

“Not all men are like that”: Young South African Men’s Talk Following a Gender Studies  
Course

Joshua Rubenstein (RBNJOS007)

Department of Psychology

University of Cape Town

Supervisor: Taryn van Niekerk

Word Count:

Abstract: [254]

Main Body: [9996]

## PLAGIARISM DECLARATION

### PLAGIARISM

**This means that you present substantial portions or elements of another's work, ideas or data as your own, even if the original author is cited occasionally. A signed photocopy or other copy of the Declaration below must accompany every piece of work that you hand in.**

### DECLARATION

1. I know that Plagiarism is wrong. Plagiarism is to use another's work and pretend that it is one's own.
2. I have used the American Psychological Association formatting for citation and referencing. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this essay/report/project from the work or works, of other people has been attributed, cited and referenced.
3. This essay/report/project is my own work.
4. I have not allowed, and will not allow anyone to copy my work with the intention of passing it off as his or her own work.

**NAME: Joshua Rubenstein**

**SIGNATURE: .....**

**STUDENT NUMBER: RBNJOS007**

**SUPERVISOR: Taryn van Niekerk**

**PSY4000W: Research Project**

### **Acknowledgements**

I would like to express my gratitude to the following people:

To the gender studies students who participated in my research.

To my supervisor, Dr. Taryn van Niekerk, for your insight, support and guidance throughout the research process. Thank you for everything.

To Lance Louskieter and Daniel Goldstone for comments on earlier drafts of this manuscript.

To Daniel Goldstone and Aaron Jacobs for assistance in editing this manuscript.

To my parents for their continued emotional and financial support.

### Abstract

In South Africa cisgender heterosexual men and masculinities are implicated in a number of gendered, social and political issues. Literature largely from the Global North suggests that gender studies courses can act as pro-feminist interventions for cisgender heterosexual men and masculinities – if resistance is overcome. The current study examined how heterosexual South African men talked about their experiences of participating in a first year introduction to gender studies course and the examined implications of their discursive practices for such pro-feminist courses. Semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted with ten undergraduate students who had recently completed Introduction to Gender Studies at the University of Cape Town. Analysis suggested that the problematizing of men and masculinities in the course resulted in participants drawing upon *Discourses of 'the Other,'* a discourse of *Heterosexual Men and Shame* and a *Discourse of Changing Masculinity* in constructing their subjectivities. Shame appeared to be a primary motivation in participants' attempts to resist the course's pro-feminist content. Participants' primary modes of resistance involved portraying gender studies as a space for a variously constructed 'other', efforts to silence this 'other' and/or distancing themselves from this shame through various strategies. Working through shame is argued to be an important process by which participants (re)negotiated their subjectivity through drawing on a *Discourse of Changing Masculinity*. Insight into the role of shame in masculine identity negotiation may inform more effective utilisation of gender studies courses as pro-feminist interventions. Personal reflection and awareness of common modes of men's resistance to feminism are foregrounded as implications for pro-feminist pedagogy.

*Keywords:* feminism; gender studies; heterosexual men; masculinity; pro-feminist intervention; resistance; shame

### **Introduction**

In South Africa, cisgender<sup>1</sup> men and masculinities are implicated in a number of social problems. South Africa has some of the highest rates of sexual and gender-based violence in the world - overwhelmingly perpetrated by men against women (Dartnall & Jewkes, 2013; Jewkes, Sikweyiya, Morrell, & Dunkle, 2010). Men in South Africa, specifically young men, are significantly more likely than women to be both victims and perpetrators of violent crimes or homicide (Donson, 2008). Furthermore, gender-based violence is inextricably intertwined with the epidemic of HIV/AIDS in the country (Dunkle et al., 2004; Jewkes & Morrell, 2010).

Universities in South Africa are reportedly sites where gender issues such as rape and gender-based violence manifest (Shefer, Clowes, & Vergnani, 2012; Shefer & Foster, 2009). Critical, pro-feminist work on men and masculinities highlights the need for interventions that work *with* men in an explicitly political, emancipatory way towards healthier masculine identities and gender equality (Hearn, 2007; Shefer, Ratele, Strebel, Tshabalala, & Buikema, 2007). International research suggests that men's participation in gender studies courses may provide opportunity for change (Schmitz, Richardson, & Kazyak, 2015).

### **Men, Masculinities and Violence in South Africa**

High rates of interpersonal and gender-based violence against women continue to pervade present day South Africa, perpetuated by the country's complex history of inequality, racism and violence (Gopal & Chetty, 2006; Jewkes & Morrell, 2010). Much research suggests that harmful masculinity beliefs and practices play a key role in these problems (Abrahams, Jewkes, Laubscher, & Hoffman, 2006; Jewkes & Morrell, 2010; Jewkes, Sikweyiya, Morrell, & Dunkle, 2011). For instance, Jewkes et al. (2011) found that rape perpetration by South African men was associated with less equitable views of gender roles, higher numbers of sexual partners, intimate partner violence and transactional sex. Similarly, Abrahams and colleagues (2006) found that men's likelihood of committing intimate partner violence against women was strongly influenced by beliefs in men's superiority, entitlement to sex and the acceptability of violence as a tool for discipline. Several authors have argued that such issues should be addressed through challenging hegemonic notions of masculinity (Gqola, 2007a; Hearn, 2007; Jewkes & Morrell, 2010).

'Hegemonic masculinity' is used broadly to refer to the dominant form of masculinity in a system of socially constructed, historically and contextually contingent masculinities,

which interact with other gendered practices to legitimate heteropatriarchy<sup>2</sup> (Connell, 1987, 1995; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005).

Gender issues apparent at South African universities are similar to those in the country more broadly. These include rape, sexual coercion, sexual harassment, gender-based violence and transactional sex (Clowes, Shefer, Fouten, Vergnani, & Jacobs, 2009; Dastile, 2008; Shefer et al., 2012; Shefer & Foster, 2009). Masculinities are foregrounded as a key factor in these problems, but there is very little research into masculinities in university settings (Shefer et al., 2012). Further, given the current calls for transformation in South African universities, gender transformation is one such issue that requires attention on the political agenda (Cornell, Ratele, & Kessi, 2016). There is a need for research into interventions with men and masculinities in this context.

### **Interventions with Men and Masculinities**

Ratele (2016) argues that while generating much interest and knowledge, critical research on men and masculinities in South Africa has had little discernible effect on gender-equality. Among other things, he points to the need for more “empathetic”, “personalised” (p. 37) feminist interventions with men (Ratele, 2016). He suggests that although learning about liberal ideas of gender (i.e. through pro-feminist approaches) may be constructive, profound psychological change only arrives when one “returns to face the patterns of behaviour, emotions and thought generated by the lack and pain in their own childhood” (Ratele, 2016, p. 37). This reasoning implies that a purely intellectual intervention may be much less impactful than a personalised psychological one.

The Khanyisa programme and the One Man Can initiative might be classified as ‘empathetic’ and ‘personalised’ interventions in the South African setting. Both worked with men and boys in vulnerable communities, challenging harmful gender norms and practices through group discussion (Van den Berg et al., 2013; York, 2014). These interventions appear to have yielded many positive outcomes; however they have also encountered much resistance (Van den Berg et al., 2013; York, 2014). Men often resisted the reformed views of masculinities and gender roles that were suggested in these programmes, and rates of such resistance were higher amongst younger men (Peacock, 2013; Van den Berg et al., 2013). Such resistance can be conceptualised as both psychological (wherein men resist challenges to masculinities as an ego-defense) and social (to prevent potential loss of material power and privilege) (Connell, 2003; Freud, 1958/2001; Ratele, 2015).

Such resistance is ubiquitous in international research with men in gender studies courses (often termed 'women's studies') (Guckenheimer & Schmidt, 2013; Pleasants, 2011; Wantland, 2005). Using discourse analysis of in-depth interviews with eight men who had completed gender studies courses at the University of Carolina, Pleasants (2011) identified the discourses of personal guilt, appeals to progress (i.e. gender relations are 'equal now'), inevitability (wherein gender inequality was unavoidable) and appeals to masculine authority (i.e. feminist ideas as 'illogical' and their own views as authoritative) as ways men resisted feminist challenges to the heteropatriarchal order (Pleasants, 2011). Moreover, this resistance may often be unconscious, "enacted despite [men's] stated openness and interest in learning feminism" (Pleasants, 2011, p. 248). It is commonly reported that men perceive feminism negatively and view gender studies courses as sites of 'male-bashing' (Pence, 1992; Wantland, 2005). This may in part explain the remarkably low uptake of men into gender studies courses (Case, 2007; Stake & Rose, 1994).

Men who do participate in gender studies courses may experience positive outcomes should their resistance be overcome. Research suggests that such men more actively challenge hegemonic masculinity in their own lives, as well as their male privilege (Miner, 1994; Schmitz et al., 2015). One proposed mechanism for this change involves challenges to the performance of hegemonic masculinity in the classroom, especially through performances of alternative masculinities (Guckenheimer & Schmidt, 2013; Wantland, 2005). Wantland (2005) evaluated an all-male feminist anti-rape course with men in fraternities, and found that participants confronted and deconstructed their complicity in rape culture as well as those of their peers. Furthermore, Miner (1994) reported that because of the very small number of men in such courses, men experienced feeling less valued, "left out," and "on the margins" (p. 457) – which helped them understand the perspective of women and people of colour. Other findings from this literature show how men experience greater awareness of gender inequalities, improve their relations with women and are more likely to become involved in social justice and feminist work (Miner, 1994; Schmitz et al., 2015).

The above international studies offer important insight into men's experiences of participating in gender studies courses, although much of this research was conducted in the mid-90s and early 2000s. As gendered dynamics are constantly shifting, there is a need for more current, context-specific research on these topics. Further, the majority of research on men in gender studies courses has been carried out in North America or Europe and therefore fails to capture the experiences of those in the Global South. For example, Halevi and

Blumen (2005) found that in an Israeli context, men were quiet and passive, whilst classroom practices of resistance were entirely absent. The authors point to the need to understand class dynamics through an intersection of social factors, which may be very different from the Western stereotype (Halevi & Blumen, 2005).

Clowes (2013, 2015) has researched masculinities and gender studies in the South African context. She argues that teaching for pro-feminist change is complicated by popular understandings that feminism is Western, 'unAfrican' and particularly, anti-African men (Clowes, 2015). There also remain ideas that gender equality is a 'women's issue' and not a problem for men (Clowes, 2015). Moreover, there is very little acknowledgement that normative performances of masculinity can be psychologically harmful to men (Clowes, 2013). Clowes (2015) suggests that the very low uptake of men in gender studies in Western Cape universities, including the University of Cape Town (UCT), is informed by such ideas. She contends that introducing students to perspectives that challenge normative and essentialised understandings of masculinity present the possibility of change (Clowes, 2015).

In summary, many gendered social issues, including gender-based violence, crime, and HIV/AIDS continue to plague South Africa. These problems also manifest at South African universities, and although some descriptive work has been done in this setting, there is a need for research into interventions specifically. Working with young men represents a possible channel through which to address these issues. International research with men in gender studies courses suggests that engagement with feminism can yield positive outcomes - if resistance is overcome. However much of this research is out-dated, and is largely from the Global North. It would therefore be an important contribution to South African scholarship on men, masculinities and pro-feminist interventions to gain a deeper understanding of how men talk about their experiences of participation in university gender courses and the broader impact thereof.

### **Aims and Objectives**

This research aimed to explore how young, cisgender, heterosexual men talk about their participation in a first-year gender studies course at UCT. It planned to examine how male students' construct their experiences of the course, and how they draw upon discourses of masculinity and change. Further, given that the content of the course could arguably be viewed as posing a significant challenge to systems of heterosexual male privilege, it was



hoped that the current study would provide insight into interventions that challenge such systems and the dynamics thereof.

**Main research question:**

How do young, heterosexual, cisgender, male students talk about their experiences of participating in a first year gender studies course at UCT?

**Sub-Questions:**

- What meaning do male students make of their participation in the course?
- What discourses of masculinity and constructions of change do male students draw upon when talking about their experiences of the course?
- What are the implications of these discourses for this gender studies course as a pro-feminist intervention?

**Theoretical Framework**

The current study employs feminist poststructuralism as a theoretical framework. This approach rejects the possibility of absolute truth and objectivity, and views knowledge as socially constructed in relation to the social and material world (Gavey, 1989). Knowledge is never neutral as “[t]hose who have the power to regulate what counts as truth are able to maintain their access to material advantages and power” (Gavey, 1989, p. 462). Although it maintains emphasis on material bases of power and gender inequalities, feminist poststructuralism departs from earlier feminist approaches through the rejection of gendered essentialism and not taking experience to have inherent meaning (Gavey, 1989; Weedon, 1987). Rather, the ways in which individuals make meaning and constitute their subjectivities (sense of self) are multiple, transient, unstable and discursively constructed through language (Gavey, 1989).

Language is organised into discourses – “system[s] of statements which cohere around common meanings and values [that] are a product of social factors, of powers and practices” (Hollway, 1983, p. 231). Consequently, discourse provides the means through which power relations are established and material power exercised (Gavey, 1989). There are always multiple discourses that provide competing and possibly contradictory meanings (Gavey, 1989). Discourses offer various subject positions for individuals to adopt (Weedon, 1987). Moreover, feminist poststructuralism provides a framework for understanding how

social categories and identities are constructed through discursive processes of inclusion and exclusion, for example how masculinities are constructed relative to the binary other (i.e. femininities) (Søndergaard, 2002). Accordingly, feminist poststructuralism aims to embrace complexity and contradiction whilst offering critical insight into oppression, resistance and the workings of gendered power (Gavey, 1989).

In alignment with the post-structuralist approach, the current study conceptualises masculinities in their plural form (Aboim, 2010). This approach views masculinities as intrinsically plural: internally hybrid and always formed through tension and contradiction (Aboim, 2010). Men and masculinities are increasingly defined through myriad material positions and cultural references, and as such there are multiple ways of 'doing' masculinity – a set of discursive repertoires which are constantly growing, shifting and evolving (Aboim, 2010). Aboim (2010) argues that in such mercurial systems of masculinities, the idea of a single hegemonic masculinity has little practical utility as it often cannot be differentiated from other forms; although it does have heuristic value.

Shame and its complementary emotion, pride, play an important role in identity constructions and social interactions (Scheff, 2003a). Particularly, it has been argued that shame is performative through the ways in which it manages individual and group boundaries (Ahmed, 2004). In the present context, it is useful to think of shame as an emotional response to becoming aware of one's 'internalised domination' generated through heterosexual male privilege in heteropatriarchy (Pease, 2014). Pheterson (1986) defined internalised domination as "the incorporation and acceptance by individuals within a dominant group of prejudices against others," (p. 20) and it explains in part how privileged individuals may perpetuate oppressions without thinking of themselves as oppressive.

## **Method**

### **Research Design**

The current study employed a qualitative-based discursive approach as the research design. Part of the 'turn to text' in psychology, discursive approaches represent a key critical method by which to study the social processes that maintain systems of oppression (Burman & Parker, 1993). Psychological and social phenomena are seen to have both an individual and collective reality that is structured, understood, produced and reproduced through language (Burman & Parker, 1993). Language, therefore, does not simply describe reality, but shapes our very understanding of it, and consequently our practices (Burman & Parker, 1993).

Critical analysis of discourse allows for understanding and commentary on socio-political processes and can inform and support movements for change (Burman & Parker, 1993).

### **Sampling**

A combination of purposive and snowball sampling strategies were employed (Wilson & Maclean, 2011a). Cisgender, heterosexual men who completed the course in question – *AXL1100S: Introduction to Gender Studies (IGS)* – in 2014, 2015 or 2016 were eligible for participation. Given the study's specific interest in young men, the sample was limited to men between the ages of 18 and 25 years. Further inclusion criteria included having passed the course (as this suggests some degree of engagement with the subject matter) and being a South African citizen – given the interest in masculinities from a Global South setting. Following initial difficulty with recruiting participants, a draw for a R300 shopping voucher was added as an incentive for participation.

The course content of IGS focused on the concepts of “sex”, ‘gender’, and ‘sexuality’ as a way of understanding how these organise and maintain power relations within societies”, (Africa, 2016, p. 1) and exploring the intersection between these and other social systems (e.g. ‘race’, class, religion and ability) (Africa, 2016). A third of the course was centered on the study of masculinities and femininities (Africa, 2016). Other themes of the course included intersexuality, sport and gender, heteronormativity and intersectionality (Africa, 2016). In 2014, 2015 and 2016, 363, 518 and 578 students participated in IGS respectively. Notably, around a third of the course content was not covered in 2016 due to protests at UCT.

In total 10 participants (n=10) were recruited: six from 2016, three from 2015 and one from 2014 editions of the course. Five identified themselves as ‘black’, three as ‘coloured’<sup>3</sup> and two as ‘white’. Participants’ ages ranged between 19 and 25, with a median of 21.5.

### **Data Collection Tool and Procedure**

The current study utilised semi-structured interviews to collect data. Semi-structured interviews are the most widely used data collection method in qualitative research in psychology, as they allow for many different forms of analysis (Willig, 2008).

The database of students’ emails was accessed through the UCT Gender Studies Department, and students were invited to participate via e-mail. This email briefly outlined the aim of the proposed research and the eligibility criteria (see Appendix A). Interviews took

place at mutually agreed upon times in a private room in the UCT Psychology Department. The consent form (see Appendix B) was read through with the student and all aspects were explained and questions were answered. After consenting to participate students were given a demographic information form to complete (see Appendix C) and thereafter the interview commenced. A non-directive interviewing style was employed (Willig, 2008). Participants were encouraged to speak freely and openly, and were told that the researcher was interested in their experiences, views and opinions and that there were no 'correct' or 'incorrect' answers (Willig, 2008). A semi-structured interview schedule - a small number of open ended questions covering key areas of interest – was utilised (see Appendix D) (Willig, 2008). Following completion of the interview, participants were debriefed (see Appendix E).

### **Data Analysis**

Following from the theoretical framework and aims of the proposed study, thematic discourse analysis was utilised. Thematic discourse analysis represents a slightly more focused version of the approach broadly defined as thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thematic discourse analysis is not affixed to a particular theoretical framework, but fits well with a post-structuralist epistemology (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Patterns within a discourse are identified, and the underlying assumptions, social ideas and ideologies interrogated (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Specifically, the aim is to identify social discourses and subject positions available at a given time, placing emphasis on how individuals draw on such discourses in constituting their subjectivities, and how these practices reproduce or challenge existing gender relations (Gavey, 1989). Themes are not simply 'discovered' during analysis; rather the researcher plays a very active role, identifying, interpreting and reporting patterns and themes and shaping the findings (Taylor & Ussher, 2001).

Thematic discourse analysis was conducted following Braun and Clarke's (2006) broad guidelines for thematic analysis. This six-step process involves: (1) familiarising oneself with the data through transcription and repeated readings; (2) generating initial codes identifying features of interest; (3) searching for broader themes; (4) reviewing these themes; (5) defining and naming key themes and (6) producing the final report (Braun & Clarke, 2006). These steps do not specify a linear procedure - rather they are guidelines for a recursive process, where the researcher moves back and forth between phases as necessary (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Discourses themselves were identified during steps three and four above and analysed using the two-step procedure defined by Potter and Wetherell (1987).

This comprised of: (a) searching for patterns in the data, which include both differences and consistencies in either content or form of accounts, and (b) reflecting on the function and consequences of these features, “forming hypotheses about these functions and effects and searching for linguistic evidence” (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 168).

### **Ethical Considerations**

Key ethical considerations for the current study are discussed below following the guidelines of Wilson and Maclean (2011b).

#### **Harm to Participants**

It is unlikely that participants were harmed during the process of the study. Given the personal nature of the research topic, participants may have experienced some discomfort or distress. After each interview participants were debriefed, asked to reflect on the interview process and given an opportunity to add anything more. They were also given details of counselling and student wellness services.

#### **Privacy and Confidentiality**

The nature of semi-structured interviews gives participants a large degree of control over information they choose to share. Interviews were conducted in a private room in the UCT Psychology Department. Participants are identified by a pseudonym of their choice in all transcriptions and research reports and all personal identifying information was removed. Transcripts and recordings were encrypted and kept in a secure location. Only the primary researcher (J.R.) had access to identifying information at any stage.

#### **Informed Consent**

In the informed consent form participants were provided with all the necessary research information to make an informed decision, as well as acknowledgement that they may withdraw from the study at any point without negative consequences. Furthermore, the researcher went through the consent form with each participant and asked if they had any questions or concerns before proceeding.

#### **Debriefing**

Immediately following the interview, participants were debriefed. They were asked to reflect on the interview process and any way in which they may have found it distressing. Contingencies were managed by the researcher and details of counselling services were provided. The findings will be shared with the staff of the UCT Gender Studies department.

### **Reflexivity**

Reflexivity is crucial in qualitative research and involves an evaluation of the researcher's contributions and co-construction of knowledge and meaning at every step of the research process (Willig, 2008). Face-to-face interviews are interactions constructed between two individuals and are embedded in social situations and contexts, making power relations crucially important (Parker, 2005). Feminist approaches to interviewing emphasise how power is produced and reproduced during the interview process, and in the case of men interviewing men, behaviour and talk tends to be shaped by assumptions around gender norms (Parker, 2005). My own identity as a white, cisgender, heterosexual man – positioned in groups privileged in heteropatriarchy – has important implications for the data constructed. Much research demonstrates masculinity as something that is performed, and thus, my own masculine identity may have encouraged participants to put on an emphasised performance of masculinity (Schwalbe & Wolkomir, 2001). Conversely, my identity may have facilitated the building of rapport as men may feel safer speaking to someone of a gender in-group. I have not completed the course in question.

### **Limitations of the Study**

There are several limitations to the study. By the time the interviews were conducted, between eight months and three years had passed since participants completed IGS, and their experiences of the course may have been difficult to remember or mitigated by intervening events. Participants' experiences and consequently their constructions of IGS may have differed depending on the year they took the course. Furthermore, this study cannot be considered a comprehensive account of men's talk of IGS as the relatively small sample size may limit the range of discourses employed.

### **Analysis and Discussion**

This study aimed to examine how cisgender heterosexual men talk about their experiences of participating in a first year IGS course. The analysis suggests that participants

draw on *Discourses of 'the Other,'* a discourse of *Heterosexual Men and Shame* and a *Discourse of Changing Masculinity* in constructing their subjectivities following IGS. These discursive strategies were mutually inclusive and functioned to various ends in participants' and more broadly men's interests, primarily around escaping shame, silencing the 'other' and re-centering men in IGS.

### **Discourses of 'the Other'**

Participants were found to provide various constructions of the 'other' through their talk about the course. Firstly, participants were found to position men in IGS as '*the enemy*' and to exclude them as 'the other'. Secondly – and in contrast – the men constructed some women classmates as '*Angry Feminists*', thereby othering women who 'de-centred' the heteropatriarchal norm. The male participants responded to their de-centering in a number of ways: by portraying themselves as victims of unfair attack, by attempting to silence the 'other', and through *Declarations of Progressiveness* – by positioning themselves as 'progressive,' often relative to a conservative, 'backward' 'other' man. The following discourses are explored further below, relative to men's talk about 'othering': *Heterosexual Men/Masculinities as "the enemy"*, '*Angry Feminists*' and *Declarations of Progressiveness*.

#### **Heterosexual men/masculinities as "the enemy".**

Participants' generally constructed men as portrayed in IGS as 'bad'. These constructions were deployed to position men as victims, while playing off the 'other's' (generally constructed as women or feminists) supposed harshness to silence them.

*[L]et's say you get up and I say "my name is [Naba], I identify as a heterosexual male," and suddenly you become the symbol of patriarchy. Whatever thing that you are saying, or you do ...they see as you as sort of an ambassador of patriarchy and so obviously they will come with that mentality of you are representing the enemy [laughs]... and yeah... it comes to that aggression that we spoke about... (Naba)*

The above extract illustrates how Naba constructs himself as unfairly portrayed as an "ambassador of patriarchy" – a representative of "the enemy". Naba thereby positions men as 'victims' who receive undeserved "aggression" from others

regardless of what they say or do. In a more drastic construction, men were said to be represented:

*As evil beings. I feel like [...] we are the oppressors of women, of gays, of lesbians [...] Like I don't remember...seeing a good representation [...] Hence maybe somehow...the reason why like women [laughs] who does gender studies they have this anger [...] they always feel that they need to defend themselves to men...because maybe of what they are given. (Tyla)*

Not only is Tyla positioning men (and himself) as victims of malicious attack, but he goes further in suggesting that the reason why women in the course are supposedly angry is because of these portrayals. This represents an attempt at silencing, whereby the stereotype of women as illogical or irrational is employed to delegitimise their voice (Landrine, 1985). Other participants displayed more ambivalent perspectives, with the course “showing another side to masculinity”/ “non-traditional masculinity” (Jay) or “[men] could be portrayed as much worse” (Bob).

While participants reported heterosexual men as side-lined in IGS, the ‘others’ who were centered were constructed in various ways. Tyla reported that “gender studies is dominated by girls [...] queer bodies and feminists. Like, they made me feel bad about myself.” Naba identified people “who don't recognise this binary of gender ... and people who are lesbians, gays” as those dominating IGS. These ‘others’ were often constructed as against men/masculinity and in some cases out to get them – as in the case of Naba (above), where he highlights how he felt “bad” about himself, which he blamed on these ‘others’. The above discursive strategies drew upon stereotyped notions of feminism as ‘anti-men’ and gender studies courses as sites of ‘male bashing’ (Pence, 1992; Wantland, 2005). Such representations functioned to position men as victims of an ‘overly emotional,’ ‘illogical’ ‘angry feminist’ other (Landrine, 1985).

### **‘Angry feminists’.**

The ‘other’ was most commonly linked to the stereotype of the ‘angry feminist’ (Twenge & Zucker, 1999). Heterosexual men were positioned as victims of ‘angry feminists’ who were often disciplined or silenced by participants. This included constructing ‘angry feminists’ as ‘irrational’ or not doing feminism ‘properly’. Four participants directly identified women or feminists as angry or aggressive.



*... these comrades [feminists] can be very [...] [laughs], not violent in the sense that [they] will hit you, but they can use a sort of language, that I find, its condescending you know ...it's very aggressive and, I dunno... some people don't respond very well to aggression. (Naba)*

Naba constructs the language feminists' use as "violent", aggressive and condescending. Moreover, his last comment implies that because some people do not respond well to this "aggression", 'feminists' are responsible for moderating it. This represents an attempt at silencing women whereby this 'aggression' should be expressed in a way that is more acceptable to him.

Six participants took a more oblique angle on the sub-discourse of 'angry feminists', portraying the debates that occurred in class as "heated" (Hess), "angry" (Bob) and "very hectic" (Tyla). These portrayals often drew on similar discursive resources to constructions of individuals as angry/aggressive. Again there were subtle attempts at silencing – for instance Bob recommended that people needed to "keep the debates more civil" and that it should not involve "attacking the person" but rather the "actual issue."

Four participants expressed disagreement in the ways they saw feminism operating in IGS and at UCT more generally. This often took the form of portraying the readings of the course ('written feminism') as "factual", objective and "academic", as opposed to the "personal" (Daniel) accounts of women. This functioned to silence and other the 'angry feminist'. In one articulation:

*[T]he feminism that I'm seeing in [the] real world, I'm totally against it because it's disrespecting [...] it's putting the life of girls in danger [...] because there are some guys who become furious fast in a way, like you cannot disrespect me and say it straight to my face like you won't apologize [...] Hence I feel like the feminism I'm seeing is very dangerous, to women, to men, to all of us... It does not fix things, but it only cause[s] harm [...]. The feminism that is written down by feminist scholars, it's so beautiful in the way that it tries... to dig down, deep down, for us to understand how women have been oppressed, how gays have been oppressed, queer bodies, lesbians like all... I feel like it's liberating, but the one I'm seeing, it's disrespectful and I think it's the reason why many guys are totally against feminism. (Tyla)*

In the above extract, Tyla describes written feminism as "so beautiful" and "liberating", yet he simultaneously proclaims that he's "totally against" the feminism he is

witnessing. He constructs enacted feminism as “disrespecting [men]” and “putting the life of girls in danger”. His argument appears to be that enacted feminism is disrespectful to men, who “become furious fast.” This contradictory statement constructs women as ignorant and irrational and needing to be ‘respectful’ of men who supposedly cannot control their own anger (Hollway, 1984; Landrine, 1985). Moreover, he declares that enacted feminism does not fix things and only causes harm, and ironically places the blame for men being against feminism on the way women are doing feminism (as opposed to men’s resistance to feminism challenging male privilege), positioning men as the victims of this ‘mistake’. The implication therefore may be that women should do feminism in ways that are more ‘rational’, ‘objective’ and stereotypically masculine – tying into ideas of a male monopoly on reason (Connell, 1995). The above is similar to the discursive strategy of appeals to (masculine) authority identified by Pleasants (2011). Here, men attempt to silence women through contrasting women’s ‘subjective’ ‘emotional’ positions to the ‘unbiased’ and ‘objective’ perspective of men (including themselves) (Pleasants, 2011). Women’s enactments of feminism thus present an easier target to discredit than feminist theory.

Participants’ practices functioned to silence the ‘angry feminist’ other, while at the same time maintaining their positions in favour of gender equality. The feminist axiom of *empowering* women’s voices seems entirely forgotten in the above discursive attempts. Attempting to maintain a perception of their own progressiveness was ever-present in participants’ attempts to silence the ‘others’.

### **Declarations of progressiveness.**

All participants engaged to some degree in *Declarations of Progressiveness*, whereby they made statements intended to portray themselves as progressive and ‘good’. These declarations often occurred near the beginning of the interview, and regularly involved participants juxtaposing themselves against a backward ‘other’ man. It is argued these declarations functioned to re-center men in IGS.

Participants often proclaimed their allegiance to moral principles and opposition to injustice. High praise for the course was also commonplace. Hess stated: “I’m not for discrimination, and I’m not for the way society is constructed – because of the course – it opened my eyes.” Others asserted: “I’m against patriarchy. I believe in justice, like you should be treated equally” (Tyla) and “it’s hard not to be a feminist” (Adam). Despite such

declarations, they seemed to adhere to different notions of what subscribing to such moral principles actually meant.

Accounts of progressiveness often included testimonies of personal change. Phrases like “eye-opening” (e.g. Naba) and “it was enlightening” (e.g. Thando) were common. One participant confessed that such statements were in part an attempt to be perceived a certain way:

*[F]rom the person I was before to the person I was after - I was definitely more open-minded and open to other opinions and... uum, kind of changed my character as well. [...] It will do the same for a lot of people who are kind of like me before, or who are generally quite ignorant when it comes to issues that are addressed. (Bob)*

Bob draws upon declarations of progressiveness in positioning himself. He juxtaposes himself now (as “open- minded”) against how he was before and how other men – aligned with the heteropatriarchal normative – still are (i.e. “ignorant”). Bob later admitted that he had made deliberate effort to try come across well in the interview, expressing fear of being seen as “one of those people that don’t really care and have a bad attitude toward [gender issues].” Such incongruence between efforts to appear progressive and his serious resistance to feminist ideas highlights the complex and often contradictory ways participants constructed their subjectivity in the interview space.

The participants ‘progressiveness’ was often juxtaposed with the backward views of other ‘non-enlightened’ men. This is illustrated by Tyla who describes a situation where another man showed sexual interest in him:

*... I didn't feel the need to be furious, it felt like, “nah, nah brah,<sup>5</sup> I'm not gay” [...], I didn't feel bad about him, why would he try to approach me? Am I a woman now or some...? Nah, I didn't feel it and I think, thanks to [the] gender course, now I'm cool with it [...], hence I so wish many guys can understand the fact that, if you are not gay you will never be gay, it's fine. If a gay person come and approach you, you're not gay... that's ok, that's not bad [...] Its natural... no hard feelings, you shouldn't beat gay for trying to approach you, it doesn't mean you are not man enough, it's just that the person liked you... and you should respect the fact that they were brave enough to tell you. (Tyla)*

Tyla positions himself as progressive through language such as, “thanks to [the] gender course, now I'm cool with it.” He constructs himself as enlightened relative to other

heteronormative men, stating how he wishes other men would hold his position. Moreover, he constructs 'other' men as insecure, homophobic and violent through stating that other heterosexual men "shouldn't beat gay for trying to approach you, it doesn't mean you are not man enough".

These 'other' men were further described in a number of notable ways: as people who wanted to "create a joke out of the course or something" (Bob), as "pulling faces... and expressing their masculinity" in class (Hess) and as "hyper-masculine" (Jay). When asked to elaborate, Jay defined hyper-masculine men as people who: "don't really care what other people think", tend "to be misogynist", "impose themselves on others", shut others down who disagree with them and ironically, as likely "to 'other' people". What emerges is a construction of the inconsiderate, backward, misogynistic, hyper-masculine 'other man', which is contrasted to those who did the course, and who by implication are excluded from such negative qualities. Thus, participants attempt to regain pride and power through having completed the course, relative to 'other' backward men.

Several participants attempted to convey their progressiveness through expressing their general intentions to educate others. In perhaps the most extreme example, David stated:

*I'm in a position where I enlighten people and educate them, you know.*

*Somebody said: "I might not change the world but at least I can be the mind that sparks... the voice that sparks somebody who's gonna do it." So yeah, I see myself as that person.*

His use of language such as "enlighten" and "educate" allows David to construct himself as progressive and able to provide benevolent assistance to a backward 'other.' Later in the interview he continued, "I wanna teach, I wanna bring light into the world, [...] the people [...] that don't understand, the people that are in darkness" (David). The construction of the enlightened/backward binary continues through the use of symbolic language of "light" versus "darkness." Such discursive creations may serve to subtly re-center heterosexual men in the scheme of gender studies, whereby those 'good men' who have completed the course can go out and 'enlighten' other 'backward' men.

In sum, the varying constructions of the 'other' were employed in different ways: in participants' attempts to position themselves as victims, as 'angry feminists' operating maliciously, as ideas of masculinity to distance themselves from and as a backward man against which to contrast themselves. In such attempts to re-center themselves avoidance of shame was central.

### **Heterosexual Masculinity and Shame**

Participants overwhelmingly drew upon a discourse of shame in constructing their subjectivity following IGS. As noted, participants constructed heterosexual men as de-centered and 'others' such as the 'angry feminist' were positioned as empowered. In addition, participants constructed heterosexual men and more generally, hegemonic masculinities, as implicated in heteropatriarchy and gender injustice. This problematising of male privilege brought about emotional responses of shame amongst the men, who negotiated the emotion in complex ways – through both resistance and 'working through'. A sub-discourse of *discursive attempts of men to escape shame* is also explored.

In positioning themselves relative to a discourse of heterosexual male shame, the participants drew upon language such as 'anxious', 'embarrassed', 'intimidated', 'nervous', 'frightened' and 'afraid'.

*[I]t was quite new to me, and the way the actual course was run – was quite different to what I've experienced with other courses [...] it made me quite anxious to actually partake in it freely, and um, I'd just be quite nervous to speak out in like lectures or like [tutorials] [...]. [In] my first tutorial, the tutor would ask something, and no-one would really answer so I went ahead and tried it and I said something that was like quite problematic, and like she fixed it, but that was quite like embarrassing for me [...] that also made me realise that I needed to be like more careful with things that I say in the course... (Bob)*

The language Bob employs to describe his emotional responses to the course – "anxious", "embarrassing," "nervous" – appear indicative of an underlying sense of shame. He reports saying something in the first tutorial which was problematised by the tutor, which made him feel embarrassed. His response, a view articulated by the majority of participants, was that he had to be "careful" as to what he said in the course. These constructions of shame and fear were reiterated by other participants. IGS was constructed as: "quite intimidating" (Adam) and "frightening at times" (Naba). Shame emerged in similar ways to the *Discourse of Guilt* identified by Pleasants (2011), wherein participants feel guilty for their privileged positions within the heteropatriarchal order. This shame appeared to be a driving force behind many of the efforts participants made to distance themselves from shame and/or to silence the

'other'. Men's minority positions in the course were a further point of anxiety for several participants:

*Like especially because there were so few of us [men], like it was really hard to blend in, but I felt like the moment they said something [...] like the gender pay gap, or... it would almost be like I feel eyes on me... (Daniel)*

Daniel articulates that men were outnumbered and he struggled to blend into the class. When issues were raised that implicated men or masculinities, he felt "eyes on me". This language suggests his discomfort with being made visible as a privileged male subject in an environment of 'others'. Further, his construction of an 'us' and 'them' binary acts to position all men, including himself, as passive subjects under this problematizing gaze.

Literature on shame suggests that it is an emotional response that often occurs when individuals first become aware of their privilege (Pease, 2014). In this case, participants' male privilege and patriarchy are challenged in IGS which seems the likely context for a response of shame. Pease (2014) noted that challenging male privilege is likely to result in a powerful emotional response in men, as their own investments in heteropatriarchy are indicated. Scheff (2003a, 2003b) proposed four individual responses to shame in social interactions: (1) hiding or avoidance, (2) self-depreciation, (3) leaving the interaction and (4) identifying oneself as inferior or morally deficient. Individuals may have difficulty articulating these feelings, and the suppression of shame may lead to attacking those perceived as shaming these individuals (Gottzén, 2016).

All participants constructed themselves as avoiding confrontation. Four participants reported not talking much in lectures, while the other six reported not talking at all. Sitting near the middle or back of the lecture theatre were also common tactics.

*I think [the class] was very – like everyone engaged, a lot... um... personally I'd just go to lectures get my stuff done and like bolt [laughs][...]. I feel like the further back you [sit], the more you're not as involved – but still there.*

(Adam)

Adam describes how sitting near to the back of the class enabled him to not be involved and seen, constructing this as an easy position from which to "bolt". Participants' avoidance behaviour may represent an attempt to distance or dissociate themselves from contexts of shaming, or to avoid being problematised by 'others'.

Although participants generally utilised a strategy of avoidance, in a couple of cases what appears to be admiration was shown towards other men who did speak out. Specifically, this admiration appeared to be to these other men's performances of shamelessness.

*[A] male spoke out and [...] he just said, "this Bruce Jenner person..." or something like that, and like everyone attacked him, and he didn't really mind, [...] cause he was kind of a confident person, and he was just enjoying himself like interacting in the class, but people really got offended and were having a go at him and yeah... and that kind of made me angr – [stops] – like after that I didn't really think about interacting in the class at all. (Bob)*

Bob constructs the male student as admirable through the language that he uses to describe him (i.e. "confident", "just enjoying himself") and perhaps even enviable through of the lack of shame he expressed. He stopped himself halfway through saying the word angry in discussing how this male student was 'attacked'. Later in the interview it was revealed that this other student was insinuating that transgender people were mentally ill because of higher suicide rates in this group<sup>6</sup>. Bob went on to enthusiastically disagree with this position, describing people who held it as "closed-minded". It appears what is admirable for Bob in this case is this other man's courage and *lack of shame*, which could be reflective of Bob's own attempts to avoid shame.

Two participants resisted male de-centering in IGS through some association with, and subsequent rejection of its 'gayness'. The 'gayness' of gender studies was constructed as shameful ground for heterosexual men, in a similar vein to the findings of Miner (1994). In response to a question around how he had engaged further with the ideas of the course:

*Hess: [M]y one friend is first year, and he's doing gender studies this year, and [...]he's kind of one dude who's like embodying the full message of the course, and against... he's against like the heterosexual idea of masculinity and he's like, "It's a construct," like what the course says he's just saying it. [...] I told him: "Dude, if you really believe that it's fine and everything like that, why don't you sleep with a male and come back to me and brag about it the way you would when you sleep with a female?"*

*J.R.: Ok, does he brag about it when he sleeps with a female to you?*

*Hess: All the time! [laughs]*

*J.R.: And what did he say?*

*Hess: It made him stop speaking [laughs]... it made him stop speaking [laughs for a while].*

In this interaction, Hess describes a male friend of his doing IGS at the time of the interview, as “embodying the full message of the course”. Hess challenges him to have sex with a male and brag about it in the same way the friend seemingly brags about his heterosexual encounters. Hess’s laughter signalled his amusement (or even discomfort) with his comment. Earlier in the interview, when asked why he had not studied gender studies further, he stated that “females” and people “who identify as [...] homosexual” are the ones taking the course. These participants appear to be feminising IGS, thereby constructing it as unsuitable ground for heterosexual men. Homophobia is a common aspect of dominant modes of heterosexual masculinity (Pease, 2014). To conform, heterosexual men may attempt to avoid any association with (or even proximity to) homosexuality as this might ‘feminise’ them in the eyes of other men, rendering them ‘unmanly’ and shameful (Halberstam, 2005; Pease, 2014). In this light, Hess is shaming his friend – ‘feminising’ him for departing from tenets of dominant masculinity.

### **Discursive attempts of men to escape shame.**

Participants engaged in a number of discursive practices which acted to silence the ‘other’ and empower themselves. Such talk functioned to delegitimise those who were shaming them and/or remove themselves from the discursive position of being shamed. These attempts were contingent upon context as well as how the ‘other’ was constructed. The silencing of the ‘angry feminist’ was one such example – as noted earlier. Several other modes are discussed.

In response to shaming of men in IGS, two participants drew upon a discourse of ‘*not all men*’, which has been widely documented as a discursive resource for men resisting feminism (Berns, 2001):

*I believe there are a lot of guys [...] who are good people, who are willing to protect women [...] I don't like [the fact that], even the people who are talking about those bad experiences with men... I believe they also have good example[s] of men, whereby they have done good... to themselves, even their men who are special to their lives, maybe their father, maybe their boyfriends, maybe their friends... but they do not dish out that information, they only focus*



*on the bad side of men, and I believe... if you focus on one bad something, it will always be this horrifying, this evil.* (Tyla)

Tyla proposes that women are withholding information of men doing good things, thus resulting in the supposed representation of men as “horrifying” and “evil” – positioning men as victims of this ‘unfairness’. He constructs the position of the ‘good guys’ through stating that many “are good people”, “willing to protect women”. Tyla attempts to avoid this shaming through drawing upon patriarchal notions of women needing men’s protection. Such positioning draws on what Pleasants (2011) identified as a *Discourse of Intentionality*, wherein men’s intentions (i.e. being ‘good’ or ‘protective’) are disconnected from their own actions as well as social structures of heteropatriarchy. Tyla later lamented this situation, reiterating: “I so wish they can understand that *not all men* are like that [emphasis added]”. In a different response to supposed generalisations about men, Aphiwe stated:

*[L]et’s say, if maybe one man rapes and then it would be like ‘these black men [...] who are being controlled by sexual desire [...].’ The blame is masculinities... not the actual perpetrator of the crime, [...] it’s like even those who identify as heterosexual men, those masculinities are being included [...] they don’t understand how can they see other like... maybe people who are wearing short... like dresses that are short, [mumbles] or like revealing, or something like that...*

Aphiwe is expressing anger specifically about colonial constructions of black men as hypersexual and ‘out of control’ which he perceives as being employed in the context of IGS to place blame for rape on black masculinities (Lewis, 2011). However, his response is to insinuate that ‘others’ do not understand other reasons, “like dresses that are short, or like revealing” – implying that by wearing revealing clothing women are (at least partially) to blame for their own rape, reproducing the discourse of *victim-blaming* (Grubb & Turner, 2012). Despite this problematic response, the above extract highlights the importance of an intersectional reading of participants’ experiences of IGS. Aphiwe, who identified himself as a black Xhosa man, constructed himself as experiencing racist constructions of black sexualities during IGS.

When asked for recommendations about how they would improve the course, participants utilised various strategies to re-center men’s experiences and avoid contexts of shame. Several suggested they would want the nature of the debates to change so ‘people’ (presumably men) “would feel more comfortable” (Jay), or have “a kind of freedom [...]

given” to them (Thando). Aphiwe proposed that they make lecture videos available as when “we are discussing a topic about men [...] and you feel like uncomfortable when they... you are getting those looks and then you decide maybe not to come attend.” He is implying that the course should cater for men who feel uncomfortable and ashamed during the lectures when masculinity is under the spotlight. Several other recommendations that did not relate to this attempt at re-centering were also present.

As evidenced, participants went to significant lengths to avoid shame. Strategies included delegitimising the shaming ‘other’, positioning themselves as knowing better than the shaming ‘other’ and attempting to position themselves outside the context of shaming – e.g. as the ‘good guy’. Several authors have argued that while shame can play itself out in unproductive ways in relation to social justice issues, shame is a necessary part of challenging and making visible privilege (Halberstam, 2005; Pease, 2014). Furthermore, the ‘*working through*’ of shame and resistance forms a central aspect of the process of individual change (Halberstam, 2005).

### **A Discourse of Changing Masculinity**

In response to shame and the problematizing of many ideas of masculinity in IGS, participants drew upon a *Discourse of Changing Masculinity* in (re)negotiating their masculinity. Ideas of confusion in relation to masculinity, ‘unlearning,’ broadening definitions of masculinity and acceptance of qualities previously thought improper were foregrounded. A notable exception was one participant who denied personal change was possible. These discourses often drew upon similar resources to *Declarations of Progressiveness*. Participants’ constructions also differed significantly depending on their background, and are read intersectionally.

Several participants described the confusion they felt about their masculinity following IGS. For instance when asked what ‘being a man’ means to him, Naba responded:

*Wow, yoh! That is very deep [laughs] [...]. This is work in progress, I'm still trying to... figure it out, you know. What does manhood exist? [...] I'm Xhosa by ethnicity, so obviously there comes a time where you go to the mountain and those patriarchs there, they tell you, “This is how you behave as a man.” [...] I went there to that thing of mountain before I came to UCT [...] so you have those values that are instilled in you [...] and now I came here to UCT and only to find out that all these things I've been taught, nah it's being*

*challenged here... and now you find yourself in a place of confusion [laughs]... like ok, so if these things that I've been taught that are prerequisites to be a man [...] They... are misinformed, and now what must happen? [...] So that's why I'm saying I'm still trying to figure it out.*

He constructs his experience of *Ulwaluko*<sup>7</sup> and the values instilled during the process. Upon arriving at university he found that the tenets of masculinity he had been taught during *Ulwaluko* were being challenged, and he positioned himself “in a place of confusion”. It is evident how both general constructions of masculinity and particular cultural ideas and values in Naba’s life were being renegotiated in the context of IGS – highlighting the importance of an intersectional understanding of men’s experiences of the course. In a slightly different take, David described his conflict around the pressures and expectations he felt as a man:

*I think it's very complicated because [...] you're an ally of like these type of movements and what-what, but at the same time [...] there's also internal things that you struggle with [...]. I'm younger right now, 22 years old, um and you know what it's like to be in a position... not having money, not being able to provide, so you also understand the anger, and the frustration and the pressure that society puts on males [...] to be this sort of strong masculine figure, that doesn't show emotions, that doesn't cry [...] so yeah, that's why I personally battle with it.*

David had previously identified himself as a black man raised in a “previously disadvantaged [...] background”. He positions himself as an ally of “these type of movements,” (following a discussion of #menaretrash<sup>8</sup>), but also constructs his ideas of masculinity around his internal struggles with being poor and being expected to be a provider. He elucidated upon the pressure society appears to put on males and portrays it as contributing to his own frustration and anger.

The idea of ‘unlearning’ was mentioned by several participants. This was generally linked to a conception of how previous ideas and experiences had become embedded, as Naba illustrates:

*[L]et's say, as a young boy, if [...] you're running, you're falling down. Then you get up, you cry, you know? Those older people say, “Ehh! No man, men don't cry.” [...] [S]o you end up internalising those things, you know? To say whatever pain that I am feeling, me, I'm a man, [I] can never be seen crying, [...] so that's what I mean about that... that socialisation. [...] So there must be an unlearning of some sort that needs to happen.*

In constructing his masculinity, Naba draws upon the widespread notion of masculinity that “men don’t cry”. Such masculine norms have been linked to a variety of emotional problems in psychological research (Vogel, Heimerdinger-Edwards, Hammer, & Hubbard, 2011). Naba constructs such interactions as internalised by him, resulting in him being unable to express emotional pain. He draws upon the idea of “unlearning” in constructing his desire to change.

Several participants constructed IGS as broadening their ideas of masculinity. This often involved retaining some aspects while altering others.

*I saw being a man is not only with the... clothes and going to the mountains, it's about how you come back and then act in society, how you treat people differently, how do you understand your position, how do you understand your privileges and then how do you make sure that [...] your privilege doesn't oppress those who don't identify as men... yet, under the customary law.*

(Aphiwe)

Aphiwe constructs his broadened idea of masculinity after IGS as not just completing *Ulwaluko*, but also including responsible and considerate behaviour in society upon return. This behaviour included treating others better, understanding positionality and privilege and not oppressing “those who don’t identify as men... yet”. He still draws on normative ideas of masculinity linked to *Ulwaluko*, but presents a somewhat more liberal stance.

Following IGS, some participants positioned themselves as accepting aspects of their identity that conflicted with dominant expectations of masculinity. Bob discussed the influence of these normative ideas, and tendencies towards ‘compensation’:

*[I]n terms of sexuality I was kind of – I always thought [...] that I was more feminine than other males – I would just take more into my appearance, and treat people in a different way than people who tried to be a hyper-masculine dude [...], before I would compensate and try to shift that away, but now I've kind of been liberated that I just act freely [...] particularly that way I dress and the way I interact with people.*

Bob acknowledges that masculinity often operates with reference to a normative ideal, and he identified that such comparisons can be unproductive (Connell, 1995). He constructs himself as “liberated” to act freely – primarily with regard to his dress and interactions – as an acknowledgement that compensation is unnecessary. Use of words such as “liberated” may link back to *Declarations of Progressiveness*.

One participant responded to the challenges IGS posed to masculinity through denial that he could change. Hess unequivocally stated his position: “[T]he ideologies of masculinity um, it’s in me [...], I can’t let it go – I’m always gonna be masculine, I’m always gonna portray masculine ideologies, naturally then – I’m not even gonna do it consciously... naturally”. Here masculinity is constructed as an “embedded ideology,” something done unconsciously, “naturally”, something ‘normal’. Hess appeals to essentialist biological notions of masculinity through presenting masculinity as fixed, and opposed to ‘being female’ thereby denying the possibility of change (Connell, 1995).

In sum, participants negotiated confusion and challenges to their masculinity in different ways. Ideas of ‘unlearning’, broadening definitions of masculinity and accepting qualities previously thought improper, as well as *Declarations of Progressiveness* were employed.

### **Recommendations and Conclusions**

This study’s findings show how the problematizing of men and masculinities in IGS resulted in participant’s drawing upon discourses of *The Other*, *Heterosexual Masculinity and Shame* and *Discourses of Changing Masculinity* in constructing their subjectivities. Shame appeared to be a primary motivation in participant’s attempts at resisting feminist ideas. The centrality of the discourse of shame highlights how renegotiating masculinity in the context of gender studies is first and foremost an emotional process. The complex and contradictory ways participants constructed their subjectivities emphasises how they may not be aware of the extent to which their talk functioned to resist feminism. This apparent lack of awareness or reflection upon their own resistance may entrench individuals in positions strongly opposed to feminist goals. The ‘working through’ of shame is thus posed as an important process by which participants (re)negotiated their subjectivity through drawing on a *Discourse of Changing Masculinity* (Halberstam, 2005). The emotional nature of processes of ‘working through’ highlights the need for ‘empathetic’ and ‘personalised’ interventional approaches (Ratele, 2016). The differing constructions of participants’ subjectivities further underline the need for individualised and intersectional pedagogy (Clowes, 2015; Ratele, 2016).

Two practical implications for feminist pedagogy are suggested. First, encouraging heterosexual men to reflect upon their personal experiences of gender studies may help improve their engagement with feminism. This could be done in a less public context where

patience and constructive feedback with resistant men does not undermine the feminist goal of empowerment. Individual tutorial assignments, personal reflective essays or encouraging individuals to keep some sort of diary may be possible options. Second, emphasising conscious awareness of the common ways men resist feminism, particularly in the context of gender studies, may be valuable in encouraging reflection and 'working through'. This could be accomplished through teaching such content in lectures or tutorials and/or prescribing relevant literature as required readings. Future research could explore the effects of such additions on men's constructions of gender studies and their abilities for self-reflection and 'working through' of emotional responses.

In conclusion, this study contributes to understanding how young, heterosexual, cisgender, male students talk about their experiences of participating in a first year gender studies course at UCT. Participants drew on existing discourses of both resistance to feminism and changing masculinities in constructing their subjectivity.

## References

- Aboim, S. (2010). *Plural masculinities: The remaking of the self in private life*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Abrahams, N., Jewkes, R., Laubscher, R., & Hoffman, M. (2006). Intimate partner violence: Prevalence and risk factors for men in Cape Town, South Africa. *Violence and Victims, 21*, 247–264. doi:10.1891/088667006780644271
- Africa, A. (2016). AXL1100S course outline. Retrieved from <https://vula.uct.ac.za>
- Ahmed, S. (2004). *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Berns, N. (2001). Degendering the problem and gendering the blame: Political discourse on women and violence. *Gender & Society, 15*, 262–281. doi:10.1177/089124301015002006
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Burman, E., & Parker, I. (1993). Introduction – Discourse analysis: The turn to text. In E. Burman & I. Parker (Eds.), *Discourse analytic research: Repertoires and readings of texts in action* (pp. 1–13). London, UK: Routledge.
- Case, K. A. (2007). Raising male privilege awareness and reducing sexism: An evaluation of diversity courses. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 426–435. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00391.x
- Clements-Nolle, K., Marx, R., & Katz, M. (2006). Attempted suicide among transgender persons: The influence of gender-based discrimination and victimization. *Journal of Homosexuality, 51*(3), 53–69. doi:10.1300/j082v51n03\_04
- Clowes, L. (2013). The limits of discourse: Masculinity as vulnerability. *Agenda, 27*(1), 12–19. doi:10.1080/10130950.2013.778621
- Clowes, L. (2015). ‘I act this way because why?’ Prior knowledges, teaching for change, imagining new masculinities. *NORMA, 10*, 149–162. doi:10.1080/18902138.2015.1050863
- 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. doi:10.1080/10130950.2009.9676236
- Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person and sexual politics*. Palo Alto, CA: University of California Press.

- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Palo Alta, CA: University of California Press.
- Connell, R. W. (2003). *The role of men and boys in achieving gender equality*. United Nations, Division for the Advancement of Women. Retrieved from <http://gender.care2share.wikispaces.net>
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society, 19*, 829–859. doi:10.1177/0891243205278639
- Cornell, J., Ratele, K., & Kessi, S. (2016). Race, gender and sexuality in student experiences of violence and resistances on a university campus. *Perspectives in Education, 34*(2), 97–119. doi:10.18820/2519593X/pie.v34i2.8
- Dartnall, E., & Jewkes, R. (2013). Sexual violence against women: The scope of the problem. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Obstetrics & Gynaecology, 27*(1), 3–13. doi:10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2012.08.002
- Dastile, N. P. (2008). Sexual victimisation of female students at a South African tertiary institution: The victim's perception of the perpetrator. *Acta Criminologica: Southern African Journal of Criminology, 2008*(Special Edition 2), 189–206. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC28578>
- Donson, H. (2008). *A profile of fatal injuries in South Africa 2007*. Cape Town: Medical Research Council – University of South Africa, Crime, Violence and Injury Lead Programme. Retrieved from [www.mrc.ac.za/crime/nimss2007.pdf](http://www.mrc.ac.za/crime/nimss2007.pdf)
- Dunkle, K. L., Jewkes, R., Brown, H. C., Gray, G. E., McIntyre, J. A., & Harlow, S. D. (2004). Gender-based violence, relationship power, and risk of HIV infection in women attending antenatal clinics in South Africa. *The Lancet, 363*(9419), 1415–1421. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(04)16098-4
- Freud, S. (2001). Remembering, repeating and working through: Further recommendation on the technique of psychoanalysis II. In J. Srahey & A. Freud, (Eds.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud*. (Vol XXII., pp. 147–156). London, UK: Vintage (Original work published 1958).
- Gavey, N. (1989). Feminist poststructuralism and discourse analysis: Contributions to feminist psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 13*, 459–475. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1989.tb01014.x
- Gopal, N., & Chetty, V. (2006). No women left behind: Examining public perspectives on South African Police Services' handling of violence against South African women. *Alternation, 13*, 117–133.



- Gottzén, L. (2016). Displaying shame: Men's violence towards women in a culture of gender equality. In M. Hyden, D. Gadd, & A. Wade (Eds.), *Response based approaches to the study of interpersonal violence* (pp. 156–175). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gqola, P. D. (2007a). How the 'cult of femininity' and violent masculinities support endemic gender based violence in contemporary South Africa. *African Identities*, 5(1), 111–124. doi:10.1080/14725840701253894
- Gqola, P. D. (2007b). 'A woman cannot marry a boy': Rescue, spectacle and transitional Xhosa masculinities. In T. Shefer, K. Ratele, A. Strebel, N. Shabalala, & R. Buikema (Eds.), *From boys to men: Social constructions of masculinity in contemporary society* (pp. 145–160). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- 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, 443–452. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2012.06.002
- Guckenheimer, D., & Schmidt, J. K. (2013). Contradictions within the classroom: Masculinities in feminist studies. *Women's Studies*, 42, 486–508. doi:10.1080/00497878.2013.794061
- Halberstam, J. (2005). Shame and white gay masculinity. *Social Text*, 23, 219–233. doi:10.1215/01642472-23-3-4\_84-85-219
- Halevi, S., & Blumen, O. (2005). "Obviously they were there, but...": Men's presence in women's studies—an Israeli perspective. *Feminist Teacher*, 15, 203–212. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40546039>
- Hearn, J. (2007). The problems boys and men create, the problems boys and men experience. In T. Shefer, K. Ratele, A. Strebel, N. Tshabalala & R. Buikema (Eds.), *From boys to men: Social constructions of masculinity in contemporary society* (pp. 13–32). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Hollway, W. (1983). Heterosexual sex: Power and desire for the other. In S. Cartledge & J. Ryan (Eds.), *Sex and love: New thoughts and old contradictions* (pp. 124–140). London, UK: Women's Press.
- Hollway, W. (1984). Gender difference and the production of subjectivity. In J. Henriques, W. Hollway, C. Venn, & V. Walkerdine (Eds.), *Changing the subject* (pp. 227–263). London, UK: Methuen.

- Jewkes, R., & Morrell, R. (2010). Gender and sexuality: Emerging perspectives from the heterosexual epidemic in South Africa and implications for HIV risk and prevention. *Journal of the International AIDS Society*, 13(1), Retrieved from <http://www.jiasociety.org/content/13/1/6>
- Jewkes, R., Sikweyiya, Y., Morrell, R., & Dunkle, K. (2010). Why, when and how men rape—Understanding rape perpetration in South Africa. *SA Crime Quarterly*, 2010(34), 23–31. doi:10.17159/2413-3108/2010/v0i34a874
- 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). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0029590
- Landrine, H. (1985). Race×class stereotypes of women. *Sex Roles*, 13(1), 65–75. doi:10.1007/bf00287461
- Lewis, D. (2011). Representing African sexualities. In S. Tamale (Ed.), *African sexualities: A reader* (pp. 199–216). Cape Town: Pambazuka Press.
- Miner, M. M. (1994). "You're going to be the only guy in there": Men's minority experience in introduction to women's studies. *NWSA Journal*, 6(3), 452–467. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.uct.ac.za/stable/4316356>
- Parker, I. (2005). *Qualitative psychology. Introducing radical research*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- Peacock, D. (2013). South Africa's Sonke Gender Justice Network: Educating men for gender equality. *Agenda*, 27(1), 128–140. doi:10.1080/10130950.2013.808793
- Pease, B. (2014). Reconstructing masculinity or ending manhood? The potential and limitations of transforming masculine subjectivities for gender equality. In À. Carabí & J. Armengol (Eds.), *Alternative masculinities for a changing world* (pp. 17–34). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pence, D. (1992). A women's studies course: Its impact on women's attitudes toward men and masculinity. *NWSA Journal*, 4, 321–335. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.uct.ac.za/stable/4316218>
- Pheterson, G. (1986). Alliances between women: Overcoming internalized oppression and internalized domination. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 12(1), 146–160. doi:10.1086/494302
- Pleasant, R. K. (2011). Men learning feminism: Protecting privileges through discourses of resistance. *Men and Masculinities*, 14, 230–250. doi:10.1177/1097184x11407048

- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London, UK: Sage.
- Ratele, K. (2015). Working through resistance in engaging boys and men towards gender equality and progressive masculinities. *Culture, health & sexuality*, 17(Suppl.2), 144–158. doi:10.1080/13691058.2015.1048527
- Ratele, K. (2016). *Liberating Masculinities*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Scheff, T. J. (2003a). Shame in self and society. *Symbolic Interaction*, 26, 239–262. doi:10.1525/si.2003.26.2.239
- Scheff, T. J. (2003b). Male emotions/relationships and violence: A case study. *Human Relations*, 56: 727–749. doi:10.1177/00187267030566005
- Schilt, K., & Westbrook, L. (2009). Doing gender, doing heteronormativity: “Gender normals,” transgender people, and the social maintenance of heterosexuality. *Gender & Society*, 23(4), 440–464. doi:10.1177/0891243209340034
- Schmitz, R. M., Richardson, E. A., & Kazyak, E. A. (2015). *Transcending gender: A phenomenological exploration of men's experiences taking women's and gender studies courses*. Conference papers, American Sociological Association. Retrieved from <http://www.asanet.org/>
- Schwalbe, M., & Wolkomir, M. (2001). The masculine self as problem and resource in interview studies of men. *Men and Masculinities*, 4, 90–103. doi:10.1177/1097184x01004001005
- Shefer, T., & Foster, D. (2009). Heterosex among young South Africans: Research reflections. In M. Steyn & M. van Zyl (Eds.), *The prize and the price: Shaping sexualities in South Africa* (pp. 267–289.). Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Shefer, T., Clowes, L., & Vergnani, T. (2012). Narratives of transactional sex on a university campus. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 14, 435–447. doi:10.1080/13691058.2012.664660
- Shefer, T., Ratele, K., Strebel, A., Tshabalala, N., & Buikema, R. (2007). From boys to men: An overview. In T. Shefer, K. Ratele, A. Strebel, N. Tshabalala & R. Buikema (Eds.), *From boys to men: Social constructions of masculinity in contemporary society* (pp. 1–12). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Søndergaard, D. M. (2002). Poststructuralist approaches to empirical analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 15, 187–204. doi:10.1080/09518390110111910

- Stake, J. E., & Rose, S. (1994). The long-term impact of women's studies on students' personal lives and political activism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *18*, 403–412. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1994.tb00463.x
- Taylor, G. W., & Ussher, J. M. (2001). Making sense of S&M: A discourse analytic account. *Sexualities*, *4*(3), 293-314. doi:10.1177/136346001004003002
- Twenge, J. M., & Zucker, A. N. (1999). What is a feminist? Evaluations and stereotypes in closed-and open-ended responses. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *23*, 591–605. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1999.tb00383.x
- Valdes, F. (1996). Unpacking hetero-patriarchy: Tracing the conflation of sex, gender & (and) sexual orientation to its origins. *Yale Journal of Law & the Humanities*, *8*, 161–212.
- Van den Berg, W., Hendricks, L., Hatcher, A., Peacock, D., Godana, P., & Dworkin, S. (2013). 'One Man Can': Shifts in fatherhood beliefs and parenting practices following a gender-transformative programme in Eastern Cape, South Africa. *Gender & Development*, *21*, 111–125. doi:10.1080/13552074.2013.769775
- Vogel, D. L., Heimerdinger-Edwards, S. R., Hammer, J. H., & Hubbard, A. (2011). "Boys don't cry": Examination of the links between endorsement of masculine norms, self-stigma, and help-seeking attitudes for men from diverse backgrounds. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *58*, 368–382. doi:10.1037/a0023688
- Wantland, R. (2005). Feminist frat boys?: Fraternity men in the (women's studies) house. *NWSA Journal*, *17*, 156–163. doi:10.1353/nwsa.2005.0049
- We cannot allow 'men are trash' to just be another dying trend* (2017). *Huffington Post South Africa*. Retrieved 31 October 2017, from [http://www.huffingtonpost.co.za/rebone-masemola/we-cannot-allow-men-are-trash-to-just-be-another-dying-trend\\_a\\_22584104](http://www.huffingtonpost.co.za/rebone-masemola/we-cannot-allow-men-are-trash-to-just-be-another-dying-trend_a_22584104)
- Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Willig, C. (2008). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology*. (2nd ed.). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Wilson, S., & Maclean, R. (2011a). Introduction to qualitative research. In S. Wilson & R. Maclean (Eds.), *Research methods and data analysis for psychology* (pp. 177–197). Maidenhead, UK: McGraw-Hill Education.

Wilson, S., & Maclean, R. (2011b). Ethics in psychological research. In S. Wilson & R. Maclean (Eds.), *Research methods and data analysis for psychology* (pp. 593–619). Maidenhead, UK: McGraw-Hill Education.

York, M. (2014). Transforming masculinities: A qualitative study of a transformative education programme for young Zulu men and boys in rural Kwazulu-Natal. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, 7(7), 55–79. Retrieved from <http://www.jpanafrican.org/>

#### Endnotes

---

<sup>1</sup> The term ‘cisgender’ refers to individuals whose gender identity matches the sex that they were assigned at birth – as opposed to transgender or non-binary individuals (Schilt & Westbrook, 2009). In this paper the terms ‘man’, and ‘woman’, as well as gendered pronouns, are used to refer to cisgender identities. This conveys a more specific meaning, which is important given the global tendency to conflate gender and biological sex.

<sup>2</sup> ‘Heteropatriarchy’ refers to a system of dominance of both patriarchy and heterosexuality – i.e. dominance of males over females, and heterosexuality over other sexual orientations (Valdes, 1996).

<sup>3</sup> Under apartheid the term ‘coloured’ referred to individuals identified by the government as ‘mixed-race’. Some now reject the category but many are comfortable using it.

<sup>4</sup> Ellipses in square brackets indicate text has been removed to keep meaning of extract clear.

<sup>5</sup> ‘Brah’ is slang loosely meaning ‘brother’.

<sup>6</sup> In fact, although rates of suicide are considerably higher amongst transgender and non-binary individuals than many other segments of the population, research suggests that this is primarily as a result of social stigmatisation and ostracising of these individuals rather than the myth of all transgender individuals being ‘mental ill’ (Clements-Nolle, Marx, & Katz, 2006).

<sup>7</sup> *Ulwaluko* is a male initiation tradition practiced by the Xhosa people centring on ritual circumcision. Among complex and varied cultural meanings it sometimes involves the teaching of specific gendered values and gender roles (Gqola, 2007b). Various aspects of *Ulwaluko* have been points of public debate in recent decades (Gqola, 2007b).

<sup>8</sup> The #menaretrash was a popular movement on social media which primarily highlighted the high levels of sexual and gender-based violence women face at the hands of

---

men in South Africa (“We cannot allow”, 2017). Not only were individual experiences highlighted, but a broader critique of the location of this violence in patriarchy was foregrounded (“We cannot allow”, 2017).

*Appendix A***Invitation E-mail**Research Invitation: Men's Experiences of participating in a Gender Studies Course.

My name is Joshua Rubenstein and I am an Honours student in the Department of Psychology. For my Honours thesis I am doing research into men's experiences of participating in a gender studies course.

**Participants stand a chance to win a shopping voucher up to the value of R300.**

Inclusion criteria:

- If you are a South African citizen
- If you are 18-25 years old
- If you identify as a cisgender man
- **If you passed the 2014, 2015 or 2016 edition of AXL1100S Introduction to Gender Studies**
- If you identify as heterosexual

If you meet the above criteria I would greatly appreciate it if you could take part in my study.

What would it involve for you?

- An interview for 60-90 minutes where you talk to me about your experiences of participating in AXL1100S Introduction to Gender Studies.
- This would take place at any time convenient to you between 8am to 5pm on any day between the 10<sup>th</sup> of August and the 24<sup>th</sup> of September.
- This interview would be conducted in a private room in the UCT Psychology Department (PD Hahn building).
- All participants will be entered into a draw for a R300 Shopping voucher.

The research aims to add to a growing body of work on men in the South African context.

This study has been approved by the UCT Psychology Department Ethics Committee.

If you would like to participate in the study please e-mail me at [rbnjos007@myuct.ac.za](mailto:rbnjos007@myuct.ac.za) or give me a call, Whatsapp or text on 082 258 6366.

*Appendix B***Informed Consent Form  
UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN****DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY****Men's Experiences of Participating in a Gender Studies Course****1. Invitation and Purpose**

You are invited to take part in this study which explores men's experiences of participating in a gender studies course. I am an Honours student from the Department of Psychology at the University of Cape Town.

**2. Procedure**

- If you decide to take part in this study I will interview you about your experiences of participating in AXL1100S: Introduction to Gender Studies, asking you to share your experiences.
- The interview should take between 60 – 90 minutes; however, you are free to speak for shorter or longer should you desire.
- Participating in this study is entirely voluntary. You are free to end the interview and/or withdraw from the study at any time with no penalties or other consequences.

**3. Costs and Risks**

- This study poses a low risk of harm to you.
- It is possible that speaking about your experiences of participating in Introduction to Gender Studies could be discomforting and possibly distressing. However, you are not obligated to speak about anything you do not feel comfortable with.
- If you found the process of this study in any way distressing and would like to contact a counsellor, several resources will be recommended.
- You will have to give up 60-90 minutes of your time, however a convenient time for you and the researcher will be arranged.
- You will not be directly financially compensated for your time.



#### 4. **Benefits**

- This project gives you an opportunity to voice your opinions about and share your experiences of participating in Introduction to Gender Studies. It will also add to research on men and masculinities in SA.
- All participants will be entered into a draw to win a R300 shopping voucher.

#### 5. **Privacy and Confidentiality**

- Interviews will take place in a private room in the UCT Psychology Department.
- Any information you share is strictly confidential. You will remain anonymous throughout the research process and neither your name nor any other identifying characteristics will be mentioned in any research report. If anything you say appears in the research report you will be identified by a pseudonym of your choice. You have the right to request that any information you have shared be removed from the study, although such a request must occur before 29 September 2017.
- A tape recording device will be used to record the interview. You have the right to have the recording stopped at any point.
- The researcher will take strict precautions to safeguard your personal information throughout the study. Your information will be kept in a locked file cabinet without your name and other personal identifiers. Once the study is complete, your tape-recorded information will be stored for a further 5 years and after this period it will be destroyed.
- Only myself (Joshua Rubenstein) and my supervisor (Dr. Taryn van Niekerk) will have access to the recordings and transcripts.

#### 6. **Contact details**

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about the study please contact the primary researcher (Joshua Rubenstein) on 082 258 6366 or my supervisor, Dr Taryn van Niekerk, at the Department of Psychology University of Cape Town at [taryn.vanniekerk@uct.ac.za](mailto:taryn.vanniekerk@uct.ac.za). If you wish to contact the chair of the Ethics Committee, please e-mail Rosalind Adams at [Rosalind.Adams@uct.ac.za](mailto:Rosalind.Adams@uct.ac.za).

7. **Sign**

{Participant's name}\_\_\_\_\_ has been informed of the nature and purpose of the study including any foreseeable risks and costs to participating. They have been given time to ask any questions and these questions have been answered to the best of the researcher's ability. A signed copy of this consent form will be made available to the participant.

---

Investigator's Signature

Date

I {Participant's name}\_\_\_\_\_ have been informed about this research study and understand its purpose, possible benefits, risks, and costs. I agree to take part in this research. I know that I am free to withdraw this consent and quit this project at any time, and that doing so will not cause me any penalty or loss.

---

Participant's Signature

Date

**PERMISSION TO TAPE-RECORD INTERVIEWS**

I understand that the interview will be tape-recorded and that the researcher will take strict precautions to safeguard my personal information throughout the study.

---

Participant's Signature

*Appendix C*

**Participant Demographic Information Form**

**A. Basic information**

A.1 Date of birth

Day / Month / Year

A.2 Age

A.3 Do you identify yourself racially? If yes what group do you identify with?

\_\_\_\_\_

A.4 Area of residence \_\_\_\_\_

A. 5 What is your sexual orientation?

Heterosexual	Homosexual	Other (please describe)

A. 6 What is your primary e-mail address? \_\_\_\_\_

**B. Studies**

B.1 How long have you been attending the University of Cape Town? \_\_\_\_\_

B. 2 What degree are you currently studying? \_\_\_\_\_

B. 3 What year of study are you in? \_\_\_\_\_

B. 4 What are your majors? \_\_\_\_\_

B. 5 In which year did you complete AXL1100S? \_\_\_\_\_

B. 6 What was your final mark for AXL1100S? \_\_\_\_\_

B. 7 Which gender studies courses have you completed in addition to AXL1100S (if any)?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

B. 8 When do you expect to graduate? \_\_\_\_\_

B. 8 What percentage of lectures for AXL1100S did you attend?

0-20%	20-40%	40-60%	60-80%	80-100%

**C. Research specific information**

C. 1 What pseudonym do you want to be identified by in this research? \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Socio-economic status and household composition**

D.1 Which statement best describes your household situation?

a Not enough money for basics like food and clothes	1
b Have money for food and clothes, but short on many other things	2
c We have most of the important things, but few luxury goods	3
d Some money for extra things such as going away for holidays and luxury goods	4
e Lots of money for extra things such as going away for holidays and luxury goods	5
f Don't know	6

C.2 What is the main source of your household income?

A Formal salary/earnings on which you pay income tax	1
b Contributions by <b>adult</b> family members or relatives	2
c Contributions by <b>younger</b> family members or relatives (<18 years)	3
d Government pensions/Grants (e.g. pension, disability grant)	4
e Grants/Donations by private welfare organizations	5
f Other (specify main source):	6
g No income	7

C.3 Do you own the house in which you reside?

YES	NO

C.4 How many people live in your household? \_\_\_\_\_

**E. Relationship status and family information**

D.1. What is your current relationship status?

a. Married	1
b. Cohabiting/living together, not married	2
c. Single	3

d. Partner, not living together, not married	4
--	---

Other:

---

---

*Appendix D***Interview Schedule**

1. What made you want to participate in this study?
2. What made you take Introduction to Gender Studies?
3. What was your experience of taking Introduction to Gender Studies?
4. What aspects of the course stood out for you?
  - What were the highlights (if any)?
  - What were the lowlights (if any)?
5. What does being a man mean to you?
6. What was it like being a man in Introduction to Gender Studies?
7. How were men represented in the course?
8. Did the course affect the way you think about yourself in any way?
  - Have you studied gender studies further?
  - Have you engaged further with the ideas, questions and perspectives raised in the course?
9. How would you improve the course?

*Appendix E***Debriefing Form**

Thank you for participating in this study. During this debriefing you will be given a chance to reflect on your experience of the interview and any issues, questions or distress you may have will now be answered.

Purpose of this study: Research suggests systems of masculinity (what it means to 'be a man') are implicated in many social problems in this country – like gender inequality and gender-based violence - and this research aims to understand and challenge such systems. Specifically we are looking to understand how men who take Introduction to Gender Studies talk about their experience. Should you wish to learn more about such issues, readings can be sent to you or alternatively I will answer any questions you have now as best I can.

**Counselling/emergency contacts:****UCT Student Careline**

- **Tel: 0800 24 25 26** / sms 31393 for a "call-me-back" service.
- For 24/7 telephonic counseling, advice, referral facilities and general support to individuals facing any mental health challenges, or contemplating suicide. The line is also available to offer support and advice to anyone who is concerned about another person who might be in distress.

**UCT counselling service**

- **Tel: 021 650 1017 / 1020**
- Address: The Student Wellness Service, 28 Rhodes Ave, Mowbray 7700