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Abstract

In this paper we argue that social representations are a key mechanism through which knowledge about intimate partner violence is shared and understood. We draw on in-depth interviews with 11 men who had perpetrated violence against an intimate woman partner and analyse the social representations of masculinities, femininities and violence that emerge from men’s narratives about their lives and relationships. We analyse men’s social representations of violence primarily through the lens of respectability involving both masculine and feminine forms of respectability, which contribute to the maintenance of patriarchy. We show how the narrative of respectability is held together by representations of masculine heroism and feminine masochism and the findings cast light on how acts of violence are shaped by a range of intersections and structural oppressions. Social representations of gender and intimate partner violence also show how individual
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men’s narratives about violence are largely influenced by their peers, kin and wider community norms that make violence against women acceptable.
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**Resumen**
Este artículo defiende que las representaciones sociales son un mecanismo clave a través del que se comparte y entiende el conocimiento sobre la violencia dentro de la pareja. Basándose en entrevistas en profundidad con 11 hombres que habían cometido actos de violencia contra su compañera íntima, se analizan las representaciones sociales de la masculinidad, la feminidad y la violencia que emergen de los relatos de hombres sobre sus vidas y relaciones. Se analizan las representaciones sociales de la violencia que realizan los hombres, principalmente a través de la lente de la respetabilidad, involucrando tanto formas de respetabilidad masculinas como femeninas, lo que contribuye al mantenimiento del patriarcado. Se muestra cómo la narración de la respetabilidad se integra por representaciones de heroísmo masculino y masoquismo femenino, y los hallazgos arrojan luz sobre cómo una serie de intersecciones y opresiones estructurales dan forma a actos violentos. Las representaciones sociales de género y violencia dentro de la pareja también muestran cómo los relatos de hombres individuales sobre la violencia están muy influenciados por sus compañeros, familiares y normas comunitarias más amplias que convierten en aceptable la violencia contra las mujeres.
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1. Introduction

"I live in a place where like violence is born in a place [...] around every second street you see people gamble on the corners, they fighting. You must like, live in that life man to connect with other people. So you do the things that people do."

These are the words of a male participant spoken in an interview about social representations of intimate partner violence. These words illustrate the social and collective nature of violence perpetration, and they dismantle beliefs that violence is an individual act. Violence indeed is pervasive and it permeates all corners of the globe, affecting not only the individuals in the immediate environment, but also the families and communities in which people live. Although widespread, violence may be experienced differently from context to context, to the extent that it has been described as a "product of its social context" (Jewkes 2002, p. 1423). There is recognition that histories of colonialism, historical and continuing structural oppressions are key factors in shaping violence. The social context in which violence is located is an important site of analysis. The material and social conditions in which victims and perpetrators find themselves might shape beliefs that they live by. In this paper, the focus is turned to the social context of Cape Town, South Africa to explore how men’s violence against women partners can be understood.

South Africa is an example of a postcolonial context; one that has been described as an unequal society divided racially, ethnically, and along the lines of class and gender (Gopal and Chetty 2006), and more importantly one in which violence against women is of pandemic proportions. Women are of the most vulnerable and marginalized groups in this country (Domestic Violence Act 116 of 1998), with such disadvantage being skewed by other inequalities such as race and class. Although the Constitution currently protects the rights, freedom and equality of all citizens, Gopal and Chetty (2006, p. 118) argued that the onslaught of violence evident both before and after democracy is accountable for the position in which women and children find themselves – in many cases, as "subservient and invisible". Indeed, the country is in the paradoxical position of having one of the most progressive constitutions in the world, yet also having one of the highest rates of gender-based violence. Still, the statistics may not provide an accurate description of the full extent of this phenomenon (Matzopoulos et al. 2004), since some victims are silenced and thus do not report abuse (Bendall 2010).

South African scholars have identified a range of discourses implicated in men’s violence against women. These factors include: structural, gendered and racialized inequalities, a long history of violence as a result of colonialism and apartheid, and the almost normative use of violence as a means of conflict resolution (Morrell 2001, Gopal and Chetty 2006, Jewkes and Morrell 2010). The misuse of alcohol and the exposure to violence in childhood has also been associated with men’s perpetration of violence (Jewkes 2002, Jewkes et al. 2002, Abrahams and Jewkes 2005, Sawyer-Kurian et al. 2009, Jewkes and Morrell 2010). Furthermore, some noteworthy South African research has drawn attention to the relational construction of masculinity and violence (Boonzaier 2008, Matzopoulos et al. 2008, Ragnarsson et al. 2009, Lau and Stevens 2012). However, what appears to be absent from this research is an exploration of violent men’s behaviour in the context of their relationships, communities and within larger society. As emphasised by Ratele (2013, p. 251), “Violence demands to be accounted for at structural, symbolic and subjective levels”.

Masculinity is argued to be a collective practice (Connell 1995), which does not exist within “social and cultural vacuums” (Hearn and Kimmel 2007, p. 133), but is constructed within various institutional contexts such as the family, the workplace, schools, factories and in the media. As Hearn and Kimmel (2007) phrased it: “Gender is as much a structure of relationships within and between institutions as a property of individual identity” (Hearn and Kimmel 2007, p. 134) – a perspective
which is affirmed in the current paper. We argue that there should also be recognition that a man, who perpetrates violence against a woman partner, does so within wider contexts of other men and women, a family, community and society. We furthermore highlight the need to study the social and collective nature of men’s perpetration of intimate partner violence in the South African context.

Scholars working in the field of social representations and narrative research have highlighted the interplay between the individual and the social, and the ways in which individual and community stories serve to mutually reinforce each other (Humphreys 2000, Mankowski and Rappaport 2000, Mankowski and Thomas 2000, Stuber 2000). Stuber (2000, p. 514) argued that community narratives serve to create “group cohesion, integrate new members, and remind members of the values to which they are personally committed”. Research suggest that community narratives and norms may act as powerful psychological resources called upon by community members to construct and maintain personal and collective identities (Humphreys 2000, Mankowski and Rappaport 2000, Mankowski and Thomas 2000, Stuber 2000). Community narratives are also argued to be important when individuals do not identify with dominant cultural narratives (Mankowski and Rappaport 2000). In this paper¹ we argue that men’s narratives of violence against women should be understood as being part of broader cultural and community narratives about gender, violence, and heterosexual relationships. We ask: What socio-cultural representations emerge in men narratives of violence against women? This question includes an exploration of particular sanctions in men’s communities, and social and collective spaces that make violence against women possible, but also spaces that may challenge norms about the acceptability of violence against women.

2. Qualitative methodology

This paper presents an analysis of 22 individual interviews conducted with 11 men who perpetrated violence against a woman partner or partners. Participants were recruited from men’s programmes at community-based NGOs, in their respective communities. Men were eligible to participate in the study if they had perpetrated any type of abuse against an intimate female partner at some point in their lives, and if they were above 18 years of age. Individual interviews were conducted with men residing in two historically marginalised communities in Cape Town, South Africa. The men’s ages ranged from 19 to 57 years, with a mean age of 37 years, and all participants described themselves as Coloured². Five participants reported that they were unemployed at the time of the interviews, while two worked in the informal sector, and the remainder were employed full-time, predominantly in unskilled or low-skilled employment. The majority of the men were in long-term relationships.

Each of the men participated in two interviews to ensure depth and quality of the data collected, and for the interviewer to gain rapport with the men. The two interviews did not vary in type; however, aspects that were not covered or that needed clarification in the first interview were addressed in the second interview. The episodic interview was employed, which is a specific type of semi-structured, narrative interview (see Flick 2009). Men were asked to relay experiences about the following: 1) their first experience with witnessing, experiencing or perpetrating

¹ This paper presents preliminary findings of a segment of a larger research project on social representations of intimate partner violence amongst men and their social networks.
² ‘Coloured’ is a racial term created during Apartheid that referred to people of mixed race origin and grouped particular South African citizens according to their skin ‘colour’ (Hendricks 2001, Lewis 2001). The Coloured group was often perceived of as ‘between’ the black and white racial divides (Erasmus 2001, Lewis 2001, Adhikari 2005). Since the abolition of Apartheid, this term is still in use; however it is predominantly conceived of as a social construction that serves particular political purposes (Grunebaum and Robins 2001, Hendricks 2001). Some find the term controversial and offensive and use it in inverted commas or prefixed by ‘so-called’, while others use it with pride (Erasmus and Pieterse 1999, Grunebaum and Robins 2001).
violence against a woman and to provide a story of that incident, and 2) subsequent incidents of violence against women (if any) throughout their lives. Men were also invited to talk about the way in which other individuals in their social groups (friends, family, neighbours, community members, and onlookers) responded to their violence against women. More specific questions about the concept of ‘violence’ itself were also asked such as, “How have you come to understand the act of ‘violence against women’ currently?” or “What would you now constitute as violence against a woman partner?” These questions were complimented by aspects of creative interviewing. Mason and Davies (2009) make a case for the use of sensory methodology in qualitative research to understand the complex ways in which senses are intermingled with peoples’ experiences and ways of knowing. Moscovici (2001) explained that people make sense of unfamiliar phenomena through linking them to existing ideas and images, and in order to elicit some of these images, participants were asked to list or draw some of the objects and people that they associate with violence, and to provide more information about it.

2.1. Analysis of data

The theory of social representations was employed as a theoretical framework for this research. Insights from a narrative approach were also employed to add theoretical depth to the research. Concepts from the narrative approach and social representations theory share very similar intellectual traditions; both approaches are born out of a social constructionist tradition and aim to understand how people discover and organise reality (Murray 2002). László (1997) argued that the mental or verbal construction in individuals’ stories should be seen as part of the common stories by a particular culture or society that may act together and experience their own actions. In a sense, these common stories or narratives of a particular culture may be seen as shared representations of a particular group (László 1997).

We employed Stenner’s (1993) thematic decomposition analysis - a form of analysis that would allow us to integrate these varied and dynamic perspectives. Stenner’s (1993) approach attempts to discover patterns – such as themes, narratives and discourses – within the data, while also reflecting upon subject positions allocated to or taken up by a person (Ussher and Mooney-Somers 2000, Braun and Clarke 2006). Inherent in the thematic decomposition approach is the idea that meaning is largely shaped by the social (Stenner 1993), with an emphasis upon language, power, subjectivity and the co-construction of meaning. As Riessman (1993, p. 65) also reminded us: “Narratives are laced with social discourses and power relations, which do not remain constant over time”. Through Braun and Clarke’s (2006) approach to conducting a thematic analysis as well as Stenner’s (1993) work on thematic decomposition analysis, we explored men’s constructions of their own violence against women.

Our analysis also paid attention to the contexts in which stories are told by acknowledging the ‘audiences’ and the interaction and co-construction of narratives (Squire 2005) between the interviewer and interviewees. Research has shown that men’s talk about their own violence serves a performative function (LeCouteur and Oxlad 2011), allowing men to configure a certain self-presentation that may be considered socially desirable (Adams et al. 1995, Hearn 1998a, Wetherell and Edley 1999, Boonzaier 2008). Wetherell and Edley (1999) argued that there is no real or authentic self but rather people are positioned in relation to particular discourses in order to create a depiction of a coherent and preferred self. We noted that in the interviews with men in this study, they might have been showing a preferred self-presentation, allowing them to construct various selves to possibly attain some redemption for their perpetration of violence but to also highlight the complexities and various factors intersecting with their acts of violence. The representations of violence, along with the particular purposes these might have for the specific narrator(s) are key aspects explored in the analysis that follows.
2.2. Setting the scene

Based upon this study’s aim to gather data on men who have been violent, alongside community norms that might influence narratives of partner violence, the preferred site for this study were NGOs that were aligned with particular communities. The community-based NGOs that agreed to collaborate on this study serve two impoverished and historically marginalised communities in Cape Town, namely, Hanover Park and Strand. While both the townships may share similarities regarding their social composition, their histories are different. Geographically situated on the Cape Flats, Hanover Park has been described as a Coloured community, located on the peripheries of Cape Town and lodged within the boundaries of the Cape Town municipality. It was established in 1969 and was one of the many areas to which black South Africans were forcibly moved as a result of the apartheid Group Areas Act of 1950 (Jensen 1999, Lewis 2001). Initially known as Mosterd’s Bay, Hottentots Holland Strand or Somerset West Strand, the little ‘town’ of Strand was established very soon after the establishment of the Cape, forming part of the Hottentot Holland region. This coastal town was a fishing and tourist destination in the late 1800s; however, since World War 2, few traces remain of these features (Heap 1977). Currently, public buildings, residential developments, shops and factories now occupy the area. With the rapid urbanisation, widespread poverty, high unemployment rates, and severe housing shortages – largely owing to the apartheid urbanisation policies – some areas of Strand similarly resemble a forced removal area.

Both contexts display many symptoms of impoverishment and marginalisation through their poor physical environments, the high degree of social disintegration, and their geographical locations on the margins. These areas, like many other similar areas created from forced removals, is characterised by high levels of public and private violence, crime, drug and alcohol abuse. In particular, Hanover Park has entered public discourse through frequent local news reports describing gang shootings in the area, which often recount cases where innocent bystanders are killed in the cross-fire. It is in the context of Hanover Park and Strand that the current study is situated in its analysis of battering men’s talk about violence against women.

3. Representations of intimate partner violence and narratives of respectability

In this paper we found that men held particular representations of violence against women; consistent with public discourse on the issue, men constructed violence against women as wrong and immoral. They often drew upon a ‘then and now’ structure in their narratives to demonstrate their changes towards non-violence. Although the men represented themselves as ambassadors of change in their communities, they still expressed much conflict over alternative representations of intimate violence held amongst their social circles and larger communities. These alternative representations condoned violence against women and emerged within narratives of respectability, a “highly malleable ideology” (Thomas 2006, p. 467), which influences social status. An individual might be considered respectable when they attain normality and morality, and this respectability must be verified by an audience (Ball 1970, Duneier 1992). Respectability is thus an individual and collective concern (Ball 1970). In this paper we focus on men’s personal narratives of violence perpetration and show how they are linked to broader social narratives of manhood and respectability in their communities. Narratives of respectability

---

3 An area developed over the 1960s and 1970s in the name of the Group Areas Act of 1950, which acted as a “dumping ground” (Jensen 1999, p. 76) predominantly for the group categorised as Coloured South Africans. These Cape Flats townships are often referred to as “gang-land”, and are characterised by poverty, social disintegration and violence (Jensen 1999, p. 76).
were held together by social representations of heroism and protection, as well as ideas about disciplining women who ‘desire’ the abuse.

3.1. Heroism: representations of self-defence and protection

One way in which respectability was performed by male participants was through chivalrous and gallant acts towards some women. The ideology of chivalry is one that has been performed for centuries, and one of the ways in which chivalry was performed was through the protection of women (Felson 2002). Felson (2002) conceded that despite the early formulation of chivalry, still today, the contemporary man who fulfills his ‘duty’ to do special gallantries for women, might be viewed as a gentleman and chivalrous. In the current research chivalry was represented as the practice of honourable and heroic acts to protect loved ones. Eight of the 11 participants reported having been raised in abusive households where they were forced to protect their mothers or siblings against abusive fathers or male figures. This socio-cultural representation of the chivalrous man and protector seemed to have been anchored as a form of self-defence during the men’s early years:

John: My step father was also a gangster related guy. As little boys we were always to do things his way. So at night we come together, the boys make a big fire together and then we sit around the fire telling stories and so we make jokes and so on. And then one night, we we’re sitting there, boys telling jokes, my step father he’s chasing my mother bare naked. Takes a piece of wood out of the fire and he hit my mother with it. And I think that is where my anger started. When he hit my mother I was sitting there, and these boys, they were laughing. And for me, it is not a joke man because it’s my mother. So what I do, I do the same thing – because he hasn’t got a t-shirt on, only a short – his body was naked and so, I did the same thing. I pick up a piece and I start hitting him. And that is where, he built something against me. Every time he had an opportunity to hit me, he do it. And I think that is where everything starts and as I grow up, I grow up with that anger inside of me and every time I get into a fight it coming out worse, tear it apart because I will never stop until something happen.

John marked the start to his feelings of anger when he witnessed his step-father, a gangster, chasing and hitting his mother with a piece of wood. His graphic and detailed portrayal of the violent incident that happened many years ago was something that John could denote as the moment when his protective instinct surfaced. John constructed his mother as the object of his friends’ laughter, followed by his feelings of anger which led to his retaliation against his step-father. He reports that this anger played a significant role in how he responded to fights as a child and adult. For John, and other men with similar experiences, early encounters with violence involved them providing a form of protection that was perceived as necessary, honourable and noble. Later on in life when John found himself in similar situations of having to protect himself or others (as revealed in the interviews), it may have been perceived as righteous to retaliate physically.

Participants in this study talk about frequent encounters with gang violence and criminal activities, and these material conditions cannot be discounted in theorising about self-defence and survival. Violence in the face of perceived threats was a recurring survival narrative by the men in this study, and they explained that manhood was measured by their ability to be agile and to act promptly in the face of perceived threats. However, men’s acts of self-defence may also have become a response to figurative ‘threats’ to their masculinities, not necessarily to their safety. For John – shock, anger and an act of bravery was his response to the violent incident, while for Craig, protecting his mother was not always possible:

Craig: My mother has been in an abusive relationship all her life, right. He [step father] stabbed my mother one day. I think I was, I can’t remember, 11. He

---

4 All names and other personal identifying factors have been changed to protect and respect the anonymity of the participant.
stabbed my mother here and my mother just laid there and I was helpless, I couldn’t do anything. I remember playing in the park and he just came to tell me that he stabbed my mother. And I was helpless and I couldn’t do anything and all you know, all, I can still feel the rage that I had that day and now I can feel it. To think about those stuff now […] I always fought. I always fought back where, where my mom is concerned. I’m, I’ve always been over my mother. Always been, my mommy, my mommy’s boy.

Powerfully, Craig emphasised the “helpless” feeling he had when he was unable to protect his mother, and similarly to John, he also expressed the “rage” he felt towards his step-father. His final few sentences reiterated how he always tried to “fight back” for his mother, which sets a strong contrast to the scenario in which he was unable to help her. Craig’s feelings of helplessness and anger emerge strongly in his personal narrative of being the protector. Some theorists have discussed the hero, as a symbol of masculinity (Wetherell and Edley 1999, Whitehead 2005). In Wetherell and Edley’s (1999) study they found that a group of male students from the United Kingdom positioned themselves as heroic in their narratives. These heroic positions represented key characteristics of what it means to be a man such as being courageous, physically tough and able to stay calm and think clearly under pressure. Whitehead (2005) perceived masculinity as being strongly related to ‘the hero’ position, to the extent that masculinity may be defined as heroism. However, the hero is also dependent upon its adversary, the villain character, with each dependent on the existence of the other (Whitehead 2005).

The way in which the hero and the villain subjectivities merge in men’s adulthood, however, still remains unclear, and possibly reflects the very contradictory, dynamic and fluid nature of subjectivity. Wood (2004, p. 569) found that incarcerated men constructed themselves as protectors of women, and this cultural “code of chivalry” requires men to respect women and take care of them, not abuse them. It may be more likely that this chivalry is afforded to mothers, daughters or even “women in the abstract”, than towards intimate partners (Wood 2004, p. 571). Men in the current study also spoke to the abusive and controlling nature of their protection over their women partners, such as Nathan, who stated that, “The only way I thought I can protect her, is beating her, maybe (she) will listen”. We also noted this in the case of Lloyd’s drawing task, when he wrote: “if you treat your woman right, she will act like how you want her to act”. Lloyd’s statement might imply that he still wants to control his female partner even without the use of violence. In the current study, this position of control is juxtaposed to the “helpless” child who had little control and who is unable to keep his mother safe. Although the men still appeared to subscribe to the chivalrous code of manhood as adults, they continued to identify as ‘protectors’ in order to dominate women partners and women in general:

**Keith:** The beautiful thing in this community is also if you are sincere with yourself, if everybody knows there’s this Rachel, born and bred in Hanover Park, Rachel has been going to school and now she’s at Varsity, so Rachel also becomes that pride, Hanover Park pride. But Rachel mustn’t be doing, but Rachel mustn’t be doing funny things. But the moment she starts doing funny things, funny things is going to be happening to her. Like for example you maybe going to the Model C\(^5\) schools and all the kind of thing, no, nobody knows, all they see is Rachel going to school and coming back. Now somebody discovers hey, but Rachel is doing crystal meth. Rachel’s got this type of boyfriends. Rachel is going to be caught one night and she is going to be gang-banged for undermining the men in the, because the men in that street alone, was very protective of her without her knowledge even. Very protective of Rachel when she was going to school and coming back at any hour and her friends coming there and the guys on the corner say, “Hey, hey guys, you don’t mess around here. That is our darling”.

---

\(^5\) A form of schooling established nearing the end of apartheid, which, put simply, refers to government schools previously reserved for white children.
As Keith explained, women in Hanover Park who take men’s protection for granted are ‘disciplined’ through being raped by multiple gang members (“gang-banged for undermining the men”). Keith spoke about a woman who is worth protecting as having “good values”. In other words, she should not do “funny things” such as smoke “crystal meth” or have “this types of boyfriends”. Theorists have pointed to the operation of a dualistic understanding of human conduct, suggesting that dichotomies of pure/impure or good/bad are mutually dependent upon one another (Douglas 1970, Billig 1993, Marková 2003). For an unworthy ‘victim’ to exist, there must simultaneously be a worthy victim against which the respectable victim can be measured. It should also be noted that Keith actually began this passage attempting to construct men’s protection over women in a positive light, when he described it as a “beautiful thing in the community”. However, what some of the men construct as ‘protection’ in their adulthood is rather a method of controlling women, and not just any woman, but one that has “good values” and one that might be conceived of as respectable.

South African adolescent girls are forced to face intensive social and moral controls when it comes to their sexuality and sexual practices (Salo 2003). In the impoverished townships of Cape Town, discourses of respectability and ‘purity’ are an avenue through which adolescent femininity is policed (Lindegaard and Henriksen 2009). In showing sexual restraint, the girl’s social safety is assured, allowing her to be received into the network of family and neighbours – an important part of daily living in the townships. Keith’s positioning of Rachel as the adolescent girl who disobeys the men’s expectations of her respectability reiterates Lindegaard and Henriksen’s (2009) argument – that for women, preserving respectability and virginity is key to being respected.

In sum, as adults, the men constructed themselves as having more power and control over situations and their partners, which was set in contrast to the “helpless” child who had little control over keeping their mothers safe. We cannot undermine the men’s tragic and often traumatic childhood experiences. Narratives of childhood hardships highlighted feelings of fear, anger and helplessness, which appeared to stem from their witnessing of violence and their inability to protect their mothers. Although the men still appeared to subscribe to the chivalrous code of manhood as adults, they also appeared to narrate about their domination over women partners. The ‘man as protector’ subjectivity is more pro-social than ‘man as dominator’ (Wood 2004), yet both these positions share the assumption of male superiority. Even men, who suggest they are no longer violent, still appear to subscribe to the social representation of protector because it offers them a certain degree of control over women.

3.2. “Women let men hit them”: Disciplining the masochistic victim

The idea of violence as a patriarchal measure of disciplining women partners has been documented in the literature by feminist scholars (Dobash and Dobash 1979, Bograd 1990, Campbell 1992, Brown and Hendricks 1998). In this study, the men went further to show how violence as a form of discipline was anchored in their childhoods, and how this had repercussions in terms of the violence in their adult intimate relationships. John, for example shared his childhood experience of having witnessed brutal physical violence against women in the name of ‘discipline’, and Craig observed how “men used to lay down the rules”:

John: I see how men start to hit their women, stab them, hit them with anything they got in their hand. You see all that stuff, blood stains, and it’s like, they want to show us how it’s done, who is boss in the house. So all this stuff they say “I’m the man and you’re going to do what I tell you to do”, so I must grow up like that, and what they do...I can do it also. You must fix things when you see. They [the women] mustn’t do that, they mustn’t do that – you must fix it.

Taryn: And you fix it by-
**John**: Violence

**Craig**: Men used to be men. Men used to lay down the rules that was in our house, right. If your man spoke, a woman kept her mouth. I think that was the first form of abuse, right and the way kids, the way that our parents used to handle us, if you done anything wrong, you get a lashing or something. Women was supposed to sit and wait for a man to come home. When he gets home, make food. “Go fetch my shoes, put on the TV”, that’s all, that’s all part and parcel of it you see.

In sum, father figures were reported to have modelled behaviours that positioned women partners as children who needed to be disciplined by an authoritative male figure: the “boss in the house”. Much of the discontent with women was reported to be ‘rectified’ through men’s violence against women. Craig sums it up with his opening sentence – “Men used to be men”, as if the title of ‘man’ naturally implies power and authority. The men’s narratives of their own violence against partners mirrored the same pattern of how women abuse was anchored as a form of discipline by the man. There also appears to be a seamless discussion of witnessing violence during their childhood, and the later perpetration and justification of their own adult violence.

One participant described the way in which this representation is shared by men in powerful institutions, such as, police officials. Keith had caught his wife cheating on him with his friend. After getting drunk and taking drugs at the local shebeen (informal drinking establishment), Keith returned home enraged, and reported having stabbed the people in the house, and having raped his wife. Keith was shocked at the police’s response to his violence:

**Keith**: I said to the police, “I understand you are looking for me”. And to my horror and to my surprise, my sister, these detectives, while they’re listening to what I’m saying, they all sat open mouth and agreed with me and said, “Why didn’t you fucking kill the bitch?” if you’re going to prison, you’re going to get a lesser sentence” and -

**Taryn**: The police?

**Keith**: The police were saying this to me and they didn’t want to arrest me [...] What happened when I (was) at Mitchell’s Plain police station, the cops had me in one room, they said okay, they must keep me now for 48 hours because it’s a serious crime and all that, but I wasn’t in the cell, I was sitting there in their office drinking tea with the officers

**Taryn**: So they handled it quite casually -

**Keith**: It was serious, but in fact the way I could just feel the male ego man, man you know I was justified, in their minds I was justified in what I did.

Keith drew upon a cultural narrative of manhood that demonstrated the power and cultural authority that the “male ego” has in justifying acts of violence against women. He highlighted his shock at being treated so well by police officers despite the magnitude of his crime, which furthermore places those who are considered to be ambassadors of the law into question. Hearn (1998b) similarly found that police officers sometimes pardoned and condoned men’s violence against known women by saying, “I would’ve done the same myself. It was also found that perpetrators interpreted these police responses to be supportive of their violent behaviour (Hearn 1998b). Whether it is police officials who condone men’s abusive treatment of women, or men’s social networks members who reinforce representations of disciplining women – both these outcomes can send messages to perpetrators of violence against women to the effect that they will not be held accountable for their actions. More importantly, the collusion of police officials in offences perpetrated by men might justify and support their acts of violence.

Some men in this study accused women of masochistically desiring men’s domination and discipline, claiming that they “enjoy“ the abuse (Lloyd), which was
similarly noted by Bourdieu (2001) as a way to make women responsible for their own victimisation. Male participants also argued that women, who take no action against abuse, ultimately signal that they accept being abused:

**Donny:** She (has) to stop it in the first time. Before first time she and her boyfriend or her husband had quarrelled, she (has) to stop it, draw the line, but now she don't draw the line. After 10, 12 years, she (wants) to draw the line. Now it’s a big problem.

**Robert:** I think mostly the men is not only to blame for this thing because women let them, let men hit them. Because um, um, I mean you can do something about it, you don’t need to live like that.

Donny and Robert reported that many women in South Africa who do not act against abuse, passively accept it. Donny correspondingly drew upon a narrative of morality to delineate what should be considered a right or wrong response to abuse. Women who do not “stop it, draw the line” the first time abuse occurs, forfeit their chances of ever ending the abuse. Through this moral-driven narrative, which positions the victim as deserving of abuse and the perpetrator as justified in his abuse, the men attempt to construct women as non-valid victims. The woman’s victim identity is deconstructed, and instead she is made to appear as an active agent, able to leave the abusive relationship when she pleases. In investigating the marks that domination imprints on bodies, Bourdieu (2001) argued that there is a tendency to make women responsible for their domination, suggesting that women choose to participate in submissive practices against them, which is linked to the phrase “women are their own worst enemies” (Bourdieu 2001, p. 40). This is indeed symbolic power in the making, verifying that it is not a free act that the female victim remains in a relationship, but rather that it is the impact of power, which plays itself out in the form of expectations that women love, respect and admire their partners.

The structural intersectionality that battered, impoverished women might experience has been examined. Crenshaw (1994) found that, in order to eradicate violence, it was not enough that shelters for abused women only addressed the violence inflicted by the man partner. Intimate partner violence, she argued needs to be confronted according to the matrices of domination that converge in women’s lives. For example, many women of colour are fraught with child care responsibilities, the burdens of poverty, and a lack of job skills. These burdens are largely the result of gender and class oppressions. Crenshaw’s work clarifies that failure to leave an abusive situation cannot simply mean that victims desire abuse. Rather the matrices of domination that they face in seeking help limit the options women have in ending abusive relationships. In addition, there is also recognition that women are at increased risk for severe violence at moments when they attempt to leave abusive relationships (Hydén 1999).

Although some men in this study drew upon discourses of victim-blaming, counter-narratives, that challenged the notions of victim agency, were also present.

Keith shared a contrasting experience that revealed how women’s supposed acceptance of violence can stem from fear:

**Keith:** I was the other day, I was relating to some young girls in our street, they came here from Mountview [High school in Hanover Park] and they came out of school, group of girls and a group of boys were crossing the field there and this girl, again reminded me of this woman that took care of me, it reminded me also of her, because she had the whole conversation, the whole company was, she was relating about the netball game and what happened after the game and the girls were just like hanging onto her tongue here. And this boyfriend, or this guy called...and then I heard this guy shouting to this girl and she looked and one of her friends, “hey this guy is calling us” and she said “finish your story”. And that guy stormed across the road and he ran there and she didn’t look and he like grabbed her around her
neck and he pulled her and now me looking at this, at this girl, you know the eyes, you know, she was saying “Okay, all right”, but I could see the pain and the hurt and the humiliation in her eyes, because you know she was to her group, she was this strong, confident person also. And to be humiliated in front of all of them, but they just laughed and the other one still said a remark, “but you know that’s still nothing, my boyfriend threw me with a brick the other day”. I mean she’s 15, 14 year old.

Keith’s narrative of the ‘masochistic victim’ is dynamic in that it relays the central character, the strong girl, and how this shift in her demeanour occurs once the boyfriend grabs and ‘disciplines’ her in front of her friends. Keith maintained that his empathic response to the above scenario was derived from having known a similar woman to the central character, his caretaker. His caretaker was also popular amongst her friends but often found herself in abusive relationships. Although he does not explicitly say it, he began to unravel the superficiality of constructing victims as masochistically desiring abuse. He described the painful and humiliating feelings that abused women might experience in reality, consequently showing that women’s ‘acceptance’ of violence is not the same as desiring violence.

In sum, the men often referred to social representations that blame victims and accuse women of desiring violence, while at the same time showing recognition that they themselves had been subjected to witnessing and sometimes experiencing violence in their own childhoods. However, their narratives implied that their own violence should be interpreted within broader social conditions that sanction men’s violence. Constructions of the victim as accepting abuse also emerged as a form of justification amongst the men; however, one man participant endeavoured to deconstruct these representations, thereby painting a more complex picture of the pervasiveness of representations that keep women submissive and fearful of male partners. Notions of respectability were also found to inflict constraints upon women’s behaviours, and limited alternative ways of being a woman.

4. Recommendations and conclusions

A complex web of representations emerged when men were asked to convey their stories of violence against women and their thoughts around the way in which violence is made meaningful in their networks and communities. It is clear that the dominant external voices in men’s lives have an impact on the way in which they understand and construct their own violence. As John, one of the participants, said: “The house where you stay, the people in the house and the people around you – everyone, they play a role in everyone’s life.” However, some of the participants used various strategies to dissociate from representations that permit violence against women. By drawing upon broader social and cultural narratives, the men created the perception that responsibility for these beliefs should be shared across social groups, which served the function of displacing individual responsibility for their perpetration of violence against women.

The complex and multifaceted nature of subjectivity was foregrounded in men’s representations of the protector and dominator. We argued that in the context of these contradictions, men expressed positions of both power and powerlessness. These discursive practices worked simultaneously to reproduce norms of masculine and feminine respectability that keep women subordinated, and represent women as either in need of protection or as objects of abuse and control. The representation that was also firmly drawn upon by men was that of disciplining women and justifying violence perpetration against women as something that she desired or simply, that she did not resist. Women’s experiences of abuse appeared to be more complex than these social representations allowed. The danger of this representation is that it becomes a generalisation that all women who are victims of violence, somewhat desire or are accepting of the abuse. Consequently, this hegemonic story of victim-blaming results in women who experienced abuse at the hands of their partners being constructed as the ‘other’; the ‘outsider’ who is
judged by the in-group, the non-abused or the ‘respectable’ community members. As Gopal and Chetty’s (2006) argued, cultural beliefs that normalise patriarchy make it challenging for community members to seriously recognise the scourge of violence against women resulting in mistaken beliefs that victims are responsible for their own victimisation (Bendall 2010).

The treatment of women in a subservient manner and beliefs about men as ‘disciplinarians’ of women is not only practiced at the community level but also in powerful patriarchal institutions such as the criminal justice system. Previous South African research has recorded the ineffectiveness with which the criminal justice system has dealt with cases of domestic violence (Mathews and Abrahams 2001, Gopal and Chetty 2006), finding that women who had reported acts of domestic violence, experienced hostility from police officers as well as accusations that the women provoked the men and were lying about the violence. Police were also reported to be uncooperative and sometimes arrived hours or days after being called to the scene (Mathews and Abrahams 2001). Scholars, such as Crenshaw (1994, p. 7) and Rich and Grey (2005), have even gone as far as to say that the avoidance of public or police intervention may be a “community ethic”, influenced by the need to steer clear of onsloughts and attacks on the racially subordinated people of the community. Findings in this study demonstrate the tensions that exist between the way in which the law is documented in theory and the way in which it is practiced. Although South Africa’s Constitution might be considered world-class, it has little meaning if law enforcement, for example, does not share the purpose and equally enshrine the rights of women in practice.

It is crucial to pay attention not only to the violence men perpetrated but also to the structural ‘violences’ and childhood adversities that men may have endured. The findings contribute towards research that highlights intergenerational abuse as a risk factor for men’s perpetration of violence. The findings also feed into psychological, psychoanalytic, and psychosocial criminological perspectives that speak to the effects of childhood traumas, and the way in which psychosocial issues might find expression through violence (Siegel 2006, Gadd and Jefferson 2007, Mathews et al. 2011, Siegel and Forero 2012, Mathews et al. 2013, Mathews et al. 2015). Although South Africa has legislation and policy frameworks in place for the implementation of prevention and early intervention programmes for children who encounter and witness violence, child abuse is mainly addressed through a medico-legal perspective. Therapeutic responses that attend to the psychosocial and emotional needs of children – and their families – are, however, disregarded (Mathews et al. 2013, Proudlock et al. 2014). Furthermore, scarce resources and a dearth of skills at health facilities contribute towards ineffective treatment deliveries for abused children in South Africa (Mathews et al. 2012).

Mathews and colleagues (2012) thus advocated for a state-supported, multi-sectoral response, which is based upon successful models of care in order to achieve long-term recovery for survivors. Furthermore, bolstering family support and parent-child relationships might have a strong impact upon preventing child abuse, and might assist with reducing long-term psychosocial consequences (Mathews et al. 2013, Proudlock et al. 2014). Our findings support Mathews and colleagues (2012) practical recommendations for violence prevention, and argue for the need to form prevention and early intervention programmes that aid in tackling problematic masculinity practices, which involve control over women and children, as well as the social norms that render women and girls compliant and vulnerable to men. It might also be useful to direct such prevention programmes at parents, assisting them in re-thinking patriarchal practices that might produce violent masculinities.

Lastly, community interventions for interpersonal violence need to be customized to counter the negative social representations of violence against women that may be circulating in communities. Further detailed research into such community norms
are required. In Gopal and Chetty’s (2006, p. 130) words: “The status of women provides fertile ground for discrimination by various institutions in the country”, and consequently, addressing this discrimination of women in all spheres is a pressing concern.
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