodation? Ukuthwala, 'forced marriage' and the South African Children's Act. *African Human Rights Law Journal*, 11(1), 1-22.
- Naidoo, K. (2013). Rape in South Africa-a call to action. *SAMJ: South African Medical Journal*, 103(4), 210-211.
- Nayak, M. B., Byrne, C. A., Martin, M. K., & Abraham, A. G. (2003). Attitudes toward violence against women: A cross-nation study. *Sex roles*, 49(7-8), 333-342, <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025108103617>
- Neilson, E. C., Bird, E. R., Metzger, I. W., George, W. H., Norris, J., & Gilmore, A. K. (2018). Understanding sexual assault risk perception in college: Associations among sexual assault history, drinking to cope, and alcohol use. *Addictive behaviors*, 78, 178-186, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2017.11.022>
- Nombembe, P., (2019). IN HIS OWN WORDS | Luyanda Botha: 'This is how I killed Uyinene'. Retrieved 22 April 2021 from <https://www.timeslive.co.za/news/south-africa/2019-11-15-in-his-own-words-luyanda-botha-this-is-how-i-killed-uyinene/>
- O'Hara, S. (2012). Monsters, playboys, virgins and whores: Rape myths in the news media's coverage of sexual violence. *Language and Literature*, 21(3), 247-259, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/0963947012444217>
- O'Hare, U. A. (1999). Realizing human rights for women. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 21(2), 364-402.
- Onyejekwe, C. J. (2004). The interrelationship between gender-based violence and HIV/AIDS in South Africa. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 6(1), 34-40.
- Ovens, M., & Van der Watt, M. (2012). Contextualizing the practice of Ukuthwala within South Africa. *Child Abuse Research in South Africa*, 13(1), 11-26.
- Parker, I (2002). *Critical Discursive Psychology*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

- Parker, I. (1999). *Critical textwork: an introduction to the varieties of discourse and analysis*. Open Unit Press: Buckingham.
- Parwej, S., Kumar, R., Walia, I., & Aggarwal, A. K. (2005). Reproductive health education intervention trial. *The Indian Journal of Pediatrics*, 72(4), 287-291, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02724005>
- Peacock, D., & Barker, G. (2014). Working with men and boys to prevent gender-based violence: Principles, lessons learned, and ways forward. *Men and masculinities*, 17(5), 578-599, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1097184X14558240>
- Persson, S., & Dhingra, K. (2020). Attributions of blame in stranger and acquaintance rape: a multilevel meta-analysis and systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1524838020977146>
- Petersen, T., (2018). 'Cruel, vengeful, vicious' - life sentences for Hannah Cornelius' murderers. Retrieved 22 April 2021 from <https://www.news24.com/news24/SouthAfrica/News/breaking-life-sentences-for-3-found-guilty-of-hannah-cornelius-rape-murder-20181112>
- Peterson, Z. D., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (2004). Was it rape? The function of women's rape myth acceptance and definitions of sex in labeling their own experiences. *Sex Roles*, 51(3-4), 129-144, <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SERS.0000037758.95376.00>
- Pieck, J. H. (1976). The male sex role: Definitions, problems, and sources of change. *Journal of social issues*, 32(3), 155-164.
- Pina, A., Gannon, T. A., & Saunders, B. (2009). An overview of the literature on sexual harassment: Perpetrator, theory, and treatment issues. *Aggression and violent behavior*, 14(2), 126-138, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2009.01.002>
- Potter, S. J., Moynihan, M. M., Stapleton, J. G., & Banyard, V. L. (2009). Empowering Bystanders to Prevent Campus Violence Against Women: A Preliminary Evaluation of a Poster Campaign. *Violence Against Women*, 15(1), 106-121, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1077801208327482>
- Quinn, J. F., Forsyth, C. J., & Mullen-Quinn, C. (2004). Societal reaction to sex offenders: A review of the origins and results of the myths surrounding their crimes and treatment amenability. *Deviant Behavior*, 25(3), 215-232, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1080/01639620490431147>
- Qureshi, S. (2020). The recognition of violence against women as a violation of human rights in the United Nations system. *South Asian Studies*, 28(1).
- Randall, M., Koshan, J., & Nyaundi, P. (Eds.). (2017). *The right to say no: Marital rape and law reform in Canada, Ghana, Kenya and Malawi*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Reed, M., Evely, A. C., Cundill, G., Fazey, I. R. A., Glass, J., Laing, A., ... & Stringer, L. (2010). What is social learning?. *Ecology and society*.

- Ricardo, C., Eads, M., & Barker, G. (2011). Engaging Boys and Men in the Prevention of Sexual Violence. Sexual Violence Research Initiative and Promundo. Pretoria, South Africa.
- Richter, L., Mabaso, M., Ramjith, J., & Norris, S. A. (2015). Early sexual debut: Voluntary or coerced? Evidence from longitudinal data in South Africa—the Birth to Twenty Plus study. *South African Medical Journal*, *105*(4), 304-307, DOI: [10.7196/SAMJ.8925](https://doi.org/10.7196/SAMJ.8925)
- Rose, N. (2000). The biology of culpability: Pathological identity and crime control in a biological culture. *Theoretical criminology*, *4*(1), 5-34, <https://doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1362480600004001001>
- Rotheram-Borus, M. J., Swendeman, D., & Chovnick, G. (2009). The past, present, and future of HIV prevention: integrating behavioral, biomedical, and structural intervention strategies for the next generation of HIV prevention. *Annual review of clinical psychology*, *5*, 143-167, <https://doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.032408.153530>
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2012). *The social psychology of gender: How power and intimacy shape gender relations*. Guilford Press.
- Russell, M., Cupp, P. K., Jewkes, R. K., Gevers, A., Mathews, C., LeFleur-Bellerose, C., & Small, J. (2014). Intimate partner violence among adolescents in Cape Town, South Africa. *Prevention Science*, *15*(3), 283-295, DOI 10.1007/s11121-013-0405-7
- Ryan, K. M. (2011). The relationship between rape myths and sexual scripts: The social construction of rape. *Sex Roles*, *65*(11-12), 774-782, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-0033-2>
- Sarnquist, C., Omondi, B., Sinclair, J., Gitau, C., Paiva, L., Mulinge, M., ... & Maldonado, Y. (2014). Rape prevention through empowerment of adolescent girls. *Pediatrics*, *133*(5), e1226-e1232, <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2013-3414>
- Seddon, D. (2016). ‘We will not be Silenced’: Rape Culture, #RURreferencelist, and the University Currently Known as Rhodes. Retrieved 22 July, 2019 from <https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/opinionista/2016-06-01-we-will-not-be-silenced-rape-culture-rureferencelist-and-the-university-currently-known-as-rhodes/>
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2010). Research Methods for Business. *A Skill Building Approach*.
- Semenza, J. C. (2010). Strategies to intervene on social determinants of infectious diseases. *Eurosurveillance*, *15*(27), 19611.
- Sharifi, F., Larki, M., & Latifnejad Roudsari, R. (2020). COVID-19 outbreak as threat of violence against women. *Journal of Midwifery and Reproductive Health*, *8*(3), 2376-2379, <https://doi.org/10.22038/jmrh.2020.16036>

- Shange, N. (2018). Five times rape at SA's universities made headlines. Retrieved 3 April, 2019 from <https://www.timeslive.co.za/news/south-africa/2018-08-06-five-times-student-rape-made-headlines-in-south-africa/>
- Shechory, M., & Idisis, Y. (2006). Rape myths and social distance toward sex offenders and victims among therapists and students. *Sex Roles*, 54(9-10), 651-658, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9031-1>
- Sigsworth, R., Vetten, L., Jewkes, R., & Christofides, N. (2009). Policing rape in South Africa. *Agenda*, 23(82), 39-50.
- Silverman, J. G., & Williamson, G. M. (1997). Social ecology and entitlements involved in battering by heterosexual college males: Contributions of family and peers. *Violence and Victims*, 12(2), 147, <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.12.2.147>
- Sleath, E., & Bull, R. (2010). Male rape victim and perpetrator blaming. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 25(6), 969-988, <https://doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/0886260509340534>
- Smith, J. A. (Ed.). (2015). *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods*. Sage.
- Smith Slep, A. M., Foran, H. M., & Heyman, R. E. (2014). An ecological model of intimate partner violence perpetration at different levels of severity. *Journal of family psychology*, 28(4), 470, <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037316>
- Strebel, A., Crawford, M., Shefer, T., Cloete, A., Henda, N., Kaufman, M., ... & Kalichman, S. (2006). Social constructions of gender roles, gender-based violence and HIV/AIDS in two communities of the Western Cape, South Africa. *SAHARA-J: Journal of Social Aspects of HIV/AIDS*, 3(3), 516-528.
- Suarez, E., & Gadalla, T. M. (2010). Stop blaming the victim: A meta-analysis on rape myths. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 25(11), 2010-2035, <https://doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/0886260509354503>
- Sultana, A. (2010). Patriarchy and Womens Subordination: A Theoretical Analysis. *Arts Faculty Journal*, 1-18, <https://doi.org/10.3329/afj.v4i0.12929>
- Talbot, J. (1996). Affirmation and resistance of dominant discourses: The rhetorical construction of pregnancy. *Journal of narrative and life history*, 6(3), 225-251, <https://doi.org/10.1075/jnlh.6.3.02aff>
- Terry, M. S. (2014). Applying the social ecological model to violence against women with disabilities, <https://doi.org/10.4172/2167-0420.1000193>
- Thamm, M. (2019). Women protest against rape and femicide – arrest marchers, use stun grenades and turn water cannon on crowd. *Daily Maverick*. <https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2019-09-05-women-protest-against-rape-and-femicide-saps-arrest-marchers-use-stun-grenades-and-turn-water-cannon-on-crowd/>

- Thapar-Björkert, S., & Morgan, K. J. (2010). "But sometimes I think... they put themselves in the situation": exploring blame and responsibility in interpersonal violence. *Violence against women*, 16(1), 32-59, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1077801209354374>
- The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*, 1996.
- The National Sexual Assault Policy*, 2005.
- The South African Labour Guide. (2020). Retrieved 4 May, 2020 from <https://www.labourguide.co.za/general/600-code-of-good-practice-on-sexual-harassment113>
- Thompson, M. E. (2014). Empowering self-defense training. *Violence Against Women*, 20(3), 351-359, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1077801214526051>
- Thornham, H., & McFarlane, A. (2011). Cross-generational gender constructions. Women, teenagers and technology. *The Sociological Review*, 59(1), 64-85, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2010.01992.x>
- du Toit, L. (2008). The contradictions of consent in rape law. *South African Review of Sociology*, 39(1), 140-155.
- Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight "big-tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative inquiry*, 16(10), 837-851, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1077800410383121>
- Travis, C. B. (Ed.). (2003). *Evolution, gender, and rape*. Mit Press.
- Tufte, T. (2001). Entertainment-education and participation: Assessing the communication strategy of Soul City. *Journal of International Communication*, 7(2), 25-50, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13216597.2001.9751908>
- Ullman, S. E., & Peter-Hagene, L. (2014). Social reactions to sexual assault disclosure, coping, perceived control, and PTSD symptoms in sexual assault victims. *Journal of community psychology*, 42(4), 495-508, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21624>
- Unger, R. (2020). *Representations: Social constructions of gender*. Routledge.
- United Nations General Assembly. *Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women*. Geneva: UN; 1993.
- Usdin, S., Scheepers, E., Goldstein, S., & Japhet, G. (2005). Achieving social change on gender-based violence: a report on the impact evaluation of Soul City's fourth series. *Social science & medicine*, 61(11), 2434-2445, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2005.04.035>
- Van As, S., & Ramanjam, V. (2008). Children, violence and the media: opinion. *South African Journal of Child Health*, 2(1), 14.

- Van der Bijl, C., & Rumney, P. N. (2009). Attitudes, rape and law reform in South Africa. *The Journal of Criminal Law*, 73(5), 414-429, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1350/jcla.2009.73.5.591>
- Veneracion-Rallonza, M. L. (2014). Women's naked body protests and the performance of resistance: Femen and Meira Paibi protests against rape. *Philippine Political Science Journal*, 35(2), 251-268, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1080/01154451.2014.965876>
- de Vos, A. S., Strydom, H., Fouche, C. B., & Delport, C. S. L. (2011). *Research at grass roots: For the social sciences and human service professions*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Vugt, M. V., Cremer, D. D., & Janssen, D. P. (2007). Gender differences in cooperation and competition: The male-warrior hypothesis. *Psychological science*, 18(1), 19-23, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01842.x>
- Ward, C. L., Artz, L., Leoschut, L., Kassanje, R., & Burton, P. (2018). Sexual violence against children in South Africa: a nationally representative cross-sectional study of prevalence and correlates. *The Lancet Global Health*, 6(4), e460-e468, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(18\)30060-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30060-3)
- Watson, J. (2014), "Engaging with the state: lessons learnt from social advocacy on gender-based violence", *Agenda*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 58-66, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1080/10130950.2014.927626>
- Weiss, K. G. (2010). Male sexual victimization: Examining men's experiences of rape and sexual assault. *Men and Masculinities*, 12(3), 275-298, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/1097184X08322632>
- Wekerle, C., & Wolfe, D. A. (1999). Dating violence in mid-adolescence: Theory, significance, and emerging prevention initiatives. *Clinical psychology review*, 19(4), 435-456, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7358\(98\)00091-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7358(98)00091-9)
- White, C. (2015). Sexual assault and rape. *Obstetrics, Gynaecology & Reproductive Medicine*, 25(10), 295-301, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ogrm.2015.07.003>
- Willig, C. (2008). Foucauldian discourse analysis. *Introducing qualitative research in psychology*, 2, 112-131.
- Willig, C. (2003). Discourse analysis. *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods*, 2, 160-186.
- Winslow, A. (Ed.). (1995). *Women, politics, and the United Nations* (No. 151). Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Wood, J. T. (2001). The normalization of violence in heterosexual romantic relationships: Women's narratives of love and violence. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 18(2), 239-261, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/0265407501182005>

- Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- World Health Organization. (2017). *Understanding and addressing violence against women. 2012. Geneva: World Health Organization.*
- Wulfhorst, E. (2019). UN Urges Countries to End Marital Rape and Close Legal Loopholes. Retrieved 1 June 2021 from <https://www.globalcitizen.org/en/content/un-women-marital-rape-laws/>
- Yakeley, J. (2009). *Working with violence: A contemporary psychoanalytic approach*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Yodanis, C. L. (2004). Gender inequality, violence against women, and fear: A cross-national test of the feminist theory of violence against women. *Journal of interpersonal violence, 19*(6), 655-675, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/0886260504263868>
- Yule, K., & Grych, J. (2020). College students' perceptions of barriers to bystander intervention. *Journal of interpersonal violence, 35*(15-16), 2971-2992, <https://0-doi.org.wam.seals.ac.za/10.1177/0886260517706764>

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Gatekeeper Permission Request - Registrar

August 2020

The Registrar,
Rhodes University,
Makhanda,
South Africa,
6140

Dear Dr. A. Moodly,

Request for permission to recruit participants from the Rhodes University student body by using class mailing lists for research invitation purposes.

I, Shannon Skae (G14S0379) am conducting research towards a Master's degree in Psychology at Rhodes' University. My research is being supervised by Werner Böhmke in the Department of Psychology.

The proposed study is titled "Be more than a bystander, break the silence on violence".

The purpose of the research is to establish the discursive positions that students take up at Rhodes University in response to the construction of sex and gender-based violence in public awareness poster campaigns underpinned by the Bystander Intervention approach.

The proposed sample for the study is students at Rhodes University. A student refers to an individual over the age of 18 who studies full-time at Rhodes University, either living on or off campus. The researcher is looking to include some of the Psychology 1 class to participate in the study (the full class is approximately 975 students). The researcher will randomly select a sample of 20% of this population to be sent the recruiting email. This will account for an estimated 25% response rate. 180 students will be randomly selected, which means the anticipated sample size will be around 45 students. The Psychology 1 class has been chosen due to it being the largest class on campus with registration in multiple faculties and in various years of study, which most adequately represents the undergraduate student body on campus.

Participation in the study will entail participants engaging with short, open-ended, online survey questionnaires. These investigate student responses to the anti-rape posters through the use of the Bystander Intervention approach. These responses are therefore the focus of the study. Participation will be voluntary. Informed consent will be obtained through providing potential participants with a detailed description of the purposes of the research, nature of participation, potential risks and their rights as research participants, such as the right to withdraw from the study at any time, before they commence with the questionnaire. The recruiting email will contain a link to this information, which willing participants are required to click and read through (see attached). The participants will be asked to follow a second link that will lead to the questionnaire, once they have read through the informed consent information. The participants will be made aware that once they have clicked on the questionnaire then this is them giving informed consent to partake in the study.

The project proposal has undergone review by the Research Projects and Ethics Review Committee (RPERC) in the Psychology Department and will be approved by the Rhodes University Ethical Standards Committee (RUESC) subject to your consent.

I hereby request permission to recruit participants from the Rhodes' University student body through class mailing lists. Please find a copy of the recruiting email attached.

Yours faithfully,

Shannon Skae (G14S0379)

Contact number: 0832860774

Email address: shanskae@gmail.com, g14s0379@campus.ru.ac.za

Appendix B

Gatekeeper Permission Request – Psychology Head of Department

September 2020

Professor Charles Young
Department of Psychology
Rhodes University,
Makhanda,
South Africa,
6140

Dear Professor Young,

Request for permission to recruit participants from the Psychology 1 class by using class mailing lists for research invitation purposes.

I, Shannon Skae (G14S0379) am conducting research towards a Master's degree in Psychology at Rhodes' University. My research is being supervised by Werner Böhmke in the Department of Psychology.

The proposed study is titled “Be more than a bystander, break the silence on violence”.

The purpose of the research is to establish the discursive positions that students take up at Rhodes University in response to the construction of sex and gender-based violence in public awareness poster campaigns underpinned by the Bystander Intervention approach.

The proposed sample for the study is students at Rhodes University. A student refers to an individual over the age of 18 who studies full-time at Rhodes University, either living on or off campus. The researcher is looking to include some of the Psychology 1 class to participate in the study (the full class is approximately 975 students). The researcher will randomly select a sample of 20% of this population to be sent the recruiting email. This will account for an estimated 25% response rate. 180 students will be randomly selected, which means the anticipated sample size will be around 45 students. The Psychology 1 class has been chosen due to it being the largest class on campus with registration in multiple faculties and in various years of study, which most adequately represents the undergraduate student body on campus.

Participation in the study will entail participants engaging with short, open-ended, online survey questionnaires. These investigate student responses to the anti-rape posters through the use of the Bystander Intervention approach. These responses are therefore the focus of the study. Participation will be voluntary. Informed consent will be obtained through providing potential participants with a detailed description of the purposes of the research, nature of participation, potential risks and their rights as research participants, such as the right to withdraw from the study at any time, before they commence with the questionnaire. The recruiting email will contain a link to this information, which willing participants are required to click and read through (see attached). The participants will be asked to follow a second link that will lead to the questionnaire, once they have read through the informed consent information. The participants will be made aware that once they have clicked on the questionnaire then this is them giving informed consent to partake in the study.

The project proposal has undergone review by the Research Projects and Ethics Review Committee (RPERC) in the Psychology Department and has been approved by the Rhodes University Ethical Standards Committee (RUESC).

I hereby request permission to recruit participants from the Psychology 1 class by using class mailing lists for research invitation purposes.

Yours faithfully,

Shannon Skae (G14S0379)

Contact number: 0832860774

Email address: shanskae@gmail.com, g14s0379@campus.ru.ac.za

Appendix C

Recruitment email

Dear Student,

Be more than a bystander, break the silence on violence!

You have been randomly selected for invitation to participate in a research study for a Master's Degree in Psychology, focused on public awareness interventions for sex-and-gender-based violence.

It is well known that sex-and gender-based violence is rife in South Africa, especially on South African university campuses.

You can do your part in helping to develop interventions that may address the problem of sex-and gender-based violence in universities in South Africa.

The research study involves a questionnaire focusing on surrounding specific types of anti-rape posters and whether posters like this could be useful in the South African university context. As the potential audience for such posters, we are interested in your response to them. The questionnaire should take approximately 25 minutes to complete.

If you are interested in participating in this study, then please click on the link below for more detailed information. Once you have read this information and still wish to participate, you will be provided with another link that will take you to the questionnaire.

[insert hyperlink to information sheet here]

Thanks for your time!

Kind Regards,

Shannon Skae
(Psychology Master's student and the principal researcher of this study).

Supervised by: Werner Böhmke

This research has been approved by the Rhodes University Ethical Standards Committee (RUESC) and has received permission from the Registrar.

Appendix D

Recruitment information

Dear Student,

Thank you for showing an interest in finding out more about this research.

The purpose of the study is to determine student responses, reactions to and opinions of poster interventions targeting sex-and gender-based violence.

We are looking for student volunteers to complete an open-ended online questionnaire focused on your reactions to anti-rape posters. To participate you must be a full-time registered student at Rhodes University and be over 18 years of age.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary and involves the completion of an open-ended, online questionnaire. Your responses to this questionnaire will be kept anonymous and we do not require provision of any identifying information from you – only some basic demographic data that will in no way be traced back to you personally, but may be used to give some context to the answers you provide. The questionnaire should take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

Please be advised: The researcher will send out follow up emails to you where necessary. You are, furthermore, allowed to follow up with emails to the researcher during and/or after the study's conclusion for any issues or questions that you have (please see email address of researcher at the bottom of information sheet).

Please note that due to the nature of the topic, some of the images/content of the sexual violence awareness campaign posters that this research focuses on may be disturbing or cause potential distress. **If you have experienced sex-and-gender based violence, or if you think you are likely to be upset by such images, or content, please do not continue to the questionnaire.** If at any time during the completion of the questionnaire, you feel you are becoming unduly distressed please do not continue. Details for support resources that you can access, if you feel you are in need of assistance in managing this, are listed below:

- SADAG, For Counselling: zane@sadag.org, For Counselling: 011 234 4837, Emergencies: 0800 567 567, 24Hr helpline: 0800 456 789
- Lifeline, Telephone: 0861 322 322
- RU Counselling Centre, Email: counsellingcentre@ru.ac.za, Telephone: 046 603 7070

Although you are free to withdraw your participation at any time, we do ask that once you start the questionnaire, you do try your best to complete it. Incomplete responses are not always easily usable.

PLEASE NOTE THAT BY CLICKING ON THE LINK TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE YOU ARE GIVING YOUR INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THE RESEARCH.

Should you wish to continue, please click on the following link:

[insert hyperlink]

Researcher Contact Details:

Shannon Skae (Principal Researcher) on shanskae@gmail.com

Werner Böhmke (Project Supervisor) on w.r.bohmke@ru.ac.za

Closing date: 20 November 2020.

This advertisement has been approved by the Department of Psychology's Research Project and ethics review Committee, the Rhodes University Ethical Standards Committee and permission has been granted by the Office of the Registrar.

Appendix E: Questions used in the questionnaire

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project. This online questionnaire contains 2 posters, both to do with anti-rape campaigns. A series of open-ended questions follows each poster. Please complete all the questions. Your responses are totally anonymous. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. There are no right or wrong answers, you are being asked to give your own feelings and opinion on each poster.

I confirm that I am participating voluntarily in this survey.

Yes

No

What gender do you identify as?

Poster 1: Please look at and read this poster and answer the questions that follow:



Question 1: Describe what situation you think is happening in the above poster or what story you think it is telling.

Question 2: Who is responsible for the situation that is happening / may happen and why do you think so?

Question 3: How do you feel about the message that this poster conveys about sex-and-gender-based violence?

Question 4: What (if anything) do you consider to be the strong points of this poster?

Question 5: What (if anything) do you think is missing or needs more emphasis in this poster?

Question 6: Do you think this poster or one like it will help prevent sex-and-gender based violence on Rhodes campus? Please explain why / why not.

Poster 2: Please look at and read this poster and answer the questions that follow:



SOME DUDE WAS HANGING ALL OVER HER, SO WE TOOK OFF ... and got her to leave with us. She was drunk and we didn't trust him.

Visit us at www.facebook.com/MakeYourMoveMissoula for tips and events to help keep your friends and community safe from sexual violence.

MAKE YOUR MOVE!
END SEXUAL VIOLENCE

A message from Missoula's Intervention in Action Project.

This project was supported by grant no. 2008-WR-AX-0008 awarded by the Office of Violence Against Women, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, conclusions and recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of the grantor

Question 1: Describe what situation you think is happening in the above poster or what story you think it is telling.

Question 2: Who is responsible for the situation that is happening / may happen and why do you think so?

Question 3: How do you feel about the message that this poster conveys about sex-and-gender-based violence?

Question 4: What (if anything) do you consider to be the strong points of this poster?

Question 5: What (if anything) do you think is missing or needs more emphasis in this poster?

Question 6: Do you think this poster or one like it will help prevent sex-and-gender based violence on Rhodes campus? Please explain why / why not.

Question 7: What is your opinion about the idea that sex-and-gender-based violence prevention is everyone's combined responsibility? Please explain why you think / feel this way.

Question 8: If you were asked to design a poster about sex-and-gender-based violence, what would you do differently?

Thank you for completing this questionnaire! Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Appendix F

Research Publication Agreement


Rhodes University - Department of Psychology Research Publication Agreement <i>A signed copy of this agreement must be submitted with <u>all research proposals</u> submitted to the Research Projects & Ethics Review Committee (RPERC). This document must also be signed by: i) students undertaking Masters level projects and, ii) students and others acting as research assistants for staff members.</i>
Student: Shannon Skae
Supervisor / Project Leader: Werner Böhmke
Degree and type of thesis/report: Masters
Provisional title of thesis/report: Be more than a bystander, break the silence on violence. Main Question: What discursive positions do target audiences in the South African University context take in relation to the construction of SGBV in public awareness poster campaigns from a Bystander Intervention approach?

A major task of a University is to provide the infrastructure necessary for the conduct of research and for the dissemination of findings through publication in academic journals or edited books. Those who enroll for a postgraduate degree (which includes any form of research) or act as research assistants become participants in this task. With regard to the former, this means that the University has the responsibility and right to take whatever steps may be appropriate to turn student's research work into one or more publications. In light of this, postgraduate students and those acting as research assistants in the Department of Psychology must sign the following agreement as a condition for undertaking supervised research or acting as research assistants.

1. I, Shannon Skae, undertake to plan and execute the research project referred to above under the supervision of the supervisor / project leader (named above) and to remain in regular consultation with the supervisor / project leader on all aspects of the research.
2. With regard to supervised research, I understand that I have the right to publish the research, that I must reach agreement with the supervisor regarding the nature of the publication and the publication medium (e.g., specific journal or book chapter), and that I should take active steps towards publishing it within six months of being informed by the University that the degree has been awarded.
3. With regard to supervised research, I understand that my supervisor has the right to

prepare and submit the research for publication if either: i) I indicate that I do not wish to work on the publication of the research myself, or, ii) I do not provide adequate evidence of having taken significant steps towards submitting the material for publication within six months of being informed by the University that the degree has been awarded.

4. With regard to supervised research, I understand that when the research is submitted for publication my own affiliation and that of my supervisor should be given as ‘Rhodes University’.
5. I understand that the following guidelines should be followed in assigning authorship when the work is submitted for publication. These include, that:
 - a. The student should normally appear as first author and the supervisor as second author.
 - b. In some cases, other students or researchers may be included as additional authors (where they have contributed to the scientific value of the research).
 - c. Where the supervisor’s preparation of the work for publication involves him/her in considerable additional work (e.g., updating the literature review, additional data analyses, responding to instructions for revision from journal reviewers, or where the student has had no involvement in the writing up of the article for publication), s/he has the right to appear as first author.
 - d. Where a student or other participates as a research assistant in a staff member’s research project, such as in gathering and/or analysing the data, but this does not result in a thesis, the student’s contribution should be acknowledged. If the involvement was only helping to collect the data, the acknowledgement would normally be given in the text.
 - e. Should the student or other acting as a research assistant contribute substantially to the academic merit of the publication, then the student or other may be listed as a co-author. This is to be negotiated with the project leader.
 - f. Should there be uncertainty about the status of the student, research assistant, supervisor, or project leader with regard to authorship/co-authorship any one of these parties may approach the department’s Research Projects & Ethics Review Committee (RPERC) for a decision.

Signature		Date: 23 rd May 2021
------------------	---	---------------------------------

Appendix G

Plagiarism Declaration

Plagiarism declaration

I (student's name and student number), _____ Shannon Skae _____, have read and understood Rhodes University's policy on plagiarism, and I understand that if found guilty of plagiarism I risk being excluded from the University.

I hereby declare this proposal / research thesis to be my own work. Where the work of others (published or unpublished) has been drawn on, appropriate references and citations have been provided, in accordance with discipline specific requirements and conventions.

Signed:

A rectangular box containing a handwritten signature in black ink. The signature appears to be 'Skae' written in a cursive style.

Date: 23rd May 2021