

**Constructions of perpetrators of rape in psychology journal articles:
A discursive analysis**

by

Perishka Coopoo

A mini-dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Counselling Psychology

Department of Psychology

University of Pretoria

Faculty of Humanities

Supervisor

Prof Terri Bakker

August 2019

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, to my supervisor Terri, thank you for co-creating a space for me to learn, grow and write. For me to ask, answer and, ask some more. Your guidance, encouragement and patience, even from a distance, has been invaluable. It has only been incredible working with you.

To Mom, Dad and, Ster thank you for your continuous support and love throughout this process. Without you, my family, I would not have been able to further my learning in all parts of the country and survive. It has been quite the marathon and I am so grateful and lucky that I've had you cheering me on.

To Nishaal, once again you were present for most of the highs and lows when writing this dissertation. You often had to bear the brunt of my frustration when things were not making sense or when the words would not come. You also celebrated with me and shared my excitement when things were falling into place. I could not thank you enough for being a shoulder to cry on, an ear to listen and a great source of comfort, support and laughter throughout this process.

To Fran, Sheri and, Lekha, the sweet somethings we exchanged everyday throughout this journey were priceless. I appreciate the endless support, reassurance and understanding. Thank you.

Abstract

Considerable amounts of research, including research in psychology, has been produced to better understand the social phenomenon of sexual violence. The reality of sexual violence is not new but the construction of this phenomenon as a social problem is relatively recent consequence of activist effort and ideological shifts. Research specifically related to social constructions of rape and/or sexual violence have been conducted across various social domains. What seems to be lacking in the literature is an investigation into the way in which academic articles have constructed the phenomenon. The aim of this research was to explore the ways in which perpetrators of rape were discursively constructed in psychology journal articles. The theoretical background that informed this research is that of social constructionism and poststructuralism. The methodological approach deemed suitable and used for this research was Foucauldian discourse analysis. Prevailing constructions in journal articles relating to perpetrators of sexual violence were examined and their implications for subjectivity and practice explored. The findings of this research described six dominant discourses, namely a victim/villain discourse, a psychological discourse, a pathology discourse, a treatment discourse, a career discourse and a gender discourse, some of which had sub-discourses embedded within. The discourses and sub-discourses worked together to produced certain effects and functions. Also, contradictions and variations emerged within and between them. The findings of this research further allowed for a look at how psychology journal articles fit into larger societal discourses.

Key words: Rape, sexual violence, perpetrators, psychology, journal articles, Foucauldian discourse analysis

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	i
Abstract.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of tables.....	vii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Context.....	1
Perpetrators of Rape.....	1
Research Problem.....	2
Research question.....	3
Theoretical point of departure.....	4
Methodology.....	4
Data.....	4
Data analysis.....	5
Rationale.....	5
Study overview.....	6
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
Defining sexual violence and rape.....	7
Historical conceptualisations of rape.....	8
Rape in the eighteenth century.....	8
Rape in the nineteenth century.....	9
Rape in the twentieth century.....	9
Victims and perpetrators of rape: Who were they?.....	10
From feminist re-conceptualisation of rape to the 21 st century.....	11
Rape supportive culture.....	12
Rape myths.....	13

Rape in the 21 st century.....	15
Perpetrators of rape: Review of theories and research.....	16
Psychopathology of the rapist.....	16
Evolutionary perspective of perpetrators of rape.....	17
Cognitive distortions of perpetrators of rape.....	17
Social learning perspective of perpetrators of rape.....	19
Perpetrators of male/male rape.....	20
Female perpetrators of rape.....	21
Social constructions of rape, victims and perpetrators.....	22
Rape in news media.....	23
Rape in comic books.....	24
Rape in fantasy literature.....	24
Constructions of rape through talk.....	25
Constructions of rape by professionals.....	26
Journal articles: Advancing knowledge through publication.....	27
Review of rape in journal articles.....	28
Concluding remarks.....	32
CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL POINT OF DEPARTURE.....	34
Social constructionism.....	34
Poststructuralism.....	36
Foucault and power.....	38
Disciplinary power.....	39
Power, knowledge and truth.....	41
Psychology in the web of disciplinary power.....	42
Discourse analysis.....	43
Discourse.....	44
Subject positions and subjectivity.....	45

Foucauldian discourse analysis.....	46
Concluding remarks	47
CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY	49
Research question	49
Theoretical point of departure.....	49
Research design	50
Corpus of this research.....	50
Data collection	52
Data analysis	53
Guidelines for data analysis	54
Stage one: Discursive constructions	55
Stage two: Discourses	55
Stage three: Action orientation	55
Stage four: Positionings	55
Stage five: Practice	56
Stage six: Subjectivity.....	56
Analytical process	56
Credibility and rigor of research	58
Reflexivity.....	59
Ethical considerations	62
Concluding remarks	63
CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	64
Structure of findings	64
Findings of analysis	65
1. Victim/Villain discourse: Overlapping identities.....	65
1.1 The discourse of victimhood.....	65
1.2 The discourse of villains	67

2.	Psychological discourse	69
2.1	Attachment discourse	69
2.2	Personality discourse	71
2.3	Internal chaos	72
2.4	At the mercy of emotions.....	74
2.5	Cognitions and schemas: the criminal mind?	74
3.	Pathology discourse:diseased bodies and minds	76
3.1	Psycho-pathology.....	76
3.2	Medical-pathology	77
4.	Treatment and prevention discourse	78
5.	Career discourse- Perpetrators as knowledgeable experts.	79
6.	Gender discourse	80
	Concluding remarks	82
	CHAPTER SIX: INTEGRATION AND CONCLUSION	83
	Integration and discussion of discourses.....	83
	Reflexive account.....	87
	Limitations and recommendations for future research	90
	Concluding note	92
	References.....	93
	APPENDIX A: List of psychology journal articles.....	116
	APPENDIX B: Initial stages of analysis (diagrams)	134
	APPENDIX C: Table of discourses and supporting quotations	136

List of tables

Table 1: Rape myths documented from 1980 to 2016.....	14
Table 2: Overview of discourses and sub-discourses	64
Table 3: Discourses and supporting quotations	136

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Rape is a global phenomenon that has existed throughout human history (Gqola, 2016). It has been recognised as one of the most frequent forms of lived trauma worldwide (Forde & Duvvury, 2016). It has also become clear from research that sexual violence is a life-altering experience for many of the individuals who experience it (Marx, 2005). It is a crime that is committed through a sexual act without the consent or agreement between the people involved (Kaldine, 2012). The devastating effects are often experienced long after the event occurred with a multitude of psychological, physical, and behavioural consequences such as sexually transmitted diseases, chronic pain disorders and other physical ailments, anxiety, depression, substance use, sexual problems, and interpersonal difficulties (Far & Abedizade, 2017; Forde & Duvvury, 2016; Horvath & Brown, 2013; Kaldine, 2012; Marx, 2005; Petrak & Hedge, 2003). Rape is widely said to constitute a crisis of epidemic proportions in South Africa and internationally, and alarming statistics and stories of it circulate in local media, research and everyday talk (Dosekun, 2013).

The reality of rape and/or sexual violence is not new but the construction of this phenomenon as a social problem is a relatively recent consequence of activist effort and ideological shifts (Buiten & Naidoo, 2016; Chasteen, 2001). That is, in more recent times the construction of rape has broadened to include a wider variety of situations such as acquaintance and marital rape (Brownmiller, 1975). Furthermore, rape has also come to be understood as an instance and example of larger patterns of gender inequality (Anderson & Doherty, 2007; Chasteen, 2001; Gavey, 2005; Gqola, 2016). Over the past four decades, substantial research, including research in psychology, has been conducted to better understand rape in the hopes of preventing it (Tharp et al., 2013). By investigating how Psychology journal articles have constructed perpetrators of rape, which is the aim of this research, it may be possible to gain insight into how this knowledge is reflected in the literature.

Context

Perpetrators of Rape

Owing to the alarming incidence of rape, researchers have been trying in earnest to answer the question ‘What causes men to rape?’ (Blake & Gannon, 2010; Ward & Siegert, 2002). Some of these theorists were psychiatrists and, in their view, rapists were sick individuals and their behaviour reflected mental illness (Jones, 1999). Other theorists

postulated that sexual violence perpetrators held cognitive distortions which are beliefs that they have developed as a result of a mismatch between their (deviant) sexual interest and their perception of societal norms (Abel, Becker, & Cunningham-Rathner, 1984).

Researchers also compared the psychopathology and personality disorders of sex offenders with general population inmates in prison (Ahlmeyer, Kleinsasser, Stoner, & Retzlaff, 2003), and identified trait factors in adult male rapists (Masessa, 2013). Furthermore, research has examined the perceptions of early interpersonal experiences of sex offenders using attachment theory as a basic explanatory framework (McCormack, Hudson, & Ward, 2002).

An evolutionary psychology approach to the study of the human mind and human nature claims that millions of years of evolution provided specific environmental challenges that have resulted in specific cognitive mechanisms to meet those challenges through the processes of natural selection and sexual selection (Bryden & Grier, 2011; Thornhill & Palmer, 2001). According to Thornhill and Palmer (2001) since sexual coercion is a human activity, it should be explained naturalistically and in terms of natural selection. That is, men evolved to enjoy brief, impersonal 'sex' to increase reproductive success (Ellis, 1989). This behaviour was said to become innate.

Feminist literature made explicit the conceptualisation of rape as involving issues of male power and violence (Chasteen, 2001; Gqola, 2016). It was further argued that it is a rape supportive culture that provides the context for rape (Anderson & Doherty, 2007; Gavey, 2005). Culturally transmitted assumptions about men, women, violence, sexuality, and myths about rape constitute a rape supportive culture, which has sustained and justified sexual violence throughout history (Donat & D'Emilio, 1992; Edwards, Turchik, Dardis, Reynolds, & Gidycz, 2011; Gqola, 2016). Furthermore, the social learning theory of rape explores the dimensions by which sex and rape become socially scripted behaviour that further contributes to the pervasive rape culture (Deming, 2009). This theory proposes that individuals are taught, through the socialisation process, the appropriate actions for their genders regarding their expected behaviours in society and that gender-based violence is normative (Ellis, 1989; Scully & Marolla, 1984). According to Scully and Marolla's (1984) study, convicted rapists had learned attitudes and actions consistent with the rape supportive culture.

Research Problem

Theoretical battles over the social meaning of rape, rape victims, and perpetrators that have transpired since early 1970s illustrate how social problems can be constructed and

reconstructed in various public arenas (Chasteen, 2001). Research into social constructions of rape have been conducted across various social domains. For instance, researchers have investigated ways in which rape has been constructed in different media forums such as news media (Bonnes, 2010; O'Hara, 2012), comics (Garland, Branch, & Grimes, 2016), and fantasy literature (Philadelphoff-Puren, 2005; Prater, 2013). There have also been studies that examine how the general population of women (Chasteen, 2001; Dosekun, 2013) and men (Mankayi, 2010; O'Byrne, Hansen, & Rapley, 2008), construct rape, rape victims and perpetrators of rape through talk. Furthermore, researchers have investigated the ways in which victims of rape have constructed their experiences (Hlavka, 2014; Weiss, 2009) as well as how perpetrators of rape have constructed their actions (Lea & Auburn, 2001; Wegner, Abbey, Pierce, Pegram, & Woerner, 2015).

What seems to be lacking in the literature is an investigation into the way in which academic articles have constructed the phenomenon. More specifically, how psychology journal articles, with the primary focus on perpetrators of rape, have discursively constructed perpetrators. This is important because articles published in academic journals serve as a discipline's official discourse reflecting what has been deemed important in that discipline and influences practice and subsequent scholarship (Everett, 2015).

Research question

This research study intended to examine the discourses underlying what has been written about perpetrators of rape in articles published in peer-reviewed journals in psychology, indexed by Proquest, Ebscohost, and Taylor and Francis, from 2012 to 2016. More specifically, this research intended to critically investigate the ways in which perpetrators have been discursively constructed. The question that this research hopes to answer is as follows:

How are perpetrators of rape discursively constructed in psychology journal articles indexed by Proquest, Ebscohost, and Taylor and Francis, from 2012 to 2016, that primarily focus on perpetrators?

To address the abovementioned research question, social constructionism and discursive analysis are considered.

Theoretical point of departure

The theoretical background that informs this research is that of social constructionism and poststructuralism (Burr, 2015). Thus, this research looks at the constitutive nature of language and the implications for experience and practice that arise from the available constructions. Furthermore, from this stance, the relationship between power, knowledge and language is considered as well as implications for subjectivity (Agger, 1991; Fox, 2014; Gavey, 1989). This is informed by the work of Foucault (1978, 1995) by recognising the interconnectedness of power/knowledge, truth and discourse and its productive nature

Parker (2004) explains that language renders objects and events “thinkable and understandable” in the sense that they are given shape and meaning (p. 157). Foucault (1980; 1988) argues that a sense of self does not emerge from an inner core but out of complex, historical cultural positions in language. Furthermore Burr (2015) explains that all ways of understanding are seen as historically and culturally relative. That is, knowledge is specific to and the product of cultures and periods of history. Therefore, knowledge and understanding are constructed through language, social interactions and social processes which means that there can be several ways of understanding the world (Burr, 2015).

A range of helping professions have particular codes of practice that have developed from applications of a knowledge base that is seen as foundational (Lock & Strong, 2010). The key has been that practitioners can turn to such a body of knowledge to inform their continued use of such practices. The foundational assumption then is that human and social problems can be ‘correctly’ identified and then correspondingly addressed with interventions derived from such knowledge (Lock & Strong, 2010). However, the view taken by this research is that ‘facts’ and ‘true selves’ are not neutral and out there waiting to be discovered; but rather constructed through language and social practices (Fox, 2014). Therefore, from this approach it is hoped that the research question set out in this study will be answered through examining the discourses underlying what has been written about perpetrators of rape in journal articles and the possible implications thereof.

Methodology

Data

The corpus of this study includes psychology journal articles with the primary focus being on perpetrators of rape/sexual violence. For this research study, ‘psychology journal articles’ refers to articles published in journals under the ‘subject’, ‘category’ or ‘discipline’

of psychology. These journal articles are indexed by databases namely Proquest, Ebscohost, and Taylor and Francis which are available through the University of Pretoria Library. The search period for the above-mentioned articles includes January 2012 to January 2016. A total of 128 psychology journal articles were collected for analysis.

Data analysis

This research uses discourse analysis as its method of analysing the data. Foucauldian discourse analysis, specifically, is concerned with language and its role in the constitution of social and psychological life. Willig (2013) integrates Ian Parker's (Parker, 1992) 20 steps in discourse analysis which distinguishes discourses, their relations to each other, their historical location and their political and social effects, as well as the work of Kendall and Wickham (1999) which rely on fewer steps, however provide a more advanced conceptual understanding of Foucault's method. There are six stages in Willig's method of Foucauldian discourse analysis which allows for the identification of discursive resources used in academic writings about perpetrators of rape and the subject positions they contain, as well as to explore the implications for subjectivity and practice (Willig, 2013).

Rationale

As mentioned, issues addressed in academic journals influence practice and subsequent scholarship, as practitioners are encouraged to remain engaged, so their practice is informed by scholarly research (Everett, 2015). This research proceeds from a perspective where it is argued that scholarly articulations of perpetrators of rape have effects not only on our understanding, but on practice and action in relation to the social phenomenon of rape (Buiten & Naidoo, 2016). This research will contribute to the literature by diverting attention to understanding the phenomenon through explicit focus on, and the deconstructing of, perpetrators of rape in recently published journal articles. A discursive reading might be useful in unpacking the knowledge produced in academic texts as such knowledge is understood to have power in modern societies (Foucault, 1995; Hook, 2004a) and come to hold particular versions of people, in this instance perpetrators of rape, and social phenomena in place. Looking at sexual- and gender-based violence from this angle may provide further insight into the current direction of research on perpetrators of rape and the implications thereof, and ignite discussion on future directions.

Study overview

The following chapter of this research report, **Chapter two**, defines sexual violence and rape within this research study. It further provides an overview of the relevant literature and research regarding conceptualisations of rape, theories of rape perpetrations, social constructions of rape, and the role of academic journal articles.

Chapter three will explain my theoretical point of departure. This includes an overview of poststructuralism as well as social constructionism. I will also provide a comprehensive discussion of discourse analysis as theory and method. These discussions inform the underpinning of my research and methodology.

The next chapter, **Chapter four** will explain the methodology. This includes a discussion on how the research was carried out. It will provide a description of the data used as well as the collection thereof. It will then explain how the data was analysed. There is also a discussion regarding the necessary steps taken in order to ensure the credibility and rigor of the research. Finally, there is an account of the reflexive and ethical considerations relating to my study.

In **Chapter five**, the findings of the analysis are presented and discussed.

The final chapter, **Chapter six** further discusses these findings, thereafter, concluding the research with a reflexive account as well as addressing limitations and future recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter sexual violence and rape will be introduced by discussing how it is defined. A brief overview of the way rape has been conceptualised historically as well as the feminist re-conceptualisation will be presented. This will allow for a backdrop of this research area. Previous research on perpetrators of rape will then be introduced. This will include a review on the theories and studies relating to rapists as mentally ill, evolutionary explanations of sexual aggression, and cognitive distortions and social learning as casual contributors to the perpetration of rape. This will provide a picture of what has already been written about perpetrators of rape. This chapter will also discuss research regarding the social constructions of rape, victims, and perpetrators in various social and public domains. This will provide a context for the research problem highlighted in this study. Lastly, this chapter briefly discusses the role of academic journal articles in the advancement of knowledge as it is the text that will be considered in answering the research question and provides an overview of other writings reviewing rape in journal articles.

Defining sexual violence and rape

Sexual violence is recognised as one of the most frequent forms of lived trauma worldwide (Forde & Duvvury, 2016). The World Health Organization (2002) has defined sexual violence as

any sexual act, attempt to obtain a sexual act, unwanted sexual comments or advances, or acts to traffic, or otherwise directed, against a person's sexuality using coercion, by any person regardless of their relationship to the victim, in any setting, including but not limited to home and work. (p. 149)

Often, sexual violence is used an umbrella term to mean any type of violence of a sexual nature (Zinsstag & Keenan, 2017). Finding an adequate definition that encompasses all eventualities is problematic. According to Zinsstag and Keenan (2017), this is because questions arise about the meaning of consent, the intentionality of the perpetrators, as well as the 'hidden' aspect of violence in incidences that are not overtly violent. According to the World Health Organization (2002), rape is included under the umbrella of sexual violence.

Rape has been defined in various ways; however, is broadly understood as forced sexualized penetration without consent (Archard, 2007; Baker, 1999; Bourke, 2015; Gavey, 2005; Horvath & Brown, 2013; Kaldine, 2012). Legally, definitions of rape differ under domestic laws of different countries however, they usually involve sexual activity under

conditions of force, violence, fraud, or where the victim is a person who is unable to consent because he or she is drugged, intoxicated, unconscious, mentally unsound or under age (Van der Bijl, 2010). In South African law, rape is categorised as sexual assault. The Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act of 2007, defines sexual assault as a range of acts involving unlawful sexual penetration, or attempts at penetration to any extent by genital organs of another person, or by any object, including any part of the body of an animal or the part of the body of a person, into the anus, mouth or genital organs of another person.

Throughout this research study, terms such as sexual violence, sexual assault, sexual abuse, and rape will be used as other researchers, theorists or authors use them. Thus, these terms maybe used interchangeably to mean the broad definitions mentioned above. The terms victim and survivor will also be used interchangeably to refer to individuals who have been harmed by sexual violence. In addition, terms such as perpetrators, offenders and rapists maybe be used interchangeably to refer to individuals who have perpetrated sexual violence. These definitions are not all inclusive of the different forms and contexts of sexual violence as it is beyond the scope of this study.

Historical conceptualisations of rape

Definitions of rape have been somewhat complex as there have been changes in how rape has been conceptualised in different periods of history (Zinsstag & Keenan, 2017). This section provides a brief overview of how rape has been conceptualised from the eighteenth to the 21st century. It is important to note that there are a multitude of ways in which different populations have understood rape. This overview addresses the most globally common conceptualisations.

Rape in the eighteenth century

The eighteenth century was strongly influenced by the church (Freedman, 2013). Sex roles were differentiated rigidly in which case men were dominant and women were submissive (Donat & D'Emilio, 1992). During this period, sexuality was channeled into marriage for procreation of legitimate offspring and nonmarital sexual intercourse was considered an offence (Eriksson, 2011; Freedman, 2013). The church, court, and community monitored private sexual behaviour in order to regulate deviance by limiting sexual expression to marriage (Donat & D'Emilio, 1992). According to D'Emilio and Freedman (1988, as cited in Donat & D'Emilio, 1992), female chastity and fidelity assured men of the

legitimacy of their children therefore the church and community dealt more harshly with women. Furthermore, during this period, the integrity of the family was critical to status within the community and thus guarded with care (Horvath & Brown, 2013). It was understood that for men, the integrity of the family rested on female purity and monogamy therefore rape of a woman was treated as a harm to her family honor, bringing shame and loss to the man to whom she belonged, either her father or her husband (Zinsstag & Keenan, 2017). If rape cases did however go to court, a woman had to prove her nonconsent through physical and verbal resistance to the fullest extent in order to verify that she had not voluntarily engaged in nonmarital sexual acts (Brown & Walklate, 2011). Thus, rape during the eighteenth century was conceptualised as the violation of a man's property (Brown & Walklate, 2011; Donat & D'Emilio, 1992; Eriksson, 2011; Freedman, 2013).

Rape in the nineteenth century

Sexual meanings began to change toward the end of the eighteenth century in which case there was a decline in traditional church and state regulation which loosened the constraints on nonmarital sex (Donat & D'Emilio, 1992). During the nineteenth century, patriarchal controls over women's time, behaviour and sexuality weakened (Stansell, 1987). Premarital sex was no longer an offense but rather a "token of betrothal" (Stansell, 1987, p. 87). That is, women traded sexual favours for a man's promise to marry (Donat & D'Emilio, 1992). Furthermore, during the nineteenth century, women were viewed as pure and virtuous by nature and as disinterested in sex (Freedman, 1987). Therefore, women were expected to use their natural purity and superior morality to control men's 'uncontrollable' sexual impulses (Gavey, 2005; Hollway, 1989). Thus, a woman who was raped was considered a 'fallen' woman and was then blamed for the attack (Brown & Walklate, 2011). Rape, then, in the nineteenth century was conceptualised as being about women igniting men's insatiable appetite for sex, and sexual gratification for men (Donat & D'Emilio, 1992; Freedman, 1987; Frith, 2015; Hollway, 1989).

Rape in the twentieth century

During the twentieth century, the writings of psychologists and sexologists provided the foundation for reconceptualising rape (Eriksson, 2011). Most theories included the belief that rape was a perversion and that rapists were mentally ill (Donat & D'Emilio, 1992). Perpetrators of rape began to be considered as deviants rather than criminals and the label 'sexual psychopath' was used to describe them (Freedman, 1987). Rape was then conceptualised from the rapist's point of view as primarily an act of sex rather than violence

and a women's victimisation as a by-product of his pathology (Donat & D'Emilio, 1992). However, black men convicted of rape were sent to prison and not state or psychiatric hospitals (Freedman, 1987).

Furthermore, a woman's role in a rape was also considered during this time. Female nature became sexualized and female desire for sexuality became legitimated (Freedman, 1987; McKenzie-Mohr & Lafrance, 2014). Therefore, many people became skeptical that a woman could be raped if she did not consent. For instance, there are writings about an attorney beginning a rape trial by spinning an empty coke bottle to demonstrate the difficulty of then putting a pencil in the opening (Margolin, 1972, as cited in Donat & D'Emilio, 1992). The implication was that a woman would be able to fend off a man trying to rape her, if not, she must have wanted it (Crawford & Popp, 2003; Eriksson, 2011; Hollway, Venn, Walkerdine, Henriques, & Urwin, 2003).

Victims and perpetrators of rape: Who were they?

Throughout history, conceptualisations of rape brought with it ideas about who are considered victims and who are considered perpetrators (Eriksson, 2011). These ideas changed with the various definitions and understandings of rape within different periods of history and as new knowledges became available (Edwards et al., 2011). These shifts were not abrupt and explicit, but rather gradual and subtle.

As previously discussed, rape was at a time considered to be the violation of a man's property (Zinsstag & Keenan, 2017). Thus, husbands were not considered perpetrators and wives not considered victims (Edwards et al., 2011). That is, men's actions were considered to be directed against their own property (Bourke, 2015).

During the time at which rape was understood as being about sexual gratification, it was thought that men fell victim to their own sexual impulses and to women's lack of purity, as women were meant to control said impulses (Stansell, 1987). It was also during this time that due to the belief that women had no interest in sex and men had an innate desire for sex, a man could not be a victim of rape and a woman could not be a perpetrator (Eriksson, 2011).

Race also played a part in naming victims and perpetrators of rape (Buiten & Naidoo, 2016). Oftentimes, the picture of a rapist was of a black man due to the belief of his wild and uncivilized nature (Freedman, 1987). Similarly, black women were not considered real rape victims because there was a belief about their 'hypersexual nature' which implied that consent was not required (Melancon & Braxton, 2015).

The idea of a rapist as a rare, marginal stranger also became commonplace (Chasteen, 2001). Thus, men who women knew or trusted were not thought of as rapists. Furthermore, rapists were labelled as sexual psychopaths, or monstrous, which excluded seemingly ordinary men from the offence (Brown & Walklate, 2011).

With shifts in understanding women's sexuality came a shift in understanding of women as victims (Eriksson, 2011). That is, women were believed to display a sense of shyness and offer resistance as part of their nature (Muehlenhard & Rodgers, 1998). This was followed by skepticism about their victimhood as well as beliefs that women wanted to be raped (Donat & D'Emilio, 1992; Muehlenhard & Rodgers, 1998). Furthermore, as the patriarchal power over women weakened, the definition of rape victim excluded more women (Stansell, 1987). That is, women who were seen to be 'un-lady-like' by hitchhiking, smoking, drinking, dressing seductively, using bad language, and having a sexual history, were not considered real victims of rape but rather as deserving of it (Eriksson, 2011; Lea, 2007; Stevenson, 2000).

Estrich (1986) explains that a 'real' rape was recognised as occurring when a virginal young woman, of the most respectable standing, is violently accosted by a monstrous stranger and she resists to the full extent of her ability but is brutally raped sustaining multiple serious, lasting physical injuries. Victims and perpetrators not falling within this template were then not considered as such (Chasteen, 2001).

From feminist re-conceptualisation of rape to the 21st century

The feminist anti-rape movement challenged traditional assumptions about rape and provided an alternative framework for defining and interpreting sexual violence (Brownmiller, 1975; Chasteen, 2001; Donat & D'Emilio, 1992). This framework included three main ideas that any woman can be a victim, any man can be a rapist, and rape itself occurs in many forms, including acquaintance and marital rape (Brownmiller, 1975). This re-conceptualisation of rape broadened the meaning of rape to include a wider variety of situations and to include acts that did not involve overt physical violence (Donat & D'Emilio, 1992). The idea of the stranger rapist in the proverbial dark alley was commonplace prior to the feminist movement (Chasteen, 2001). Feminists argued that this mythology hid the reality that most rapes are committed by someone the women know and think they can trust (Chasteen, 2001; Donat & D'Emilio, 1992). Brownmiller (1975) has argued that the typical rapist might be the "boy next door" (p. 189). Similarly, Chasteen (2001) explains that men

who rape are from every strata of society, sharing only the desire to dominate and control women through violence.

Feminist literature challenged the view that rape is merely another form of heterosexual sex committed by one person on another and made explicit the conceptualisation of rape as involving issues of male power and violence (Anderson & Doherty, 2007; Brownmiller, 1975; Ellis, 1989; Gavey, 2005; Lea & Auburn, 2001; Russell, 2003). Furthermore, rape, from this perspective, is seen as the use of sexuality to establish or maintain dominance and control over women (Brownmiller, 1975). The feminist movement also challenged the assumption that rape is a by-product of ‘deviant perverts’ (Gavey, 2005). Rather, it is argued that it is normalising constructions or cultural understandings that provide a social pattern for coercive sexuality (Anderson & Doherty, 2007; Gavey, 2005). Thus, it is a rape culture that promotes male aggression and female passivity subsequently encouraging sexual violence (Anderson & Doherty, 2007; Chasteen, 2001; Donat & D’Emilio, 1992; Gavey, 2005).

Rape supportive culture

The views of feminists sparked research within Psychology to examine the ‘rape-supportive culture’ that provides the context for sexual violence (Donat & D’Emilio, 1992). Rape supportive culture has been broadly defined as “a pervasive ideology that effectively supports or excuses sexual assault” (Burt, 1980, p. 218). Martha Burt (1980) hypothesized that gender roles, adversarial sexual beliefs, and acceptance of interpersonal violence make up a rape culture.

Gender roles are assumed roles, responsibilities, and interests of men and women based on cultural norms and expectations (Burt, 1980; Johnson & Johnson, 2017; Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Examples of gender roles include men as dominant and women as submissive; men as aggressive and women as passive; men as strong and women as fragile; and men as sexual and women as pure (Johnson & Johnson, 2017; Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Adversarial sexual beliefs refer to the assumption that male-female sexual relationships are exploitative and filled with conflict and competition (Burt, 1980). This belief includes notions such as women are shy and manipulative when trying to attract a man, and men are only after sex (Burt, 1980; Johnson & Johnson, 2017). Acceptance of violence is the belief that violence is justified and in certain circumstances desired (Johnson & Johnson,

2017). Furthermore, it is the belief that violence is especially appropriate in male-female relationships (Burt, 1980).

Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995) expanded on Burt's model and included sexism and hostility toward women, as added components underlying a rape culture. Sexism is the stereotyping or discrimination against individuals based on their sex assigned at birth (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995). Individuals are often discriminated against when they do not fit what is expected of them (Chapleau, Oswald, & Russell, 2007). For instance, if a woman is aggressive, she may be discriminated against, similarly, if a man is passive he, too, may be discriminated against (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995; Weatherall, 2005). Sexism is said to maintain the imbalance of power between men and women thus perpetuating a rape culture (Johnson & Johnson, 2017). Hostility toward women is the belief that women are inherently "ill-willed" (Johnson & Johnson, 2017, p. 5). That is, women are believed to be deceitful and not to be trusted which justifies and legitimizes violence against them including rape (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995).

Koss, Leonard, Beezley, and Oros (1985) explained that culturally transmitted assumptions about men, women, violence, sexuality, as well as myths about rape constitute a rape supportive belief system. It is the abovementioned attitudinal components which underlie the rape supportive culture and allow for the perpetuation and use of rape myths (Burt, 1980; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994).

Rape myths

The term 'rape myth' gained prominence in the 1970's after Susan Brownmiller's seminal work on misguided beliefs about rape and Susan Estrich's analysis of how some rapes were considered more 'real' than others (Brownmiller, 1975; Estrich, 1986; Smith & Skinner, 2017). The concept of rape myths was introduced in order to explain a set of largely false cultural beliefs that were thought to underlie sexual aggression perpetrated against women (Edwards et al., 2011). These myths include elements of victim blame, perpetrator absolution, and minimisation or rationalization of sexual violence (Edwards et al., 2011; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994). Burt (1980) defined rape myths as "prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists," which serve to create "a climate hostile to rape victims" (p. 217). Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994) proposed a modified definition of rape myths: "attitudes and beliefs that are generally false but are widely and persistently held" (p. 134). Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994) further stated that rape myths were not only

stereotypical attitudes, but they also had a cultural function. This function was to deny, downplay, and justify sexual violence as well as determine which rapes are taken seriously (Smith & Skinner, 2017). Table 1 demonstrates the kinds of rape myths that have been documented from the 1980s:

Table 1

Rape myths documented from 1980 to 2016

Rape myths	Reference and year
Only bad girls get raped	(Burt, 1980)
Any healthy woman can resist rape if she really wanted to	
Only crazy men rape	
Men rape because they cannot control their sexuality	
Many women have an unconscious desire to be raped	(Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994)
Women routinely lie about being raped	
Only certain women are raped	
Women ask for it by their dress and behaviour	
It is not rape unless he has a weapon	
Husbands cannot rape their wives	(Edwards et al., 2011)
Perpetrators are monsters who are abusive all the time	(Gqola, 2016)
Rape is inappropriate sex	
There is a proper way to respond to being raped	
Rape is about male arousal and the need to have sex	
Dressing a certain way or being visibly drunk invites rape	
Women are accidentally raped because they play hard-to-get	
Rapists are strangers who abduct women in a public place and rape them in unknown places	
Sex workers cannot be raped	

Rape myths are present at both the individual and institutional/societal levels and are one way in which sexual violence has been sustained and justified throughout history (Edwards et al., 2011; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994). According to Gqola (2016), rethinking and debunking rape myths will allow a move closer to a world in which rape is taken

seriously, where those who have experienced rape can be supported and where rape is dissuaded rather than excused.

Rape in the 21st century

The theoretical battles over the social meaning of rape have transpired since the early 1970s as previously discussed. Thus, the reality of sexual violence is not new but the construction of this condition as a social problem is a relatively recent consequence of activist effort and ideological shifts (Chasteen, 2001). Now in the 21st century, rape is framed as both an instance and example of larger patterns of gender inequality; not as an outcome of individual deviancy but as act of gender terrorism (Anderson & Doherty, 2007; Chasteen, 2001; Gavey, 2005; Gqola, 2016).

Gavey (2005) was interested in unpacking what could be called the scaffolding of rape, that is the discourses of sex and gender that produce forms of heterosex that set up the preconditions for rape – constructions of women’s (a)sexuality as passive and acquiescing and men’s heterosexuality as oriented towards the urgent pursuit of sexual release. Furthermore, rape has come to be understood as a form of punishment meted out to those who transcend dominant constructions of “normal” heterosexuality (gay men, lesbian women, trans, independent women, vulnerable men) (Ferfolja, 2008). So called “transgressive” sexual and gendered subjectivities challenge dominant constructions of gender and sexuality, for example women’s dependence on men; heterosexual normativity; and power relations inherent in the male-female binary relationship (Ferfolja, 2008; Ochse, 2011). As a result of this social non-compliance, individuals who inhabit such subjectivities are often constructed as deviant, abnormal or sick (Ferfolja, 2008). This seemingly legitimizes harassment, abuse and/or other forms of social regulation.

Thus, rape in the 21st century is understood as a tool to discipline non-normative sexuality and gender (Morrissey, 2013). It reinforces patriarchal and heteronormative ideas (Anderson & Doherty, 2007; Gqola, 2016). Furthermore, this conceptualisation of sexual violence challenges the notion that the problem is rooted in the individual and argues that dominant discourses of gender and sexuality create the opportunity for sexual violence to occur, and provides a range of socially acceptable excuses and justifications that can be mobilised to legitimate an act of rape (Anderson & Doherty, 2007; Chasteen, 2001; Gavey, 2005).

Perpetrators of rape: Review of theories and research

Despite the rise of feminist and critical approaches to the study of sexual violence, there remains an unwavering tradition of research in psychology that seeks to reduce this phenomenon to an individual level of analysis (Lea & Auburn, 2001). The area in which this type of research is perhaps most prevalent is in research on the perpetrators of rape (Abel et al., 1984; Ahlmeyer et al., 2003; Bryden & Grier, 2011; Groth & Birnbaum, 2013; Higgs, Canavan, & Meyer, 1992; Masessa, 2013; Scully & Marolla, 1984; Thornhill & Palmer, 2001; Ward, Hudson, Johnston, & Marshall, 1997). This section reviews the research and theories relating to perpetrators of rape to provide some insight into what has already been written.

Psychopathology of the rapist

Owing to the alarming incidence of rape, researchers have been trying in earnest to answer the question ‘What causes men to rape?’ (Blake & Gannon, 2010; Ward & Siegert, 2002). Some of these theorists were psychiatrists and, in their view, rapists were sick individuals and their behaviour reflected mental illness and irresistible impulses as a function of personality, adjustment, or bio-chemical abnormalities (Jones, 1999). Groth and Birnbaum (2013) claimed that rape was always a symptom of some psychological dysfunction; either transient, or chronic and repetitive. Psychotherapists’ interest in understanding the causes of sexual aggression tended to emphasise their clinical impressions; often interpreted through the lens of Freudian motivational theories which looks closely at the unconscious desires that motivate people to act in certain ways (Bryden & Grier, 2011). Other researchers compared the psychopathology and personality disorders of sex offenders with general population inmates in a prison (Ahlmeyer et al., 2003). According to their study, Ahlmeyer et al. (2003) found that sex offenders in general had more varied types of personalities than general population inmates. Specifically, they were more schizoid, avoidant, depressive, dependent, self-defeating, and schizotypal. Furthermore, general population inmates had the more classically criminal personality characteristics of antisocial, narcissistic, and sadistic. Ahlmeyer et al., (2003) also found that sex offenders had affective psychopathology such as anxiety, dysthymia, PTSD, and major depression. A similar trend was found when comparing child molesters to rapists. The child molesters were more neurotic, affective, and socially impaired than the rapists (Ahlmeyer et al., 2003). Research has also examined the perceptions of early interpersonal experiences of sex offenders using attachment theory as a basic explanatory framework (McCormack et al., 2002). It was found that most sexual offenders described interactions with caregivers as involving high levels of neglect and rejection and

low levels of supervision, discipline and consistency. Furthermore, negative relationships with fathers in conjunction with looser boundaries with mothers have been associated with sexual offending (Masessa, 2013; McCormack et al., 2002).

Evolutionary perspective of perpetrators of rape

Other scholars conducted research on genetic causes of conduct and this type of research began when several scientists laid the foundations of an evolutionary understanding of the mind (Bryden & Grier, 2011). Exploration of rape in nonhuman animals and a wider application of evolutionary principles to human behaviour have generated an alternative evolutionary view of rape as a potentially adaptive rather than a necessarily pathological act (Shields & Shields, 1983). It has been theorised that certain behaviours (called “adaptive”) were conducive to individual reproductive success over our evolutionary time span (Bryden & Grier, 2011). Because those who engage in adaptive behaviours were, by definition, more likely to pass on their genes, a tendency toward such behaviours eventually became innate (Bryden & Grier, 2011; Thornhill & Palmer, 2001). Furthermore, reproductive differences between men and women led to different psychological adaptations (Thornhill & Palmer, 2001). For men, the minimum investment necessary for reproductive success- a brief copulation- was exceedingly slight and as a result, a man’s genes were most likely to multiply if he was promiscuous, casually mating with many fertile partners (Ellis, 1989). That is why an ability to enjoy impersonal sex became part of men’s natures, along with a preference for youthful (fertile) mates (Ellis, 1989; Shields & Shields, 1983; Thornhill & Palmer, 2001). In females, the genetic logic supposedly created different tendencies. While men can sire thousands of offspring in a lifetime, women can produce much less so their genes gained much less advantage from promiscuity (Bryden & Grier, 2011; Ellis, 1989). If only because of pregnancy and nursing, the minimum cost to a woman of having a child is much higher than to a man (Shields & Shields, 1983; Thornhill & Palmer, 2001). For females the adaptive strategy was to choose mates carefully, seeking men who would assist the mother and child through enduring commitments and provision of resources (Ellis, 1989). As a result, women evolved to be more reserved and selective in the choices of mates (Bryden & Grier, 2011). According to Thornhill and Palmer (2001) since sexual coercion is a human activity, it should be explained naturalistically and in terms of natural selection.

Cognitive distortions of perpetrators of rape

In theories of sex offending, there is also a growing emphasis on the role of cognitive distortions in the commission of offences (Abel et al., 1984; Lea & Auburn, 2001; Ward,

Hudson, Johnston, & Marshall, 1997). Abel et al. (1984) pioneered a hypothesis that child molesters and other sexual offenders hold unusual beliefs that separate them from non-sexual offenders. They described these beliefs as ‘cognitive distortions’ which suggested that sexual offenders hold some degree of cognitive pathology leading them to severely distort social information (Abel et al., 1984). According to Abel et al. (1984), cognitive distortions are beliefs that individuals have developed as a result of a mismatch between their (deviant) sexual interests and their perceptions of societal norms. In later work, Abel, Gore, Holland and Camp (1989, as cited in Ciardha & Ward, 2013) explicitly incorporated justifications, perceptions, and judgements used to rationalize offending behaviour in their definition.

Initially, men convicted of sex offences were often identified as ‘holding’ such beliefs more strongly than other groups in society (Feild, 1978). Other researchers continued to evaluate rapists’ distorted beliefs (Beech, Swaffer, Multra, & Fisher, 2009; Blumenthal, Gudjonsson, & Burns, 1999; Ciardha & Ward, 2013) which led to the development of psychometric instruments which could be used specifically to assess sex offenders (Auburn & Lea, 2003). Such studies/instruments typically ask rapists and nonrapists to rate their agreement with a range of beliefs (Blake & Gannon, 2010). However, research using this method has been disappointing as it was found that rapists could not be differentiated from other offenders as well as community controls (Harmon, Owens, & Dewey, 1995; Polaschek & Gannon, 2004; Sattem, Savells, & Murray, 1984; Segal & Stermac, 1984). It was further argued that this kind of research focuses on measurement of surface cognitions rather than on understanding the underlying architecture responsible for generating and organising them (Polaschek & Gannon, 2004; Polaschek & Ward, 2002; Ward et al., 1997; Ward & Keenan, 1999).

Ward and colleagues sought to rectify this deficit by suggesting that schemata (organised patterns of thought) should be considered as causal theories that interact with personal experiences to form coherent structures that help to both explain and predict our own and others’ behaviour (Ward et al., 1997; Ward & Keenan, 1999). They called these theories implicit theories where, ‘implicit’ refers to an unconscious process that takes place largely outside of an individual’s awareness (Blake & Gannon, 2010). To aid in the construction of rape-supportive implicit theories, Polaschek and Ward (2002) reviewed a variety of scales and research sources of attitudinal statements that have been found to be endorsed by rapists. By considering the numerous distortions contained in these sources and by analysing them for common themes, they arrived at five implicit theories (Polaschek &

Ward, 2002): women are unknowable/dangerous; women are sex objects; male sex drive is uncontrollable; entitlement of men and; dangerous world theory. Soon after these implicit theories were constructed and outlined, Polaschek and Gannon (2004) found evidence for these five theories in interviews with imprisoned rapists.

Polaschek and Gannon (2004) explain that when rapists talk about their offending, they often reveal aspects of their world views. These perceptions of the world were deemed related, perhaps causally, to their sexually assaultive behaviour (Polaschek & Gannon, 2004).

Social learning perspective of perpetrators of rape

The social learning theory of rape explores the dimensions by which sex and rape become socially scripted behaviour that further contributes to the pervasive rape culture (Deming, 2009). This theory proposes that individuals are taught, through the socialisation process, the appropriate actions for their genders regarding their expected behaviours in society and that gender-based violence is normative (Ellis, 1989). Scully and Marolla (1984) view rape as behaviour learned socially through interaction with others; convicted rapists have learned the attitudes and actions consistent with sexual aggression against women. Learning also includes the acquisition of culturally derived vocabularies of motive, which can be used to reduce responsibility and to negotiate a non-deviant identity (Scully & Marolla, 1984). Scully and Marolla (1984) did an analysis of interviews that they had conducted with a sample of incarcerated rapists. An analysis of their accounts demonstrated how it was possible for these convicted rapists to view themselves as non-rapists. When rapists' accounts were examined, a typology emerged that consisted of admitters and deniers. Admitters acknowledged that they had forced sexual acts on their victims and defined the behaviour as rape but attempted to excuse it or themselves. In contrast, deniers either did not acknowledge sexual contact or association with the victim or admitted to sexual acts but did not define their behaviour as rape and further justified their actions (Scully & Marolla, 1984). Scully and Marolla (1984) found that the first form of denial was informed by the cultural view of men as sexually masterful and women as coy but seductive. Injury was denied by portraying the victim as willing, even enthusiastic, or as politely resistant at first but eventually yielding to "relax and enjoy it" (Scully & Marolla, 1984, p. 542). In these accounts, force appeared merely as a seductive technique. Scully and Marolla (1984) explain that rape was disclaimed: rather than harm the woman, the rapist had fulfilled her dreams. In the second form of denial, the victim was portrayed as the type of woman who "got what she deserved" (p. 542). It became evident that through attacks on the victim's sexual reputation and, to a lesser degree,

her emotional state, deniers attempted to demonstrate that since the victim wasn't a "nice girl," they were not rapists (Scully & Marolla, 1984). Scully and Marolla (1984) also found that admitters accentuated their own use of alcohol and drugs as an excuse and deniers emphasised the victim's consumption in an effort to both discredit her and make her appear more responsible for the rape.

Researchers then have continued to examine sex offenders' explanations for their offences and their use of culturally acquired vocabularies (Mann & Hollin, 2007; Muchoki, 2011). For instance, Muchoki (2011) found that some sex offenders are immersed in normative cultural expectations about sexuality and gender and that, within this framework, they are able to create a picture that shifts the blame from themselves to their victims. Furthermore, it was found that they attempt to foster the belief that women and girls, in one way or another, provoke rape. Such vocabularies are used to trivialise and neutralise instances of rape within the wider society (Muchoki, 2011).

Perpetrators of male/male rape

Research surrounding the concept of male/male sexual assault is sparse, especially regarding the perpetrators of the offence (Almond, McManus, & Ward, 2014). However, the little work that has been done is divided into two schools of thought: 1) that male sexual assault is predominantly a homosexual encounter, and/or 2) that male sexual assault is an expression of social dominance conducted by heterosexual offenders (Almond et al., 2014; Groth & Birnbaum, 2013; Sivakumaran, 2005; Turchik & Edwards, 2012). Groth and Birnbaum (2013) explain that in cases of male rape outside of prison, one might assume that the gender of the victim is an important and psychologically significant determinant of victim choice as compared to sexual assaults in institutional settings where there is no option regarding the sex of the victim. It was apparent in the research done by Groth and Birnbaum (2013) that for the offender who rapes other men in prison, the assault may be a counterpart to his sexual offences against women in the community and that the selection of a male as his victim, to a significant extent, is situationally determined. According to Groth and Birnbaum (2013), offenders who rape males in the community fall into two groups/categories/types. For the one category of offenders, the genders of their victims are not of special significance; their victims could be males and females (Groth & Birnbaum, 2013). This lack of discrimination would tend to suggest an undifferentiated or multisexual orientation (Groth & Birnbaum, 2013). The victim may symbolise what they want to control, punish and/or destroy- something they want to conquer and defeat, and the sexual assault is an act of

retaliation, of power and assertion of their strength or manhood (Groth & Birnbaum, 2013). The second category of offenders specifically target men. According to Groth and Birnbaum (2013), this is related to homosexuality; the selection of a male victim constitutes a counterpart to the selection of a female victim by a heterosexual rapist. It has also been said that men who are conflicted over and uncomfortable with their sexual attraction to and involvement with other men may target other men in their assaults as an expression of this unresolved aspect of their lives (Groth & Birnbaum, 2013). This is a reiteration of Groth and Burgess's (1980, as cited in Almond et al., 2014) motivational components of male on male sexual assault: conquest and control; revenge and retaliation that are motivated by anger; sadism and degradation; and conflict and counteraction that involved issues of unresolved sexuality. Hodge and Canter (1998, as cited in Almond et al., 2014) also concluded that there are two distinct types of perpetrators of male/male sexual assault. First, there are those sexual assaults committed by heterosexual men in which the assailant is not victim specific and that all males are potentially victims. These assaults tend to be stranger attacks motivated by dominance and control, with no sexual gratification involved (Hodge & Canter, 1998, as cited in Almond et al., 2014). It is suggested that this need to control and humiliate the victim may be further motivated by feelings of conflicted sexuality or gay hatred (Almond et al., 2014), drawing parallels with the assumptions of previously mentioned explanations by (Groth & Birnbaum, 2013). Second, there are those sexual assaults that are more likely to be committed by homosexual men, in which sexual gratification is a primary motivation for the attack (Hodge & Canter, 1998, as cited in Almond et al., 2014).

Female perpetrators of rape

Female sex offending is an under-researched area compared to male sexual offending (Beech, Parrett, Ward, & Fisher, 2009). However, the possibility of female sexual assault was recognised in academia as early as the 1980s (Finkelhor & Russell, 1984, as cited in Kramer, 2015). The primary challenge in researching female sexual abusers is that, compared with their male counterparts, very few women that commit sexual crimes are actually convicted and sentenced making it difficult to access these women and their victims (Kramer, 2015). Those women that are apprehended and researched by the justice and mental health systems tend to have committed a sexual crime against a child and are most often an accomplice to a male offender (Beech et al., 2009; Denov, 2001; Gannon, Rose, & Ward, 2008; Hayes & Carpenter, 2013; Kramer, 2015; Strickland, 2008).

While some studies claim that female sex abusers are a heterogeneous group (Gannon et al., 2008; Sandler & Freeman, 2007) others have attempted to construct generalisable profiles, typologies and classifications (Higgs et al., 1992; Vandiver & Kercher, 2004) in order to indicate any existing similarities across female sex abuser samples. Over the last two decades, the traditional means of understanding female sexual assault has been to place the abuser into one of three categories. These categories originate from a study conducted by Mathews, Matthews and Speltz (1989, as cited in Kramer, 2015) whereby qualitative data from interviews conducted with 16 convicted American female sexual offenders were used inductively to develop typologies. The first category is the Lover/Teacher type who rarely inflicts physical harm and views herself as a sexual educator (Higgs et al., 1992). Her victims are primarily male children and adolescents (Vandiver & Kercher, 2004). The second category is the Predisposed type. These women are regarded as arising from “a long transgenerational familial history of sexual abuse resulting in intense feelings of worthlessness” (Higgs et al., 1992, p.136). This type is described as very emotionally disturbed, psychotic or sociopathic (Travers, 1999, as cited in Kramer, 2015). The third category encompasses the Male-Coerced type, which describes female sex abusers that act under the, often abusive, instruction of a male accomplice (Higgs et al., 1992). In most of these cases the female abuser is romantically involved with or married to the male abuser and the victim is usually a family member or their own child (Vandiver & Kercher, 2004).

Significantly, none of the abovementioned typologies or theories of causation locate the responsibility for the crimes entirely within the abuser (Kramer, 2015). The fault seems to have an indirect frame of reference rather than the more direct one that is often applied to male abusers (Kramer, 2015). This may render female perpetration of rape invisible or not harmful (Denov, 2001).

Social constructions of rape, victims and perpetrators

As previously discussed, feminists refuted the long-held belief that rapists were men who were helplessly controlled by their overwhelming and deviant sexual impulses (Donat & D’Emilio, 1992). Rape is now recognised as an act of violence, not of sex as previously mentioned theories have held. Rape is a form of domination and control, a weapon used to “enforce women’s subordinate role to men” (Donat & D’Emilio, 1992, p. 15). Furthermore, normative gender relations were argued to be thoroughly implicated in the maintenance and support of rape (Gavey, 2005). Within radical feminism, rape came to be seen not simply as an outcome of individual male deviancy, but as an act of gender terrorism (Gavey, 2005).

Thus, sexual violence was redefined as a social problem. Social constructionism provides a perspective for exploring the social problem of sexual violence (Muehlenhard & Kimes, 1999).

Over the past three decades, substantial research has been conducted to better understand rape in the hopes of preventing it (Tharp et al., 2013). More specifically, research into social constructions regarding rape has been conducted across various social domains. Constructions of sexual violence have the power to label some acts negatively, while ignoring and, by implication, condoning other acts (Muehlenhard & Kimes, 1999). How sexual violence is constructed affects how people label, explain, evaluate, and assimilate their own experiences as well as the experience of others (Donat & D’Emilio, 1992; Gavey, 2005; Weiss, 2010). Furthermore, the social constructions of sexual violence convey numerous assumptions about power and coercion, sexuality and gender (Anderson & Doherty, 2007; Gavey, 2005; Lea & Auburn, 2001). Thus, from the beginning of the feminist discourse on rape, rape was framed as both an instance and example of larger patterns of gender inequality (Brownmiller, 1975; Chasteen, 2001). Many social scientists and other writers came to agree that rape was the endpoint on a continuum of heterosexual interactions where male aggression and female passivity are fundamental to the social construction of sexual violence (Gavey, 2005). Furthermore, social constructions of rape affect reactions to the phenomenon for example, by denying the high prevalence of rape, positioning the victims as responsible, or normalising some forms of coercion such as rape by intimates (Gavey, 2005). Researchers have investigated ways in which rape has been constructed in different media forums such as news media (Bonnes, 2010; O’Hara, 2012), comics (Garland, Branch, & Grimes, 2016), and fantasy literature (Philadelphoff-Puren, 2005; Prater, 2013).

Rape in news media

Bonnes (2010) conducted a critical analysis of a Grahamstown newspaper reporting on rape. It was found that these newspaper articles often reinforced patriarchy through de-emphasising the role of the rapist. By de-emphasising the role of the rapist, the perpetrators responsibility for rape is obscured. Bonnes (2010) further reported that victim-blaming goes hand-in-hand with de-emphasising the perpetrator. The de-emphasis of the perpetrators in newspaper articles demonstrates a lack of sympathy for the victim. For instance, it was suggested that victims should avoid certain behaviours and ways of dressing to avoid rape (Bonnes, 2010). When a victim does not avoid those things, she is often depicted in the news as to blame for the rape. Berrington and Jones (2002) reported that when a victim avoids such

behaviours, they are portrayed as sensible women. Similarly, O’Hara (2012) analysed newspaper articles and found that victims were portrayed as either virgins attacked by so-called monsters or as promiscuous women who invited the rape. Furthermore, news media frequently portrayed rapists as sociopathic monsters (Bonnes, 2010; O’Hara, 2012). This reinforces popular conceptions of rapists as sick or disturbed men.

Rape in comic books

Garland et al. (2016) examined instances of rape and sexual assault in comic books to determine which popular rape myths were identified and supported within the manifest and latent content of this form of media. Overall, findings suggest that comic portrayals of rape and sexual assault reveal negative cultural stereotypes and reinforce victim blaming (Garland et al., 2016). The scenes support many different rape myths that contribute to victim blaming, such as the myths that victims provoke perpetrators to rape them and that victims could avoid rape by changing their conduct (i.e., job choice, dressing provocatively, being out alone, being under the influence). Other myths supported by comic books that contribute to victim blaming include the myths that when a victim says “no,” he or she really means “yes,” and that if a victim really wanted to stop the rape from occurring, he or she would have (Garland et al., 2016).

Rape in fantasy literature

Philadelphoff-Puren (2005) considered Charlotte Lamb, a Mills and Boon writer, who has sold over 100 million copies of romantic fantasy literature worldwide. According to Philadelphoff-Puren (2005), her novels are marked by a specific stylistic signature; that is, her consistently violent representation of heterosexual sex. The heroines in her books can be expected to resist all sexual advances very strongly, while her heroes determinedly ignore all refusals on the part of the heroines, even those refusals which include expressions of pain (Philadelphoff-Puren, 2005). Furthermore, according to Prater (2013), fantasy literature is one more culturally powerful genre in which rape is narrated and given that the genre is widely read and popular, it has some power to reinforce and naturalise rape culture. Myths, language and metaphors produce meaning, they shape the way an event is experienced in the world (Prater, 2013). Fantasy narratives in particular are a place where rape myths can be reiterated as they often feature ideas of heterosexuality marked by aggressive ‘seduction’; a model in which an overbearing man ignores his partner’s resistance (Prater, 2013).

Constructions of rape through talk

There are also studies that examine how the general population construct rape through talk (Chasteen, 2001; Dosekun, 2013; O’Byrne et al., 2008). Chasteen’s (2001) goal was to explore the everyday definition and interpretation of rape held by women. It was found that rape had been constructed as a form of personal destruction and a form of theft. In terms of the personal destruction construction, women talked about rape as a destruction of the physical and emotional self; as an act that strips them of everything that is theirs in a way that can never be replaced (Chasteen, 2001). Chasteen also found that in terms of the theft construction, women talked about rape as stealing or taking something valuable; like a robbery or invasion of a sacred place. Rape was also constructed as an event that propels one into a particular position in a social structure (Chasteen, 2001). That is, the raped woman is subjugated, stigmatized, and judged for her new status as victim (Chasteen, 2001). Weiss (2009) examined 944 narratives of women that had been raped and found that women excuse or justify their situations, largely by drawing on social vocabularies related to a rape supportive culture. For instance, it was found that women attributed offenders’ sexually coercive behaviour to their natural and apparently uncontrollable biological urges as men. This also implicated victims as responsible for igniting these uncontrollable urges (Weiss, 2009). Weiss (2009) also found that women did not call their experience rape because there was no serious injury or because their experience was explained as a normal part of intimate relationships. Furthermore, these women drew on victim blaming vocabularies by suggesting that it was their fault for acting inappropriately or failing to resist effectively. Weiss (2009) concluded that the vocabulary used to justify and excuse sexual victimisation reflect several common rape myths and gender stereotypes. Dosekun (2013) considered how the issue of rape in South Africa is discursively constructed by women who have not experienced it. These women made use of the statistics repertoire in their talk to construct rape as a clear crisis in South Africa (Dosekun, 2013). Furthermore, they constructed rape as a violent act of a crazy or criminal man. Dosekun (2013) also found that the race repertoire was used to construct the rapist as the racial Other, more specifically as a black man. The gender repertoire was used to construct rape as a function of everyday, unequal norms which advantaged men and disadvantaged women (Dosekun, 2013). Dosekun (2013) concluded that these repertoires intersected to construct rape as horrifically prevalent in South Africa, yet concerning a classed, raced, and spatially distanced other. In looking at young men’s understandings of sexual refusal, O’Byrne, et al. (2008) found that rape was constructed as an extreme example of miscommunication and as victim precipitated. The miscommunication

model was invoked to suggest that no does not always mean no, that if no is not explicitly and verbally stated then rape is just consensual sex and, that women's attempts at communication is difficult for men to interpret (O'Byrne, et al., 2008). Furthermore, the victim precipitation model was invoked to suggest that women can and should avoid the occurrence of rape by not placing themselves in 'flirty' situations and in private spaces with men. O'Byrne, et al. (2008) concluded that discursive resources of a rape culture are readily available.

Constructions of rape by professionals

Research has also been done on professional perspectives of sexual offenders. For instance, Lea, Auburn, and Kibblewhite (1999) did a study on professionals' (police officers, psychologists, social workers and probation officers) perceptions, attitudes and experiences with working with sex offenders. The findings from this study showed that professionals viewed rapists as violent, aggressive and driven by the need to dominate and control (Lea et al., 1999). Other characteristics ascribed to rapists were that they were psychopathic and predatory. It was also found that professionals understandings of the motivation to rape include that sexual offending is a learned social behaviour, a consequence of not being able to form normal social relationships, a symptom of deviance, and rooted in the need for sexual gratification. Elias and Haj-Yahia (2017) explored the perceptions of social workers who work with sex offenders. It was found that, regarding motives, these professionals talked about sex offences as a disorder or deficit in personal development, as a difficulty controlling impulses, a lack of boundaries, difficulty in interpersonal relationships, and distorted thinking. Furthermore, Elias and Haj-Yahia (2017) found that social workers talked about sex offenders' appearance as seemingly normative and educated which does not fit with the offenders' deviant personalities. These professionals also perceived sex offenders to be manipulative, devious and self-absorbed. Also, sex offenders were viewed as damaged people who had suffered in the course of their development (Elias & Haj-Yahia, 2017). Denov (2001) explored professional (police officers and psychiatrists) perspectives on female sexual offending. It was found that for these professionals, the gender of the offender appears central to the meaning of the sexual offence and thus cannot be conceptualised without its gendered context. As female sex offending challenges traditional sexual scripts concerning 'appropriate' female behaviour, it appears that efforts are made, either consciously or unconsciously, to transform the offender and her offence, realigning them with more culturally acceptable notions of female behaviour, ultimately leading to the denial of the

problem (Denov, 2001). That is, professionals often portrayed female sex offenders as harmless, benign women incapable of sexual aggression. Denov (2001) found that although professionals recognised that a sexual offence had occurred, the female offender's actions were absolved by affirming that there was no malicious intent to her actions. Also, that, despite her sexually aggressive behaviour, she was portrayed as posing no threat or danger to community. Lastly, the circumstances surrounding the sexual offense were reconstructed and the victim was held responsible for the incident especially if he was male (Denov, 2001).

Exploring the views of professionals becomes important as they may be the key actors in informing researchers and policymakers in this field in the future (Collins & Nee, 2010; Elias & Haj-Yahia, 2017). Research by professionals impact on legislation, decision-making, clinical practice and intervention - all with the aim of protecting potential future victims and to prevent relapse (Elias & Haj-Yahia, 2017). Research by professionals within a discipline, for instance social sciences, has the status of expert knowledge in which case it holds power (Foucault, 1980). This knowledge and power are carried out through, and infiltrates everyday social discourses (Foucault, 1995; Woodward, 2009).

Throughout history, media portrayals have shaped what is deemed important in a culture and the way people view others (Everett, 2015). Popular magazines, movies, music, and the news provide people with information regarding the needs and behaviours of individuals and groups; therefore, when real-life interactions with these populations are limited, media portrayals can significantly influence perception (Everett, 2015). Furthermore, the academy has its own channels of knowledge distribution that serve as the medium through which its messages and meanings are articulated and disseminated. These mediums include, but are not limited to, scholarly books, conferences, the classroom, the co-curriculum, and academic journals which not only produces knowledge within a wider cultural context but also the knowledge percolates back into popular culture (Parker, Georgaca, Harper, McLaughlin, & Stowell-Smith, 1995). Academic journals have become the official record of a discipline and shapes our understanding of phenomena (Enger, 2003; Everett, 2015).

Journal articles: Advancing knowledge through publication

Knowledge is a diverse and multi-faceted phenomenon (Woodward, 2009). Psychology produces powerful kinds of knowledge (Hook, 2004a). Vocabularies, theories and techniques of psychology have come to hold particular versions of people and social

phenomena in place. These knowledges have a great deal of power in modern societies as they are formulated by ‘experts’ and reproduced in networks of writing (Foucault, 1995; Hook, 2004a). The documentation of these knowledges by experts can be found in journal articles which, according to Enger (2003) and Everett (2015), serve as a discipline’s official discourse. Thus, psychology journal articles, in their role as the discipline’s official discourse, sets the agenda for and reflects what has been deemed important at specific points in time within the field. Issues addressed in the journal articles influence practice and subsequent scholarship, as practitioners are encouraged to remain engaged so their practice is informed by scholarly research (Everett, 2015). Within the genre of academic journals, peer reviewed journals hold the most prestige (Marsh & Ball, 1989; Suls & Martin, 2009). Peer review is a highly esteemed process in many academic disciplines in which the quality of a manuscript is evaluated for publication.

The development of disciplines such as psychology rests upon an ever-growing framework of ideas that is generated and tested over time through the collective research of scholars working toward the advancement of knowledge (Enger, 2003). Scholarship contributes to human knowledge, confronts the unknown, and seeks understanding for its own sake (Boyer, Moser, Ream, & Braxton, 2015). Over time, with continued application, acceptance, and analysis, theories may become known as basic knowledge within a discipline (Boyer et al., 2015). The underpinnings of specific theories eventually become widely accepted and passed along to students as primary tenets of understanding; knowing these tenets becomes necessary for progressing through a discipline and eventually discovering new theories and applications and further advancing knowledge (Enger, 2003).

Over the last century, one method of advancing knowledge has been through the publication of articles in academic journals (Enger, 2003). The publication is how we come to know about our world, is socially constructed, and is defined as an ongoing process embedded in the communication of the members of a discipline (Mirielli, 2003).

Review of rape in journal articles

In conducting a search for studies investigating the way in which journal articles have framed rape, it became apparent that such research is limited. Studies that were found included a content analysis of rape in social work literature; a content analysis of psychological research on domestic violence, sexual assault, and sexual harassment; a review

of what has been published in PsychInfo relating to rape and sexual assault and; a critical sociological enquiry in to the ways in rape is framed in scholarly discussions in South Africa.

McMahon and Schwartz (2011) reported on a content analysis of the social work research literature to assess the level of attention that the profession has paid to the rape of adults. The authors analysed 66 articles that appeared in 35 different peer-reviewed journals between 1975 and 2008. The study found that rape was a primary focus in about one third of social work articles. However, 4% of the articles connected rape with another issue that were central to the social work profession such as alcohol/drug use, child abuse, disabilities, feminism, health, sexualities, mental health, poverty, pregnancy, and domestic violence (McMahon & Schwartz, 2011). According to McMahon and Schwartz, in the remaining articles, rape was mentioned only as a variable related to other social issues but was not explored in depth. Most articles were client focused and highlighted the impact of rape on clients, the lack of screening and clients' disclosure of rape, and interventions for survivors. The authors also found that articles addressing practitioners' needs were few however included topics such as the need for increased support for social workers through training or supervisions, the impact of working with rape survivors and the potential for vicarious trauma, and including content on rape in social work formal education. Even fewer articles were found addressing macro-level issues such as rape in relation to sexism, gender roles, media, race, culture, legal systems, religion, social work ethics, and therapy or counselling. Furthermore, McMahon and Schwartz found that theoretical frameworks were provided in 15 articles with feminist theories used most frequently. Stress and coping theories were used to describe survivors' various responses in 3 articles, the ecological framework was used in 2 articles, and the remaining 3 referred to cognitive, developmental and psychodynamic theories. Based on their findings, McMahon and Schwartz concluded that the low overall number of articles available for their study is an indication that the issue of rape has not been a priority in the profession. Furthermore, they concluded that within the social work profession, more emphasis needs to be placed on screening clients for sexual violence and on training practitioners on how to respond safely and properly. In addition, more needed to be done regarding the impact of engaging with survivors as well as on evaluating strategies to assist social workers and to prevent vicarious trauma. McMahon and Schwartz also concluded that rape within different cultural groups needs to be further understood and included in research as culture will have a direct impact on resources available and survivors' willingness to access these services.

Previous critiques of traditional psychology portrayed a discipline that examines social problems from an exceptionalistic perspective; that is, as conceptualising social problems as individual defects (Prilleltensky, 1989, as cited in Salazar & Cook, 2002). Salazar and Cook (2002) analysed 10 years of psychological research on domestic violence, sexual assault, and sexual harassment to determine whether this criticism applied to research on violence against women. Overall, Salazar and Cook found an emphasis on causal research with less attention given to intervention research. Furthermore, most of this research, particularly the sexual assault and domestic violence literatures, targets the individual level and is evidence of exceptionalism. According to Salazar and Cook's findings, research in sexual harassment though, a problem manifest in organisations, contains the largest proportion of studies that focus on system and organisation levels. Furthermore, Salazar and Cook found evidence of an exceptionalistic perspective in their analysis of sample composition in domestic violence studies, where over half the causal and intervention studies involved victims and perpetrators. However, for sexual assault and sexual harassment, a minority of studies focused on victims and perpetrators. This finding suggests that sexual assault and sexual harassment fields study the problem in relation to other groups of individuals who play some role in the prevention or maintenance of these problems. However, Salazar and Cook found that a great number of sexual assault studies explore questions in samples drawn from student populations while very few conduct research with community samples or with relevant systems or organisational personnel. Furthermore, findings showed that sexual harassment research is frequently conducted in higher education settings, where the problem is prevalent, but less often conducted in workplace settings, where the problem also occurs. Also, they found that an overwhelming majority of studies do not examine contextual factors. That is, psychology tends to ignore the social, political, and historical context of the problem. Salazar and Cook concluded that an absence of context, coupled with an overemphasis on causality versus intervention, individual level analyses, and sampling from limited settings, suggest that as a discipline psychology maintains a reliance on individual psychology to reveal answers to violence against women issues that for the most part may reside in social and cultural institutions. These findings support the view that psychological research on violence against women suffers from a heavy emphasis on exceptionalism at the expense of a universalistic perspective (Salazar & Cook, 2002).

Koss (2005) did a review of rape and sexual assault publications in PsychInfo. She tracked the number of articles published and highlighted a gradual increase between 86 years

prior to 1958 and 1973. Koss further reported on a dramatic increase in articles published on rape from 1974 onwards. Koss then examined the topics relating to rape published in specific time periods from 1974. She documents a lengthy list of topics, some of which are still present in rape literature today. Her results showed that majority of the topics related to victims of rape, their assessment, experiences and treatment. She also reported that studies focussing on rape myths emerged in 1979 however only became a large portion of literature on rape in the most recent 5-year period of her research, which was from 1999. It was also during this time that Koss found the emergence of studies focussing on the discourse analysis of rape. More relevant to the current research on perpetrators of rape, it is noted that Koss found studies focussing on typologies of rapists in 1974 and the social skills of rapists in 1989. However, topics relating to perpetrators of rape were limited.

Buiten and Naidoo (2016) considered how scholarly discussions on rape in South Africa are evolving by applying a critical sociological lens of enquiry to the ways in which the problem of rape is constructed. They found that rape has come to be understood within social scholarship, both in South Africa and internationally, as being a manifestation as well as a demonstration of unequal and gendered power. That is, discussions have moved away from individualized conceptualisations of rape as an act of sexual desire and moved towards understandings of the role of social structure and power relations. They found that feminist scholars have contributed to reframing rape as a problem of socially constructed gender norms and sexualities. Furthermore, Buiten and Naidoo found that the reframing of rape as a manifestation of gendered power led to an increase in research focusing on the role of masculinities. That is, gender socialisation into violent, emphasised masculinity has been identified as being a significant factor in the perpetration of rape. It was also found that race and class have been implicated in the problem of rape in South Africa. However, the role of race and class in the issue of rape has become both highly visible and invisible. In discussions of the causes of rape, scholars have written about racial and economic inequalities as contributing factors, and the ways in which these intersect with gender have been brought to the fore (Buiten & Naidoo, 2016). On the other hand, Buiten and Naidoo found that there is a tendency for contemporary research into incidence and attitudes that contribute to rape to focus on black African men and particular geographical spaces, which often without explicitly addressing the focus on these 'South African men', has implicitly racialized and classed the issue of rape. Furthermore, research into various privileged groups of men in South Africa is far less common and by not addressing these patterns in contemporary

research explicitly, the assumptions about perpetrators and the role of South African men in general are reinforced. Lastly, Buiten and Naidoo found that there is a concentration of literature focusing on the link between rape and health framing rape as a health and medical problem. That is, most of the South African literature on rape as a specific form of gender-based violence is located within epidemiology. Upon further investigation, it was found that epidemiological studies of rape tend to frame it not only as a health problem, but as a public health problem, for both victim and perpetrator, particularly when rape is associated with HIV infection. Rape is subsequently framed as having national consequences, especially through the link with HIV/AIDS, as well as through social factors such as culture and poverty which are referenced as causes and implicated through correlations. According to Buiten and Naidoo, this framing moves beyond individualized understandings of the health dimensions of rape, reiterating the approach of gender and feminist scholars who construct rape as a social rather than individual problem. However, Buiten and Naidoo concluded that while this is a strength of the epidemiological work on rape, there are nonetheless limitations in this framing. That is, framing rape primarily as a health problem or epidemic, although constructed as a public health issue, carries a tendency to understand the impact of rape in more narrowly defined health terms. Furthermore, a strong concentration of epidemiological studies on rape serves to medicalize it, drawing on an implicitly narrower interpretation of ‘harm’ than a sociological analysis might. Thus, rape is still represented primarily as a medical and psychological threat, rather than also as a social threat in broader terms (Buiten & Naidoo, 2016).

After conducting searches using numerous databases such as Proquest, Ebscohost, Sage journals, Taylor and Francis, the University of Pretoria’s institutional repository, as well as obtaining the help of a research librarian at the University of Pretoria, research on the social construction of rape, and more specifically of perpetrators, in academic texts has thus far not been found.

Concluding remarks

In any culture, including the academic culture, norms and values are communicated through discourse. Discourse is defined as “an interrelated set of texts, and the practices of their production, dissemination, and reception, that brings an object into being” (Phillips & Hardy, 2002, p. 3). In other words, discourses are the aggregate of speech, writing, thought, and feelings on a topic, or set of topics, that both define and are defined by those topics. The area of rape/sexual violence has a particular history and culture that must be taken into

consideration when examining the discourses found within (Everett, 2015). Thus, the previous section provided an overview of the social phenomenon of rape. There was a discussion on rape myths and a rape supportive culture, a brief overview of theories and research pertaining to perpetrators of rape. Furthermore, research regarding social constructions of rape, victims and perpetrators that has been conducted across various social domains such as news media, comic books, fantasy literature, talk of the general population as well as in the professional domains was also discussed. Furthermore, in understanding the context of this study, the previous sections discussed journal articles and the advancement of knowledge through publication, and a review of rape in journal articles. What seems to be lacking in the literature is an investigation into the way in which academic articles have constructed the phenomenon of sexual violence. More specifically, how journal articles, with the primary focus on perpetrators of rape, have discursively constructed perpetrators. This informs the rationale of my research. The next chapter will explain my theoretical point of departure. This includes an overview of poststructuralism as well as social constructionism. I will also provide a comprehensive discussion of discourse analysis as theory and method. These discussions inform the underpinning of my research and methodology.

CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL POINT OF DEPARTURE

This chapter outlines the theoretical background which informs this research by briefly discussing social constructionism and poststructuralism, and the assumptions they make about language, knowledge, and power. It also includes a discussion of some of the work of Michel Foucault, specifically relating to power, disciplinary power, and the relationship between power, knowledge and truth. This allows for a greater understanding of the theoretical lens through which this research is carried out. This is followed by a brief overview on discourse, subject positions, and subjectivity. This will aid in further understanding Foucauldian discourse analysis, which will also be briefly discussed, as it informs the methodology of this research.

Social constructionism

Social constructionists adopt a critical stance towards assumptions and knowledge about the world (Burr, 2015). From this perspective, research looks at the constitutive nature of language and is aimed at identifying the numerous available constructions of social reality in a given culture (Willig, 2013). It also looks at how these constructions are used, and what the implication might be for human experience and social practice (Willig, 2013).

Historically and still evident today, there is the assumption of reality as knowable and that it is possible to discover objective facts that represent general truths about a basic, underlying reality through the scientific method (Corey, 2013). It is from this view that the power of science and knowledge of objective experts came to be relied on as they supposedly possess the truth about a reality that is out there (Becvar & Becvar, 2014). Social constructionism challenges the notions of unbiased observations, absolute truths and objective scientific knowledge (Khoja-Moolji, 2014) as well as the idea that the world and people have a particular 'nature' to be discovered (Hook, 2007). For instance, social constructionism challenges the idea that psychology can uncover the essential characteristics of individual people (Lock & Strong, 2010). Rather, social constructionism sees reality as socially constituted (Burr, 2015).

According to Burr (2015), social constructionism is grounded on four key assumptions. First, social constructionists take a critical stance towards taken-for-granted knowledge by challenging conventional knowledge that has historically guided our understandings (Burr, 2015). Burr further explains that we should be critical of the idea that we can know the nature of the world by objectively observing it and rather be ever suspicious

of our assumptions about how the world appears to be. That is, social categories for instance may be seemingly natural, however it is argued from this perspective that these categories are constructed through language (Burr, 2015; Gergen, 2001). Similarly, Parker (2004) explains that language renders objects and events “thinkable and knowable” in the sense that they are given shape and meaning (p.154). Burr (1998) describes the concept of ‘constructive alternativism’ which is the idea that there are a potentially infinite number of alternative constructions of reality (p. 13). If what we take ourselves and others to be are constructions and not objective descriptions, then social categories such as race, gender, and sexuality for instance are taken as human constructions, not fixed and naturally occurring.

The second assumption of social constructionism is the belief that language and concepts used to generally understand the world are historically and culturally relative (Burr, 2015; Lock & Strong, 2010). That is, over different situations, the meanings of particular events as well as our ways of understanding them vary (Lock & Strong, 2010). Where and when one lives in the world will influence the way we understand and engage with different human categories such as men and women for instance. Furthermore, ways of understanding are not only specific to culture and periods of history but are also a product thereof (Burr, 2015). Burr explains, then, that one cannot assume that ‘our’ ways of understanding are any nearer to the truth than others’.

Thirdly is the assumption that knowledge is constructed through social processes, and what is considered to be truth is a product of daily interactions between people (Burr, 2015). Also, as knowledge is derived through a communication process (Dant, 2013; Gergen, 2001), when we talk, write, represent ideas in pictures, music and dance, we are involved in exchanging meaning about the world. Thus, all these forms of cultural communication can be treated as constructions (Dant, 2013).

The fourth assumption is that knowledge and social action go together (Burr, 2015). Here it is argued that we can talk of numerous possible constructions of the world and each construction brings with it a different kind of action from humans (Burr, 2015). Therefore, a social constructionist approach looks at how these constructions are used and what the implications might be for social practice and experience (Willig, 2013). For instance, we consider how these constructions bring about what is acceptable for different people to do and how they treat or experience others (Burr, 2015). Burr argues that much of the experience that constitutes us as people is socially constructed and that language is at the heart of this

constructions process. Burr uses the analogy of language as a bag of labels. Not only can we choose from the bag of labels to describe and construct events and experiences, but also our internal states. Thus, people are self-defining and socially constructed participants in their shared lives (Lock & Strong, 2010). Lock and Strong (2010) further state that a social constructionist perspective replaces the notion of ‘description’ with ‘construction’ because language is a social action which constructs versions of reality.

Through a social constructionist lens then, this research does not attempt to uncover an underlying psychological truth about perpetrators of rape, but rather looks at the constitutive nature of language and the available constructions of perpetrators of rape in psychology journal articles.

Poststructuralism

Poststructuralism, like social constructionism, assumes that language constructs the phenomena it describes (Namaste, 1994). However, poststructuralism moves beyond social constructionism by focusing on the ways in which power circulates within language communities and through language practices to constitute meanings and subjects (Khoja-Moolji, 2014). Thus, poststructuralism refers to a theoretical orientation that revolves around the relationship between power, language, and knowledge (Fox, 2014)

Poststructuralism is an extension and advancement of structuralism and the work of Saussure (1974), a linguist who emphasised that language constitutes the world as people know it and thus also creates social identities and social relationships (Stead & Bakker, 2010). The key concept highlighted by Saussure (1974) is that of the sign. Signs can be thought of as the things that populate our mental life, things we may refer to, talk about, muse upon, try to describe and so on (Burr, 2015). Signs have two parts to them. There is the thing referred to (the concept) which he called the signification or signified and there is the word or spoken sound pattern used to refer to it which he called the signal or signifier (Saussure, 1974). However, Saussure also believed that once a signifier became attached to a signified, this relationship became fixed (Burr, 2015; Holdcroft, 1991). This means that once words become attached to particular meanings they are fixed in that relationship, so that the same word always has the same meaning (Burr, 2015).

The departure from structuralism is based on the view that meaning is never fixed in which case poststructuralism welcomes the plurality of meanings (Gavey, 1989). Words, sentences, poems, books, jokes and so on change their meaning over time, from context to

context and from person to person (Burr, 2015). Thus, meaning is always contestable; rather than language being a system of signs with fixed meanings upon which everyone agrees, it is a site of variability, disagreement and potential conflict (Burr, 2015; Williams, 2014). From a poststructuralist view, then, talk, writing and social encounters are sites where power relations are acted out (Gavey, 1989).

Another contribution to poststructuralism is Derrida's (1978) argument that it is in the nature of language to produce meaning only with reference to other meanings (Agger, 1991; Hepburn, 1999). Derrida (1978) further argued that users of language attempt to define concepts through their difference from other things. Derrida (1978) coined the term 'différance', meaning both a difference and an act of deferring, to characterize the way in which linguistic meaning is created rather than given. Because each word depends on the meaning of other words, it is argued that the meaning of a word is never fully 'present' to us; instead it is endlessly deferred in an infinitely long chain of meanings (Hepburn, 1999). Derrida (1978, 1998) expresses this idea by saying that meaning is created by the play of differences between words; a play that is limitless, infinite and indefinite. Namaste (1994) explains that a focus on this play is useful because it reveals that what appears to be outside a given system is always already fully inside it; that which seems to be natural is historical.

Furthermore, Hepburn (1999) explains that logocentrism is the tendency to "invoke some such ultimate authority as a foundation for all thought, language and action", and that this authority is invoked through the operation of binary oppositions (p. 644). Derrida (1998) suggested that logocentric claims to know the truth about the world will take one or more binary oppositions and privilege it over the other. Privileging one pole of the opposition deliberately obscures or silences the rival voices of the inferior pole, drowning out other claims to know the truth, or to offer an alternative reading of things (Fox, 2014; Hesse-Biber & Hesse-Biber, 2012; Namaste, 1994). Therefore recognising the impossibility of direct knowledge of reality is important from this perspective as well as to acknowledge the possibility of unraveling a text's assumptions and uncover repressed meanings (Allen, 2011; Hepburn, 1999; Namaste, 1994).

Poststructuralism requires that researchers examine power and how it operates through discourse and knowledge (Brown & Strega, 2005; Dickerson, 2010). People have power in direct proportion to their ability to participate in discourses that shape society (Foucault, 1980, 1994). Thus, it is also from a poststructuralist perspective that it is suggested

that this relationship between power and knowledge can have consequences for subjectivity and identity (Agger, 1991; Fox, 2014; Gavey, 1989; Williams, 2014). Of particular importance, and relevant to this research, is the work of Michel Foucault (1997) where discourses are seen to “articulate what we think, say and do” (p. 315).

Foucault and power

Michel Foucault questioned the nature of power and its impact on people (Rabinow & Rose, 2003). He brought forward how power produces truth and how our “truths” about ourselves and the world are linked to various institutional practices which aim “to know and manage human individuals” (Rabinow & Rose, 2003, p. 3).

These truths, ways of knowing, and discursive formations position us in relations of power because it has implications for how we are treated, what we can do and say (Parker, 1999). By suggesting that power is exercised through discourse (Willig, 2013), and an effect of discourse (Burr, 2015), Foucault is demonstrating that we should not view power in negative terms. That is, power does not only exclude, repress, censor, mask or conceal (Foucault, 1995). According to Foucault (1995), “power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth” (p. 194). Furthermore, Foucault (1978) states that “power is everywhere” (p.93).

In his writing about power, Foucault (1995) notes that in premodern societies power and social authority were centered in the sovereign power and force was exercised to elicit compliance. This conception of power gradually shifted to a new form of disciplinary power through which people are managed and controlled by willingly submitting themselves to their own and others’ scrutiny (Burr, 2015). According to Foucault (1978), the classical privilege of sovereign power is the “right to take life or let live” (p.136). Sovereignty manifested itself as a right to kill when then sovereign’s existence is in danger (Foucault, 1978). Because the law represents the will of the sovereign, a violation of law is simultaneously an attack of the sovereign (Hook, 2004b). Consequently, those who break the law are not only punished for their wrongdoing but are prosecuted as enemies who challenge the authority and existence of the sovereign (Foucault, 1995). Furthermore, Foucault (1995) explains the public spectacle of torture as an example of a form of punishment reflective of sovereignty in which the criminal had to be physically attacked, tortured, dismembered, destroyed, in a symbolic display of the sovereign’s power.

In contrast to the repressive mode of sovereign power, Foucault (1995) articulated the shift from public punishment to a modern form of power in which people exercised discipline among themselves and others. This modern power, disciplinary power, is productive rather than repressive in that it brings things into being (Hook, 2004b).

Disciplinary power

Disciplinary power is subtler and more pervasive and instead of coming from a central authority it is carried out through discourse (Combs & Freedman, 2012). Foucault (1995) argued that it was more effective than sovereign power because it led to greater maintenance and control of the population by producing “subjected and practiced, ‘docile bodies’” (p.138). The human body began to enter a machinery of power that “explores it, breaks it down and rearranges it” (Foucault, 1995, p.138).

According to Foucault (1995), the success of disciplinary power derives from the use of three instruments; the hierarchical observation, normalising judgement, and the examination. The concept of hierarchical observation assumes that the exercise of discipline coerces by observation and not force (Foucault, 1995). It is the actions of individuals being constantly watched by persons of a higher power or supervisors, that “maintains the disciplined individual in his subjection” (Foucault, 1995, p. 187). In his writing, Foucault uses Jeremy Bentham’s Panopticon to conceptualise surveillance in modern society. The panopticon is a structural design of an ideal prison that makes all individual cells observable from a central watch tower but makes the watch tower itself unobservable from the cells (Foucault, 1995). Thus, prisoners do not know when and if they are being watched. According to Foucault (1995), this enables disciplinary power to be both “absolutely indiscreet” since it is assumed to be everywhere and always alert, and discreet, since it functions “permanently and largely in silence” (p. 177). This omnipresent hierarchical surveillance or disciplinary gaze is associated with a hold over the body or a mechanism of power because those being watched will begin to regulate their own behaviour (Foucault, 1995). The argument is that the practice of surveillance becomes internalised and all members of society then came to monitor and control their own and others’ behaviour according to the prevailing standards of normality (Burr, 2015).

The concept of normalising judgement, another disciplinary instrument, refers to the evaluation and correction of behaviours through comparing and classifying individuals based on conformity to a standard or norm (Foucault, 1995). The aim of discipline then is

normalisation in which irregularities are eliminated and individuals become increasingly homogeneous (Hook, 2004b). According to Foucault (1995), minor punishments, consisting of “a whole series of subtle procedures...from light physical punishment to minor deprivations and petty humiliations” were used to correct and train individuals to behave in accordance with the norm (p. 178). However, it was no longer only errors and wrong doings that were deemed punishable, but also failing to attain a certain standard. Thus, “the whole domain of non-conformity now became punishable” (Hook, 2004a, p. 227). That is, a “micro-penalty” operated in which deviations from the rigorous set of norms or categories regarding the most detailed aspects of everyday human behaviour such as the use of time, the way in which activities were carried out, the way in which individuals spoke, the way in which the body functioned and moved, became the object of disciplinary attention (Foucault, 1995). Now, scholars have observed normalising judgement in a variety of social forums including, for instance, definitions of physical or mental illness (Keenan, 2001). However, it is not only patients and clients who are objects of normalising judgement but those who inhabit positions of disciplinary power over them such as psychologists and doctors are then subject to disciplinary techniques (Keenan, 2001). Psychology is implicated here to the extent that it has provided us with various ways of assessing and categorising people (Burr, 2015), and relevant to this research, perpetrators of sexual violence.

According to Foucault (1995), the hierarchical observation and normalising judgement come together in the ‘examination’, the third instrument of disciplinary power. The examination is a “normalising gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to quantify, to classify and to punish” (Foucault, 1995, p. 184). The examination provided a means by which the individual is always seen and evaluated, and places individuals in a “network of writing” that captures and fixes them (Foucault, 1995, p.189). That is, results of the examination are documented in ways that aim to identify aspects of the individual and, this system of examination and documentation allowed for the creation of the individual as an object that can be described, analysed and compared (Foucault, 1995). The accumulation of documents and the organisation of comparative fields made it possible to “classify, form categories, to determine averages, to fix norms” (Foucault, 1995, p.190). Thus, a “power of writing” became essential in the mechanisms of discipline (p. 189). The examinations then, “surrounded by all its documentary techniques, makes each individual a ‘case’” (Foucault, 1995, p. 191). That is, an individual could be described, judged, measured, compared to, trained, corrected, classified, normalised or excluded based on the examination. Therefore,

description becomes “a means of control and method of domination” (Foucault, 1995, p. 191). According to Foucault, the examination is at the center of constituting the individual “as effect and object of power” and of knowledge (p. 192). Foucault (1995) further asserts that the individual is “a reality fabricated by this specific technology of power that I have called “discipline” (p. 194). That is, in Foucault’s (1995) words, discipline makes individuals (p. 170).

Power, knowledge and truth

Mills (2003) explains that Foucault’s writings are concerned with how it is that we know something, and how what we know becomes established as a fact. That is, there is an interest in the production of knowledge through discourse and how it organises and constitutes inclusions and exclusions, by noticing and privileging some form of knowledge while obscuring and discrediting other forms of knowledge (Brown & Strega, 2005; Burr, 2015; Mills, 2003).

Each society has its “regime of truth”, that is, types of discourse which it accepts or ways of distinguishing between “true and false statements” (Foucault, 1980, p. 131). These regimes of truth are a system of power relations; truth claims become a vehicle or expression of power because discrediting facts would mean undermining knowledge through the exercise of power (Foucault, 1980). Thus, according to Foucault (1980, p. 132), there is a battle ‘for truth’, or at least ‘around truth’ and truth is linked in “a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it” (p.133). Furthermore, knowledge linked to power, not only assumes the authority of ‘the truth’ but has the power to make itself true (Hall, 2001). Not ‘true’ in the absolute sense but of a discursive formation sustaining a regime of truth (Hall, 1997). Foucault (1978) argues then that “it is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together (p. 100).

Power/knowledge is thus an abstract force which determines what will be known, rather than assuming that individual thinkers develop ideas and knowledge (Mills, 2003). Foucault (1995) explains that it is not individual scholars or the “activity of the subject of knowledge” that produces a corpus of knowledge (p. 28), but rather that it is the effects of power/knowledge , “the processes and struggles that traverse it and of which it is made up, that determines possible domains of knowledge” (p. 28).

Thus, according to Foucault (1995) power produces knowledge. He further asserts that power and knowledge “directly imply one another”; that there is no power relation

without “the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations” (p. 27). For Foucault then, knowledge and power always go together as a pair. Where there is knowledge, there is power (Burr, 2015).

Psychology in the web of disciplinary power

According to Hook (2007), all human sciences, including psychology, and their associated practices emerged from the context of relations of power through practices of surveillance, normalising judgment, and examination. Within a template of disciplinary technology, psychology has grown to new levels of specialization, attaining its own rules, practices and languages of control (Hook, 2007). Hook further explains that institutions like the asylum, the school, the clinic and the therapeutic arena are the places where individuals are, at the same time, the level of observation and intervention as well as the raw materials for the production of knowledge and systems of diagnosis and categorisation. Thus, psychology has altered the way in which it is possible to think about people (Rose, 1996). Rose (1996) further asserts that psychology has produced a range of social authorities for instance clinical, counselling, educational, and industrial psychologists. These social authorities have social powers and status because of their possession of psychological truths and their mastery of psychological techniques (Rose, 1996).

As mentioned before, there are battles for and around truth which are linked to systems of power (Foucault, 1980). According to Rose (1996, p.55), to be “in the true”, facts, evidence, results, arguments, must be permitted to enter a complex apparatus of truth, that is, for instance psychology journals. However, these journals have editorial boards and referees who are responsible for evaluating whether articles ‘fit in’ with the disciplinary rules for discussing a particular subject and what it is possible to say within that discipline (Mills, 2003). Thus, it could be said that disciplines such as psychology prescribe what can be counted as possible knowledge within a particular subject area such as perpetrators of rape. Here, it can be seen how power and knowledge become inseparably intertwined, and that the possible domains of psychological knowledge on individuals and populations coincides with areas of research in psychology by those in positions of power (Foucault, 1995; Hall, 2001; Hook, 2007; Mills, 2003). This knowledge and power is carried out through, and infiltrates everyday social discourses (Foucault, 1995; Woodward, 2009).

It is here where one can consider the role of psychology, and related disciplines, in categorising and regulating behaviour and the emergence of the psychological complex (Rose, 1985) or psy-complex. Parker (2002) explains the psy-complex as the network of theories and practices that includes not only academic and professional psychology, but also popular psychology in wider society and everyday thinking. The psy-complex covers the different ways in which people are categorised, observed and regulated by psychology, as well as the ways in which they live out “psychological models” in their own talk, actions, and experience (Parker, 2002, p. 132). That is, human experience becomes psychologized and individualized, and lay people incorporate the ideas of professionals and start to redefine their everyday experiences in these terms (Parker & Revelli, 2018). Thus, the psy-complex as a broad network of psychological knowledge and practices, both in the discipline and in popular culture, informs our most basic notions of self, mind, deviance and normality (Hook, 2004c). Therefore, this research explores the way in which psychology has come to ‘know’ or has bring into being perpetrators of rape in journal articles. Furthermore, from this perspective it is assumed that the constitution of perpetrators of rape in psychology journal articles will have implications for psy-professionals, perpetrators of rape, as well as in the wider society. Rose (1996) argues that psychology is not just a body of theories and explanations, but an “intellectual technology” (p. 10). That is, it is a way of making visible and intelligible certain features of individuals, in this case perpetrators of rape, and their behaviours. Psychology is a discipline, an institutionalised system of power and knowledge, a discursive network of functional constructs (Hook, 2007).

Discourse analysis

Discourse analysis shares the concern of other qualitative approaches with the meaningfulness of social life, but it also attempts to provide a more profound interrogation of the precarious status of meaning (Phillips & Hardy, 2002). Traditional qualitative approaches often assume a social world and then seek to understand the meaning of this world for participants (Wood & Kroger, 2000). Discourse analysis tries to explore how socially produced ideas and objects that populate the world were created in the first place and how they are maintained and held in place over time (Phillips & Hardy, 2002; Wood & Kroger, 2000). Parker (1997) explains that rather than trying to uncover underlying belief, discourse analysis emphasises variability in language, and works to uncover the function language serves. Furthermore, discourse analysis is concerned with the way in which texts are constructed out of available discursive resources rather than being discovered as new each

time (Parker, 1997). Thus, an important contribution of discourse analysis is that it examines how language constructs phenomena, not how it reflects it (Willig, 2013). In other words, discourse analysis views discourse as constitutive of the social world- not a route to it- and assumes that the world cannot be known separately from discourse (Phillips & Hardy, 2002; Wood & Kroger, 2000).

Discourse

At times, discourse in general terms refers to actual practices of talking and writing (Cameron & Panovic, 2014; Hall, 1997; Mills, 2004; Philips & Hardy, 2002). In the 1960's the general meaning of discourse began to shift from a linguistic concept of connected speech and writing (Mills, 2004). Now, the term discourse has been defined in various ways (Arribas-Allyon & Walkerdine, 2017; Macleod, 2002; Stead & Bakker, 2010).

Fairclough (2003) defines discourse as “a way of representing some part of the physical, social and psychological world” (p.17). Arribas-Ayllon and Walkerdine (2017) define discourse as institutionalised patterns of knowledge that govern the formation of subjectivity. Burr (2015) describes discourse as “a set of meanings, metaphors, representations, images, stories, statements and so on that in some way together produce a particular version of events” (p.64). Hollway (1982 p.231 as cited in Gavey, 2005) asserts that discourses are a product of social factors, of powers and practices rather than an individual set of ideas. Parker (1992) defines discourses as “a system of statements that construct an object (p.5). Mills (2004) asserts that a discourse is a set of statements “regulated by a set of rules which lead to the distribution and circulation of certain utterances and statements” (P.54). Henriques, Hollway, Urwin, Vinn and Walkerdine define discourse as “any regulated system of statements” (p. 105).

Thus, relevant to this research then, discourse is about the production of knowledge (Hall, 2001). Hall (2001) further explains Foucault's argument that discourse constructs topics, defines and produces objects of our knowledge and governs the way a topic can be meaningfully talked about and reasoned about. It also influences how ideas are put into practice and used to regulate the conduct of others. Furthermore, discourses are constructive (Macleod, 2002). That is, discourse is not simply a way of describing the social world but rather discourse constructs it (Burr, 2015; Ramazanoglu, 2002; Weatherall, 2005; Willig, 2013). Social reality or the social world is then produced through discourse (Parker, 2014). Parker (2014) argues that discourse allows for things that are not ‘really’ there to be seen and

that once an object has been elaborated in a discourse it is difficult not to refer to it as if it were real. Thus, the effect of discursive practices is the near impossibility to think outside of them (Hook, 2007). It is not to say that everything is constructed and that nothing exists outside of discourse, rather that we can only think about experiences, material objects and the world through discourse (Mills, 2004).

Similarly, discourse not only constructs objects and the social world but also people. That is, the person cannot pre-exist language (Burr 2003, p. 47). Various discourses become available to a person offering them different identities and ways of being (Burr, 2015). Our behaviour is then shaped in response to discourse when we claim or resist what is discursively available (Burr, 2015). Discourses contain “instructions on how to think, be and do” (Brown & Strega, 2005, p. 226).

Subject positions and subjectivity

According to (Hook, 2004b), the term subject is used rather than individual because it emphasises the various forms of social power we are subjected to and subsequently brings us into being. It is argued from this perspective that subjects are not autonomous creators of themselves or their social worlds but rather, they are embedded in a complex network of social relations (Namaste, 1994). Foucault (1982, p. 777) explains that his objective has been to “create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects”. He further states that “it is a form of power which makes individual subjects” (Foucault, 1982, p. 781). Hall (2001) explains that the subject is produced within discourse by personifying the particular forms of knowledge which the discourse produced. Furthermore, discourses also provided a place for the subject to locate themselves in a position from which it makes the most sense and thus subjecting themselves to its meanings, power and regulation (Hall, 2001). Davies and Harré (2001) explain that an individual is then constituted and reconstituted through the various discursive practices in which they participate. In other words, discourse constructs objects as well as subjects, and as a result make available positions within networks of meaning that a speaker can take up and place others within (Willig, 2013).

Discourses create positions for people to occupy as subjects and within these positions there are certain expectations about how to act, what to say and what not to say (Gavey, 1989; Namaste, 1994). Thus, these subject positions become meaningful and have effects (Hall, 2001). That is, individuals may differ in terms of their social class, gendered, racial and

ethnic characteristics, for instance, however, there will be no meaning until they have identified with those positions which the discourse constructs, subjecting themselves to its rules, and hence becoming the subjects of its knowledge/power (Hall, 2001). There are always several conflicting discourses at play and as the subject is determined by discourses, the subject is fragmented; it is not positioned only in one way and by only one discourse, but rather is ascribed many different positions by different discourses (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002).

Positions in discourse provide us with the content of our subjectivity (Burr, 2015). When we take up these positions, we come to experience the world and ourselves from that vantage point (Burr, 2015). Hook (2004b) explains that discourse is internalised in self-monitoring, self-knowing ways, in the production of subjectivity. Subjectivity then is our individuality, our sense of self, how we think and feel, how we experience being in that position (Hollway et al., 2003; Willig, 2013). The relationship between knowledge and power has consequences for subjectivity and identity (Agger, 1991; Fox, 2014; Gavey, 1989; Williams, 2014). Thus, what we are in the sense of being subjective individuals is difficult to separate from the effects that power and discourse have on us (Hook, 2004c). Considering the argument of several conflicting discourses being at play, as well as the fragmented subject, we could argue then that subjectivity, or our sense of self can be theorized as multiple and potentially contradictory (Hollway et al., 2003). Therefore, from this perspective, a sense of self does not emerge from an inner core but out of a complex of historical, cultural positions in discourses. According to Foucault (1982), power produces us and our individuality at the same time that it works upon us.

Foucauldian discourse analysis

When looking at discourses, there are a variety of approaches to discourse analysis (Arribas-Allyon & Walkerdine, 2017; Parker, 1999). Relevant to this research is a Foucauldian discourse analysis which explores the role of language and power in the constitution of social and psychological life (Willig, 2013). Foucauldian discourse analysis asks questions about the relationship between discourse and how people think or feel (subjectivity), what they may do (practices) and the material conditions within which such experiences may take place (Willig, 2013). The focus here is on the availability of discursive resources within a culture and its implications for those who live within it (Willig, 2013). Foucauldian discourse analysis looks at 'valid' knowledge in a given context and explores how this knowledge gained its status of validity as well as what the functions and consequences might be for

shaping our social reality (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). By using this approach, we are able then to contextualize the different kind of knowledges and truths and, place emphasis on the social and cultural context in which truth and meaning are produced (Lock & Strong, 2010).

From a Foucauldian point of view, discourses facilitate and limit, enable and constrain what can be said by whom, where and when (Parker, 2014). Discursive constructions in turn make available certain ways-of-seeing the world, and certain ways-of-being in the world (Willig, 2013). Therefore, this approach is also concerned with the role of discourse in wider social processes of legitimation and power (Willig, 2013). That is, since discourses make available ways-of-seeing and ways-of-being, they are strongly implicated in the exercise of power. Furthermore, dominant discourses favour those versions of social reality that legitimate existing power relations and structures (Willig, 2013). However, given that there are always a number of discourses surrounding an event or phenomenon, each offering an alternative view, each bringing with it different possibilities for action, it follows that alternative constructions or counter-discourses can, and do emerge (Burr, 2015).

Foucauldian discourse analysts also take a historical perspective. Discourses are located in history; the objects they refer to are objects constituted by earlier discourses (Parker, 1992). Thus, the Foucauldian approach explores ways in which discourses have changed over time and uses the history to disturb taken-for-granted knowledge (Kendall & Wickham, 1998; Willig, 2013). Furthermore, Foucauldian discourse analysis allows us to expose historical conditions through which knowledge has played a part in shaping individuals (Arribas-Allyon & Walkerdine, 2017). Thus, it is argued that individuals can practice or act in certain ways within a given historical context (Arribas-Allyon & Walkerdine, 2017).

For this study, Foucauldian discourse analysis was therefore deemed the most suitable approach because it allowed for prevailing constructions in journal articles relating to perpetrators of sexual violence to be examined and their implications for subjectivity and practice to be explored (Burr, 2015; Willig, 2013).

Concluding remarks

This chapter allowed for an understanding of the theoretical backdrop of which this research is situated. Social constructionism is an important contributing orientation as this research looks at the constitutive nature of language and the available constructions of social reality. It also enables an exploration of the implications and consequences of those

constructions for our experience and social practice. Moving beyond social constructionism, a poststructural stance recognises the relationship between power, knowledge and language and the implications and consequences for subjectivity. This chapter also considered the work of Michel Foucault to gain a better understanding of the interconnectedness of power/knowledge, truth and discourse and the productive nature thereof. There was a further discussion on how psychology fits into the web of disciplinary power. Lastly, there was a discussion on discourse analysis, specifically Foucauldian discourse analysis as it provides context to the research questions and the way this research goes about answering it through the identification of discursive constructions of perpetrators of rape in psychology journal articles, and the implications thereof. The following chapter, my methodology, is situated in theories discussed above.

CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY

The aim of this chapter is to show how this research was carried out. It includes a brief overview of the research question that this study hoped to answer. Following this is a short summary of the theoretical point of departure that was discussed in the previous chapter, in which this research is situated. There is also a description of the research design, the data used as well as the collection thereof. This is followed by a discussion on how the data was analysed using Foucauldian discourse analysis as the method of analysis and what it entailed. Lastly, this chapter reports on the necessary steps taken in order to ensure the credibility of the research process and an overview of the ethical considerations necessary for this research.

Research question

This research study intended to examine the discourses underlying what has been written about perpetrators of rape in articles published in peer-reviewed journals, indexed by Proquest, Ebscohost, and Taylor and Francis, from 2012 to 2016. More specifically, this research intended to critically investigate the ways in which perpetrators have been discursively constructed. The question that this research hopes to answer is as follows:

How are perpetrators of rape discursively constructed in psychology journal articles indexed by Proquest, Ebscohost, and Taylor and Francis, from 2012 to 2016, that primarily focus on perpetrators?

Theoretical point of departure

The theoretical background that informs this research is that of social constructionism and poststructuralism (Burr, 2015). Thus, this research looks at the constitutive nature of language and the implications for experience and practice that arise from the available constructions. Furthermore, from this stance, the relationship between power, knowledge and language is considered as well as implications for subjectivity (Agger, 1991; Fox, 2014; Gavey, 1989). This is informed by the work of Foucault (1978, 1995) by recognising the interconnectedness of power/knowledge, truth and discourse and its productive nature. A range of helping professions have particular codes of practice that have developed from applications of knowledge. Thus, practitioners in the discipline of psychology turn to said bodies of knowledge to inform their identification and intervention strategies for human and social problems. However, the view taken by this research hopes to shed light upon the effects produced by the discursive constructions of perpetrators that emerge in psychology

journal articles. The publication is how we come to know about our world, is socially constructed, and is defined as an ongoing process embedded in the communication of the members of a discipline (Mirielli, 2003). What we know within psychological frameworks are understood in the Foucauldian sense as the effects of discourse and ‘disciplinary technologies’ in modern society that produce individuals (Hook, 2004b). In the words of Foucault (1995), the individual is a “reality fabricated by this specific technology of power called the discipline” (p. 194).

Research design

According to Willig (2013), qualitative researchers can adopt a variety of positions regarding the nature of knowledge their research seeks to generate. This qualitative study is grounded in the previously discussed social constructionism and poststructuralism paradigms which challenges notions of objective truths (Hook, 2007; Khoja-Moolji, 2014; Lock & Strong, 2010). Rather, the methodological approach to this research is concerned with the social constructions of knowledge (Burr, 2015). This approach assumes that all human experience is constituted by language and is thus discursively constructed. Therefore, discourse analysis has been adopted for this research. More specifically, Foucauldian discourse analysis, which is the method of analysis used in this research, is concerned with how language is implicated in power relations, as well as with discursive constructions and their implications for subjectivity and practice (Burr, 2015). This allows me to critically investigate the ways in which perpetrators of rape have been discursively constructed in psychology journal articles. The following sections provided a detailed description of the methodological processes followed to carry out this research.

Corpus of this research

Discourses are embodied and enacted in a variety of texts (Phillips & Hardy, 2002). Texts may take a variety of forms including, but not limited to, spoken words, pictures, symbols, artefacts, and relevant to this research written texts. Furthermore, according to Enger (2003) and Everett (2015), academic journals serve as a discipline’s official discourse and sets the agenda for and reflects what has been deemed important at a specific point in time. Thus, the corpus of this research includes psychology journal articles indexed by Proquest, Ebscohost, and Taylor and Francis which are made available through the University of Pretoria. For the purpose of this research, ‘psychology journal articles’ included articles published in journals in the ‘subject’, ‘category’ or ‘discipline’ of psychology. It is not to say that Psychology scholars do not access articles or publish articles in journals from different

and related disciplines. However, these parameters were set to avoid the complexities and implications of including articles from other disciplines that may be used and published by psychology scholars. The journal articles used for analysis were published between 2012 and 2016 in order to capture the latest writings at the time of the commencement of this research. The data included full-texts from peer reviewed journals. According to Marsh and Ball (1989) and Suls and Martin (2009), peer-reviewed journals hold the most prestige and the peer-review process is highly esteemed in many disciplines in which the quality of a manuscript is evaluated for publication.

Decisions about the data in discourse analysis are similar to those in other research, in that it should be relevant to or representative of the phenomenon of interest (Wood & Kroger, 2000) and should generate answers to our research question/s (Willig, 2013). Thus, the articles selected for analysis primarily focus on perpetrators of rape as the discursive object under investigation. Furthermore, articles included writings of perpetrators of any gender and sexuality, who have and have not been formally convicted, as participants and subjects of investigation or theoretical explanation, risk factors associated with perpetration, and intervention and rehabilitation of perpetrators. These inclusion criteria were considered to allow for the widest possible variation in the text concerning perpetrators of rape. However, due to the scope and size of this study, exclusion criteria were also considered to avoid the danger of becoming overwhelmed by too much data as well as to ensure that the data remained relevant to the research question.

Articles were excluded if the primary focus was on others' attitudes and perceptions of perpetrators of rape, for instance analysis of perpetrators in other domains (newspapers, media forms, talk of others). Furthermore, articles were excluded if using systematic reviews, literature reviews and content analysis as methodologies, as it is considered to be other researchers' interpretations of studies or articles (Sandelowski & Barroso, 2007). Articles were also excluded if they contained perpetrators in the content, however, the primary focus or phenomenon of interest was of something else, for instance the validity of psychometric measures or usefulness of sex offender registries. In these instances, perpetrators are considered as the secondary focus which is not in line with the research question.

As there is an awareness in the literature of the complex nature of the different typologies and categories of sexual violence and the perpetrators thereof, other articles excluded from the analysis were those addressing paedophiles, sexual homicide, and serial

rapists. Paedophilia was excluded due to the debates in the literature regarding the sexual preference of these individuals for children, and that it may or may not result in sexual abuse (Goode, 2011; Powell, 2018; Schinaia, 2010). Sexual homicide was excluded due to the debates regarding the ‘sexual element’ to the murders (Chan, 2015; Proulx et al., 2018). That is, it is argued that ‘sexual activity’ is not necessary for the murder to be sexual as the act of killing itself maybe sexually gratifying (Beauregard & Martineau, 2016). Lastly, serial rapists were excluded as they are defined in literature as those who commit more than two sex-related offenses on a stranger victim (Slater, Woodhams, & Hamilton-Giachritsis, 2014). Within the literature, serial rapists include paedophilia and sexual homicide and excludes once-off perpetrators and perpetration against known victims.

According to Potter and Wetherell (1987), traditionally, one of the most important advantages of collecting records and documents is almost complete absence of researcher influence on data, unlike interviews (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Furthermore, there is no ‘natural’ boundary line to be drawn in these cases, or no point at which sampling can be said to be complete. It is simply the case of giving a clear detailed description of the nature of the material one is analysing and its origins, as well as explaining why this chosen text is important to the study (Phillips & Hardy, 2002; Potter & Wetherell, 1987). However, as the researcher I am aware of how, by including and excluding data as described above, there is a presence of researcher influence. That is, by including and excluding data, I am contributing to what may or may not emerge as discursive constructions of perpetrators of rape in psychology journal articles. The following section provides a detailed description of how I went about collecting the data for this research.

Data collection

Journal articles were collected using key words searches for terms relevant to perpetrators of sexual violence/rape in titles, abstracts and text of journal articles indexed by the previously mentioned databases available through the University of Pretoria Library. Keyword searches included ‘rapists’, ‘sex/sexual offenders’, ‘perpetrators of rape/sexual violence/sexual assault/sexual coercion/sexual abuse’ and ‘sex/sexual predators’. The articles selected were full-texts, from peer-reviewed journals and were published between 2012 to 2016. Furthermore, in editing the search parameters in each database, ‘psychology’ was selected in the ‘subject’, ‘category’ or ‘discipline’ fields.

When doing the initial search, the inclusion and exclusion criteria were considered. Once the searches yielded results, I read the title of the article, as well as the abstract, in order to determine if the article met the previously discussed criteria. Roughly 300 articles were initially saved. I then read the initial articles in their entirety to determine their relevance and to assess whether my inclusion and exclusion criteria were appropriate.

During this stage, I reconsidered my inclusion and exclusion criteria. Upon reading through the initial data, I realised more and more articles in which perpetrators were the secondary focus. Although these may have a bearing on the discursive construction of perpetrators of rape, I made the decision to exclude them as perpetrators were not the primary focus of the article. I also found that in my initial search, articles that were saved were focused on offenders in a general sense and not specifically perpetrators of rape. I excluded these articles to avoid confusion. Through the process of modifying my criteria and reading through the articles initially saved, 188 articles were then selected for their relevance. These two processes occurred simultaneously.

Discourse analysis is an extremely labour-intensive approach (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). The challenge is not to find texts but deciding which texts to choose and to justify your choices (Phillips & Hardy, 2002). It is the researcher that judges whether the data are adequate to make an interesting argument (Phillips & Hardy, 2002; Wood & Kroger, 2000). Thus, once my criteria were modified, and I had a better understanding of what I was looking for, I then re-read the articles and based on previous discussions regarding my selection and omission of articles, a final number of 128 articles were selected for analysis (See Appendix A).

Data analysis

The corpus of this research was analysed using discourse analysis, more specifically, Foucauldian discourse analysis, as an approach to answering the research question. According to Billig (1997), discourse analysis “is not a methodology as such” (p. 39). There is no analytic method or mechanical set of procedures for conducting research and producing findings (Billig, 1997; Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Rather, discourse analysts are guided by a wider theoretical framework (Billig, 1997; Potter & Wetherell, 1987) which relevant to this research, was discussed in the previous chapter. Furthermore, the initial stages of the analytical process were theoretically guided by Potter and Wetherell (1987) and Macleod (2002), and the use of Foucauldian discourse analysis was guided by Willig (2013). These

guidelines are presented below along with a discussion/explanation of how the analysis was carried out.

Guidelines for data analysis

According to Potter and Wetherell (1987), once all data has been collected, the researcher sits with a unwieldy amount of words waiting to be transformed into research findings. However, this may lead to “immobility and panic” (p. 166). Thus, in line with Potter and Wetherell’s suggestion, my initial stages prior to the analysis itself included a coding process which I later describe in detail. Potter and Wetherell explain that coding is different from the actual analysis as the goal is not to find results, but to squeeze an immense body of discourse into manageable chunks. In conjunction with Potter and Wetherell’s coding advice, I used Macleod (2002) first steps to managing data for analysis which is to sort in into “thematic chunks” (p. 20). That is, the researcher should read and re-read the data, make notes on discursive themes that emerge and give each theme a key. Macleod then suggests that the data be read again, this time marking or noting keys next to relevant chunks of the text. I applied this to the data and then physically sorted the text into piles according to the keys (Macleod, 2002). According to Potter and Wetherell, at the end of this process the data is ready for analysis. Furthermore, Macleod states that the researcher should then read and re-read the “piles of text pieces” (p. 21) while engaging with the conceptual framework for analysis, which is discussed below.

According to Willig (2013), Foucauldian discourse analysis is specifically concerned with language and its role in the constitution of social and psychological life. Willig (2013) integrates Ian Parker’s (Parker, 1992) 20 steps in discourse analysis which distinguishes discourses, their relations to each other, their historical location and their political and social effects, as well as the work of Kendall and Wickham (1998) which rely on fewer steps however provide a more advanced conceptual understanding of Foucault’s method. However, it must be noted that the six stages in Willig’s method do not compose a full analysis in the Foucauldian sense. For instance, Willig’s stages do not address Foucault’s discussion of the “historicity and evolution of discursive formations over time” (p. 131). The stages however provide a useful framework within which I could use to identify discursive resources and subject positionings used within a text and explore the implications they may have on subjectivity and practice (Willig, 2013). The six stages of Foucauldian discourse analysis that were followed in this study, are discussed below.

Stage one: Discursive constructions

The first stage of analysis is concerned with the ways in which discursive objects are constructed (Willig, 2013). According to Willig, the discursive object is informed by the research question. Thus, the discursive object for this research is perpetrators of rape. This stage then involves the identification of the different ways in the discursive object is constructed in the text by highlighting all instances of reference to the discursive object, both implicit and explicit. This stage does not simply rely on looking at keywords but instead looks at how these discursive objects are spoken about. According to Willig, the fact that a text does not contain a direct reference to the discursive object can also tell us something about the way the object is constructed.

Stage two: Discourses

The second stage of analysis aims to locate the various discursive constructions of the object within wider discourses (Willig, 2013). Once the sections of text that construct the discursive object are identified, the focus moves to the differences between constructions. Willig explains that the same discursive object can be constructed in very different ways and that this enables the researcher to situate discursive objects within wider discourses.

Stage three: Action orientation

The third stage of analysis involves a closer look at the discursive contexts in which the different constructions of the object are being used and what the different constructions are capable of achieving (Willig, 2013). Willig calls this the action orientation of text and talk which allows for an investigation into what is gained from constructing the object in a specific way, at a specific point in the text. It further allows for a look at what the function of the constructions are and how they may relate to other construction.

Stage four: Positionings

The fourth stage of analysis looks at the subject positions that are made available within a discourse (Willig, 2013). Willig explains that discourses construct objects but subjects too, and as a result, make available positions that speakers can take up as well as place others within, and offer discursive locations from which to speak and act. Having previously located the discursive objects within wider discourses, this stage identifies subject positions offered by the various constructions. Davies and Harre (2001) explain that an individual is constituted and reconstituted through the various discursive practices in which they participate. Thus, who one is, is always an open question with a shifting answer

depending on the positions made available within discursive practices (Davies & Harre, 2001).

Stage five: Practice

Stage five of the analysis is concerned with the relationship between discourse and practice (Willig, 2013). It explores the ways in which discursive constructions and the subject positions within them can affect opportunities for action. Particular constructions and subject positions thus enable and constrain what can be said and done. Willig further explains that certain practices become legitimate forms of behaviour within particular discourses and such practices in turn reproduce the discourse that legitimate them.

Stage six: Subjectivity

The sixth stage of analysis explores the relationship between discourse and subjectivity (Willig, 2013). Willig explains that this stage allows us to trace the consequences that taking up various subject positions (stage four) can have on individuals' subjective experience. Having asked questions about what can be said and done from within different discourses (stage five), the concern is now with what can be felt, thought and experienced from within various subject positions. Willig explains that discourses not only make available certain ways-of-seeing the world but also certain ways-of-being in the world.

Analytical process

Once the data was collected and finalized, the articles were printed and numbered for ease of access and reference. My reading of the data was then guided by the theoretical framework outlined in chapter three as well as by the analytical guidelines outlined in the previous section.

In order to better manage the amount of data ready for analysis, I used Potter and Wetherell's (1987) advice on coding the data. I also used Willig's (2013) first two stages of Foucauldian discourse analysis as a guide in coding the data. A key question to ask in the first stage is "how is the discursive object constructed?" With this question in mind, I began reading the articles and highlighting all instances of reference to perpetrators of rape. This included both implicit and explicit references. I also looked at the way perpetrators were written about in the title, literature, method, findings and discussion, and conclusion sections of each article. In doing so, discursive constructions emerged.

When re-reading the data with the highlighted pieces of text discursively constructing perpetrators, I looked for similarities and differences and grouped them together as

inclusively as possible. When reviewing the discursive themes that emerged, I began to note the emergence of potential wider discourses in which the various constructions were located. I wrote out these discursive themes across a poster (see Appendix B). Although text-based accounts will be the bedrock of the research report, I found it useful to make use of diagrammatic representations of my findings in order to help make it more accessible (White, Woodfield, & Ritchie, 2003). I then used Macleod's (2002) suggestion of making a key and marking relevant texts in conjunction with Willig's second stage of analysis which looks at the wider discourses. That is, I re-read the articles and highlighted pieces of text relating to the discursive themes or wider discourses and made notes and labels. For instance, all writings about attachment were highlighted, labeled, then reprinted and physically grouped into chunks according to the discursive key. Although coding is distinct from analysis, my analytical process involved these two processes occurring simultaneously. That is, Willig's first and second stages formed part of my coding. Once this was done, I re-read the discursive themes separately with Willig's stages in mind. The use of Willig's six stages did not occur in a linear manner. However, when re-reading the coded data, I kept a printout of the following key questions relevant to each stage to guide the analysis.

- Stage one: Discursive constructions
 - “How is the discursive object constructed through language”
- Stage two: Discourses
 - What discourses are drawn upon?
 - What is their relationship to one another?
- Stage three: Action orientation
 - What do the construction achieve?
 - What is gained from deploying them here?
 - What are their functions?
 - What is the author doing here?
- Stage four: Subject positions
 - What subject positions are made available by these constructions?
- Stage five: Practice
 - What possibilities are mapped out by these constructions?
 - What can be said and done from within these subject positions?
- Stage six: Subjectivity

- What can potentially be felt, thought and experienced from the available subject positions?

By answering the questions, I then began to report on my findings which are presented in the next chapter.

Credibility and rigor of research

The social constructionist paradigm used by this study takes reality as constructed and unstable and assumes that the researcher's own values and assumptions will influence his/her interpretation and understanding of data (Terre Blanche, Durrheim, & Painter, 2006). Qualitative researchers thus propose dependability which refers to the degree to which the reader can be convinced that the findings did indeed occur as the researcher says they did (Terre Blanche et al., 2006). Accordingly, dependability is achieved through providing the reader with rich and detailed descriptions as well as an open statement about the methods used to collect and analyse data. Furthermore, as part of displaying credibility, it is important to not only explain how the research was carried out but also why particular approaches and methods were chosen to meet the aims of the research (White et al., 2003). For this reason, I have explained my theoretical and methodological positions as well as reported on the processes undertaken in doing my research, and why they were deemed appropriate.

According to Willig (2013), discursive research is best evaluated by assessing the quality of the accounts produced. Here, the focus is on the interpretations or conclusions drawn from the data (Elliott, Fischer, & Rennie, 1999). In discourse analysis, the documentation of procedures and the display of arguments contribute to the readers' trust that the analysis was carefully done (Wood & Kroger, 2000). There is also a need to demonstrate the basis on which interpretations were made through showing evidence to support them (White et al., 2003). Documentation of data and data excerpts thus became an important step in the research process because readers need to be able to perform their own evaluations of the analytic conclusions (Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Wood & Kroger, 2000). It also provides a context for understanding claims that were made (Wood & Kroger, 2000). Furthermore, it points to the accountability of the researcher, who is answerable for the way in which the research was carried out (Wood & Kroger, 2000). Thus, quotes from the data are made available in the presentation of the analysis. The quotes used were considered the most relevant to illustrate the findings of the analysis. I chose quotes according to how clearly and concisely they illustrated the discursive themes that were generated. I looked at how typical

or representative the quote was by considering whether the point of the analysis would remain the same if an alternative quote was used. The analysis also identified variation within discourses (Potter & Wetherell, 1987), as such, I included quotes that indicated variation. I also considered Potter and Wetherell's (1987) advice on analytic techniques which can be used to validate the findings of this kind of research. It is advised that a researcher be mindful of coherence, which is how the discourse fits together, and how discursive structures produce effects and functions; new problems and questions; and fruitfulness which, is novel explanations and insights regarding the topic at hand.

An essential element of rigour is the assumption that the research process displays an objective method and that for research to have any validity or truth value it must remain free of bias and researcher values (Davies & Dodd, 2002). However, Davies and Dodd argue that rather than by applying standardized rules, rigour can be achieved by paying close attention to the research process through reflection and reflexivity and by rendering visible the research process even when seemingly disordered and chaotic (Davies & Dodd, 2002). It was important for me to be aware of my own position in relation to the research project and my contribution to the discursive world (Richardson, 1996). Acknowledgement of my own reflexive role in the research process was necessary to ensure rigor.

Reflexivity

Broadly, reflexivity is a continuous engagement with how the researcher has influenced their research (Dowling, 2008). Reflexivity required an awareness of my own contribution to the construction of meanings throughout the research process (Willig, 2013). That is, it allows me to turn back onto myself to examine how my presence and stance functions in my research (Pelias, 2012). The importance of reflexivity, as Parker (2014) explains, is that we notice and describe the world from particular positions, and the position of the researcher and the possible influence thereof needs to be made explicit as a part of ensuring rigor as well as to provide context for the claims made throughout the research. Gough (2003) suggests keeping some form of research journal, and documenting thoughts and experiences, decisions and personal reactions throughout the research process. Thus, from the start of my research, I kept a journal which helped create distance from the research (Parker, 2005; Pillow, 2010) and allowed me to interrogate myself in order to better understand how I influenced the research process, and more specifically the analysis of the data (Mortari, 2015). I further used the journal to keep track of my research “trail” of altering and reshaping what occurred in my method and analysis (Ortlipp, 2008). Throughout the

research process I considered personal reflexivity as well as epistemological reflexivity (Willig, 2013).

Personal reflexivity required me to critically reflect on the ways in which my social background, assumptions, positions, practices, values, experiences and identities may shape my readings of the data as well as the research process as a whole (Gough, 2003; Willig, 2013). I am a woman who has been directly affected by sexual violence in South Africa. I am also of the opinion that it is in social processes and relations of power that sexual violence becomes possible. This would play a role in the chosen area of my research as well as interest in pursuing the research question. It would also be something to be reflective of in doing my analysis. Furthermore, I am a counselling psychologist in training. Being in the field of psychology, I had to be cautious of my reading of the data as constructions rather than taken-for-granted knowledge as I am exposed to the theories presented in the data through my training. Also, I am grounded, as a researcher, in social constructionist and poststructuralist assumptions which for me invoked a conflicting experience of my identities of researcher and psychologist (in training). This had an influence on my reading of the data in which case I had to distance myself from what I “know” and re-read the data as well as findings generated. I also considered how I separated these two identities (researcher and psychology trainee) in the research process and in practice as a psychologist. My position as “trainee” brought about discomfort for me in my research process. Firstly, because I am critically investigating the knowledge produced in psychology journal articles, which are also the resources I turn to in order to ‘gain knowledge’ throughout my training and research. That is, I became very aware of how my reading of articles differed outside of my analysis. I also then reflected on being critical in different contexts outside of research. Thus, through being reflexive, I also recognised the influence and impact the research had on me (Dowling, 2008; Finlay & Gough, 2003; Palaganas, Sanchez, Molintas, & Caricativo, 2017). Secondly, I became aware of power relations and the impact it had on my subjectivity. That is, as a trainee, I am investigating “expert knowledge”. I often felt a need to justify and disclaim that my intentions are not to discredit or “falsify” but rather to destabilise taken-for grant knowledge and create opportunities to become aware of different possible constructions. Furthermore, I experienced myself as questioning whether I had the “right” to do so.

Epistemological reflexivity required me to reflect on my methodological decision making and the assumptions of the epistemological framework that this research was grounded in, social constructionism and poststructuralism (Dowling, 2006; Willig, 2013). It further required me to reflect on the implications of such decisions and assumptions for the research and its findings (Dowling, 2008; Palaganas et al., 2017). Throughout the research process I was mindful of the way in which the research question defined and limited what could be found (Dowling, 2006; Willig, 2013). Thus, I was aware that this research did not set out to uncover an underlying psychological truth about perpetrators of sexual violence, but rather understood that the findings would present as discursive constructions. I also considered how the research design and method of analysis may construct the data and findings (Dowling, 2006; Willig, 2013). That is, psychology journal articles were regarded as discursive texts in which knowledge is produced. Furthermore, the findings were not taken as objective facts or truths, rather they were acknowledged as constructions that were generated from the data, by the researcher. Reflexivity draws attention to the point that findings of discourse analysis apply equally to the social texts produced by discourse analysts as to anyone else (Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Richardson, 1996). It is not consistent for me as the researcher to claim that there is no objective truth or fact and then to carry out my research as a detached observer and make objective, factual statements about it (Richardson, 1996). Thus, as Potter and Wetherell (1987) explain, it is possible to acknowledge that my own language is constructing a version of the world, while proceeding with analysing texts. It is thus important for me, as the researcher, to acknowledge that my own work is not immune from the social process being studied (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

Here I discussed reflexivity as an important part of my research. The hope was to create transparency in my research process (Ortlipp, 2008), achieve rigor (Davies & Dodd, 2002), to help readers understand something more about the work done (Parker, 2005), and to acknowledge my self in my research (Burr, 2015; Dowling, 2006; Mortari, 2015; Parker, 2005; Willig, 2013). Although reflexivity is practiced throughout the research, I report on it here to highlight the importance of it and to introduce what I had to consider and reflect on. A reflexive account will be revisited in the findings and discussion chapter as I acknowledge that my reflexive practice, my position, my epistemological stance and my data act upon each other throughout the analysis in which case I make visible the effects on my research (Finlay & Gough, 2003; Parker, 2005, 2014b).

Ethical considerations

Ethics concerns the morality of human conduct and in relation to social research, it refers to moral deliberation, choice and accountability on the part of the researcher throughout the research process (Miller, Mauthner, Birch, & Jessop, 2012). Discussions about ethical principles in social research tend to revolve around four main areas: harm to participants; informed consent; invasion of privacy; and whether deception is involved (Bryman, 2012). This study will not include human participants therefore there will be no risk of harm. The data will include journal articles published online and made available to registered University of Pretoria personnel therefore, publisher permission will not be needed. A list of the articles analysed is provided in order to acknowledge the sources used (see Appendix A). Full-text articles were not reproduced in the dissemination of this research thus copyright infringement is not a concern. I was also be mindful throughout the research process of the fact that ethical responsibilities for researchers do not only relate to direct interaction with participants and materials (Forrester, 2010). Researchers, including myself, are expected to act honestly and with integrity as well as to have good intentions and outcomes throughout the research process (Forrester, 2010; Miller et al., 2012).

Integrity in the reporting of my research required that my explanations and conclusions be generated from and ground in theory and data (White et al., 2003). Thus, ethically it is important to provide readers with representative pieces of data (Hesse-Biber, 2017), which I have included in the next chapter. I am also responsible for ensuring that the data are accurate and that no fabrications or fraudulent materials are used (Christians, 2005). Furthermore, part of doing ethical research involves accountability (Miller et al., 2012). One way of demonstrating this is through transparency. Thus, ethical practice required me to be transparent about the epistemological, theoretical and personal assumptions that informed my research generally and my analysis specifically (Hammersley & Traianou, 2012; Miller et al., 2012). Similarly, reflexivity is also considered part of ethical research practice which I have discussed in the previous section and will revisit in the next chapter. However, here, I make a frank statement about reflexivity being part of my ethical practice so that I can account for how my own experiences, knowledge, identities and worldviews shaped what I saw in the data and how I interpreted and represented it. Another issue to consider was the ethics of representation. However depicted, in numbers, images, and in this case words, data representation has consequences and effects on those who read the research, those whose lives and experiences are represented, those whose behaviour is represented and those who

seek to understand (Mertens & Ginsberg, 2009; Parker, 2005; Willig, 2013). Researchers are thus responsible not only for what we write and produce but also how we write and produce (Parker, 2005; Pillow, 2010). Thus, I had to reflect on not only how perpetrators of sexual violence are represented but also researchers, journal articles, and psychologists. I then also had to consider what the effect of such representation might be, which I incorporate into my reflexive account in the next chapter. There is a need in any research, including my own, for ethical reflection on choices made throughout the collection, analysis and presentations of what we study (Seale, Gobo, Gubrium, & Silverman, 2004).

Concluding remarks

This chapter set out to explain the methodology. It included a review of the research question and the theoretical point of departure. It also discussed the research design, the corpus of the study and the collection thereof. This chapter also provided a detailed account of the steps taken in analysing the data. Practices relevant to the credibility and rigor of the research were explained including an emphasis on reflexivity. Ethical considerations relevant to this research study were also highlighted. As this section provided insight into the methodological procedures and considerations of this study, the following chapter presents the findings of the analysis and a discussion thereof.

CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the findings from the analysis are presented and discussed. This research aimed to critically investigate the ways in which perpetrators of rape have been discursively constructed in psychology journal articles. As discussed in the previous chapter, Foucauldian discourse analysis was the method used to analyse the corpus of this research. A total of 128 psychology journal articles were analysed in which six dominant discourses were produced. What follows is a presentation of the findings by introducing and discussing the main discourses identified in the data. Throughout the presentation of the discourses, the way in which perpetrators were constructed and subsequently positioned within each discourse will be discussed, as well as the implications these discursive constructions may have on subjectivities and social practice.

Structure of findings

The findings will be presented with an introduction to the discourses by discussing how they were produced. The sub-discourses embedded within the main discourses will also be described and discussed. When looking at discourses, it is considered that they are never entirely uniform, coherent or consistent (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). This is significant when considering how the findings of the analysis revealed multiple discourses, constructions and subject positions, as well as variation and contradiction between and within them. While these discursive themes are presented categorically for the sake of clarity, they should not be read as fixed and separate entities. Rather, the discourses interlink across one another and various sub-discourses speak back to other overarching discourses. Table 2 provides an overview of the structure of the findings by presenting the discourses and sub-discourses that will be discussed.

Table 2

Overview of discourses and sub-discourses

Main discourses	Sub-discourses
Victim/villain discourse: overlapping identities	The discourse of victimhood The discourse of villains
Psychological discourse	Attachment discourse Personality discourse Internal chaos

	At the mercy of emotions Cognitions and schemas: the criminal mind
Pathology discourse: diseased bodies and minds	Psycho-pathology Medical pathology
Treatment and prevention discourse	
Career discourse: perpetrators as knowledgeable experts	
Gender discourse	

Willig's (2013) key questions relevant to each stage of the analysis were answered and are integrated into the description of each discourses along with a discussion linking the discourses to previous research and theory. To illustrate the findings, excerpts from the data will be presented. The excerpts will be italicized followed by numbers in brackets corresponding to the number allocated to the article for ease of reference. A more comprehensive list of supporting quotations from the data, relevant to each of the discourses, has been tabulated (See Appendix C).

Findings of analysis

The following section will introduce the dominant discourses that were produced from the data. Six dominant discourses emerged namely a victim/villain discourse, a psychological discourse, a pathology discourse, a treatment discourse, a career discourse and a gender discourse.

1. Victim/Villain discourse: Overlapping identities

The victim/villain discourse captures the way in which perpetrators were discursively constructed as victims and as villains or perpetrators. Within this discourse the perpetrator emerged as a result of their own victimisation or as a product or symptom of their own previous trauma. That is, this discourse produces a victim-villain dichotomy; however, it also demonstrates a shift beyond this victim-villain dichotomy to the discursive constructions of these two entities as being in some ways linked or overlapping.

1.1 The discourse of victimhood

The discourse of victimhood was produced through explicit reference to the childhood traumas of perpetrators. Discussions of *childhood physical abuse* (1; 4; 72; 121), *sexual*

abuse (1; 4; 10; 67; 73; 90), *verbal and psychological abuse* (1; 51; 98; 100), as well as *neglect* (7; 35; 72; 90; 98) were often emphasised, subsequently constructing perpetrators as victims, as damaged and as a *vulnerable* (6; 51; 125) population. Within the discourse of victimhood, perpetrators are positioned as victims rather than perpetrators which diminishes their criminal status. According to Lamb (1999), in the larger victim-perpetrator dichotomy, a victim is pure, innocent, helpless and the perpetrator is monstrous and all powerful. Furthermore, Cunniff Gilson (2016) explains that a victim position also implies vulnerability. Thus, this position opens up the possibility for perpetrators to experience and feel weakness, dependency, passivity, incapacitation, incapability and powerlessness. The vulnerable subject, that is the perpetrator positioned as victim, is regarded as lacking power and agency, therefore incapable of transforming their situation or exercising agency. As mentioned, the data emphasised a link between childhood abuse and the current sexually abusive behaviours of perpetrators. This was done through use various theories regarding *long term effects of trauma* (7) and the impact on one's development. From within the victimhood discourse, there is the implication that an *unhealthy childhood* (67;127) creates a *predisposition to sexually violent behaviours* (42; 98). It further implies that sexual violence is a condition as opposed to a social problem. Thus, from the position of victim, perpetrators are able to transfer responsibility of their actions, or to excuse their actions as a reaction to or result of their own abuse.

According to Wood and Rennie (2016) and Zverina, Stam, and Babins-Wagner (2011) a victim position may provide the person with protection, access to social assistance and intervention as well as sympathy or a right to suffer. Thus, the victimhood discourse not only has implications for perpetrators but for professionals working with perpetrators as well as society at large. Within the data, recommendations often included interventions to be *trauma-based* (67; 118; 121). This implies that interventions should be at the victim level instead of the perpetrator level. Furthermore, discussions about prevention of sexual violence were aimed at the vulnerable population implying that the risk of sexual violence lies in seemingly damaged individuals. Perpetrators with seemingly healthy upbringings are not accounted for within this discourse which implies that "normal", healthy individuals cannot be perpetrators. The onus is then on professionals, for example psychologists, to prevent sexual violence through attending to persons who have suffered childhood trauma. It further implies that being a victim of childhood trauma not only has an impact on development, but also puts a person at risk of becoming a perpetrator of rape. This means that perpetrators

could be regarded with sympathy, however victims, who have not sexually perpetrated, could be regarded with suspicion or anticipation of sexually abusive behaviours.

1.2 The discourse of villains

The discourse of villains captures the way in which perpetrators were discursively constructed through direct reference to them as *predators* (53; 99; 124), *aggressors* (6; 83; 86; 125), *criminals* (56; 87), *sex offenders* (3; 56; 117; 118), *delinquents* (37; 87; 118), *coercers* (99; 106), and *abusers* (50; 76; 121). Within this discourse, it is apparent that perpetrators are not positioned as innocent, vulnerable individuals as in the previous discourse. Rather perpetrators are wrong-doers, guilty, *criminals* (3; 25; 118), and *dangerous* (60; 90). These discursive labels draw on a range of wider discourses and produces a range of different discursive meanings and positions.

The constructions of perpetrators as sex offenders and criminals are linked to broader forensic or legal discourses (Cowburn, 2005) in which perpetrators are discussed in terms of violations and the law. In doing so, perpetrators are positioned as different to law-abiding citizens. Lawbreakers then are positioned as the ‘other’, as different to ‘normal’ community members. The criminal is demonized, constructed as threatening and violent. Thus, seemingly normal community members who do not look like a ‘criminal’ may not be considered as such. They may not feel that they are in any way wrong as they do not experience themselves in this way.

In line with the criminal as threatening, dangerous and violent are constructions of the *aggressor* who *attacks those whom are weaker* (6), who is *hostile* (55; 117) and *aggressive* (25; 98). There is also the *coercer* (25), who is *forceful and intimidating* (6; 5; 32; 60; 99). And, the *abuser* who treats with *cruelty and violence* (5; 32; 122; 124). Also, there is the *predator* who *hunts, stalks and exploits* (60; 99; 107). These constructions work together in the discourse of villains to create the positions for perpetrators as *in control* and *powerful* (20) or as the remover of choice and agency. From this position perpetrators can make demands from their victims as opposed to requests. Perpetrators are then subjectively superior or dominant. From a position of power in relation to their victims, they may then experience their actions as right and justified.

Furthermore, the constructions of perpetrators as villains gives merit to the ‘real rape’ template in which when a virginal young woman, of the most respectable standing, is violently accosted by a monstrous stranger and she resists to the full extent of her ability but

is brutally raped sustaining multiple serious, lasting physical injuries (Estrich, 1986). When rape and sexual violence does not fit the ‘real rape’ image, or when perpetrators do not characterise their actions as violent, they do not fit in the discourse of villains in which case the opportunity arises for them to resist this position. They feel that they are not guilty or that their actions cannot be understood as rape.

Within the villain discourse there is also a discursive construction of perpetrators as the delinquent. During the time of Foucault’s writings, the delinquent was considered an abnormal individual (1995). This too emerges from the data; the perpetrator as *abnormal* (71), as *deviant* (4; 86; 122). In this instance, the villain discourse invokes a “bogyman fallacy” (Leon, 2011), p. 23) in which perpetrators have unique, unknown, monstrous identities. As Foucault (2003) remarks, the individual resembles his crime. This minimises all other forms of rape and sexual violence that in some way resembles ‘normal sex’ and subsequently all perpetrators’ actions that are not in line with the real rape image. This allows individuals who have sexually perpetrated to distance themselves from the crime and continue to perpetrate, and other members of society to distance themselves from the perpetrator. On the other hand, by taking up the position of other, abnormal or deviant, perpetrators may excuse their actions because of their experience as inherently flawed and different from “normal” individuals. The villain discourse then becomes a homogenous discursive label which implicitly constructs the perpetrator as other and sets up a false division between “normal” community members and perpetrators of rape and sexual violence. Thus, if perpetrators do not characterize their actions as rape, or themselves as villains, they feel that they are not guilty or that their actions cannot be understood as rape or wrong.

According to Foucault (1995), judging the delinquent requires biographical knowledge, involving observation of the delinquent and consideration of the circumstance of the crime; his life story. This is achieved from the viewpoint of psychology and its “dangerous proclivities”, social positions and its “harmful predispositions” and upbringing and its “bad antecedents” (Foucault, 1995, p. 252). By implication then, the victim-villain dichotomy is reproduced as the victim-villain overlap. The delinquent with his life story becomes the victim. Furthermore, judging the “delinquent” from the viewpoints just mentioned above is accomplished in the discourse to follow.

2. Psychological discourse

The psychological discourse accounts for attachment dynamics, emotional instability, personality characteristics, cognitions and beliefs, and dysregulation, in the discursive construction of perpetrators. Within the data, perpetrators were compared with so-called norms which suggests that they are different to and distinct from “normal” individuals. The psychological discourse was thus produced through the use of psychological theories in the data as a means of explaining this difference.

2.1 Attachment discourse

Attachment theory was used in discussions relating *to the upbringing* (121), *early experiences* (1; 4; 127) and development of perpetrators and how their developmental history formed a predisposition to offend. It was also used in explaining and describing the potential *relationship difficulties experienced* (73) by perpetrators in their current lives. These discussions also highlighted the implications for sexual perpetration in relation to *attachment in childhood* (67) and *adulthood*.

By examining the theories and discussions used in the data, the attachment discourse emerged. The attachment discourse accounts for *the nature of the bond formed between infant and caregiver* (73). This discourse posits that for the *healthy development of a sense of self, others and the world, one needs attachment security* (63). To be positioned as a securely attached individual, one needs an *emotionally available, supportive, affectionate, consistently responsive, nurturing and reliable caregiver* (63; 66; 67). Furthermore, within this discourse the securely attached individual goes on to develop a *positive image of the self and others, a sense of autonomy and independence, healthy interpersonal and emotional functioning* (51; 121), *relational intimacy, empathy* (77), *moral reasoning* (11), *perspective-taking* (77) and *self-worth* (41). However, in the attachment discourse, *care disruptions, environmental dissonance, or various other negative childhood experiences* (18) for example, *trauma* (35), *neglect* (7) and *physical abuse* (4; 35), *loss* (1), *sexual abuse* (1; 4), and violence, *may lead to insecure attachments* (35; 121). In the data, perpetrators were discursively constructed as *insecurely attached* (67; 75; 77) and *affectionless characters/personalities* (7; 77) through the use of the attachment discourse. The discursive construction of perpetrators as insecurely attached makes available subject positions of *interpersonally and emotionally dysfunctional* (126), *criminally vulnerable, maladaptive* (39; 121), *relationally inept, psychopathological, problematic, predisposed* (77), *emotionally distant* (51) and *lacking empathy* (1; 20; 113) and *moral reasoning* (11; 77 ;113). From the positions of criminally vulnerable, maladaptive,

psychopathological, and predisposed, perpetrators then have little to no control over their actions as they are at the mercy of their “developmental deficits”. Furthermore, from the positions of being interpersonally or emotionally dysfunctional, their actions could be seen as an *attachment behaviour* (77) that is, as a way to achieve intimacy or satisfy unmet needs through sexually aggressive means. There are contradictory subjectivities available within these constructions. That is, the insecurely attached perpetrator may experience a negative self-image, may feel unlovable and inadequate, lonely, may fear rejection and abandonment and may experience isolation. On the other hand, from the positions of emotionally distant, lacking empathy and moral reasoning, perpetrators may not experience said subjectivities but rather a lack of guilt, shame and a low sense of responsibility or concern for others.

The attachment discourse also framed attachment patterns and styles as *stable* (41), as having an impact *throughout his or her life*, as a *trait-like characteristic* (77), as altering little over the life span. This offers the position of eternally suffering, as set in their ways. As such, from this position perpetrators are subjectively hopeless in their attempts to change their actions and experiences. That is, nothing can be done. On the other hand, attachment patterns and styles were also framed as dynamic, *fluctuating* and *malleable* (41); as *not impervious to change* (75). That is, changes in caregiver environments from infancy, through childhood and adolescence, to adulthood, can *alter attachment patterns* (77), and attachment styles can develop and change *throughout the course of the life span*. In this construction then, there is a possibility for change.

Within the attachment discourse, sexually aggressive behaviours were attributed to negative relationships and often produced as a result of chaotic/ “abnormal” home environments of the perpetrators. This not only nullifies the possibility of securely attached individuals being perpetrators, but it also privileges one kind of caregiving environment over another. The implication of this is that it becomes easier for society and possibly professionals to distance themselves from the rape phenomenon as it would only occur in damaged or abnormal environments. That is, perpetrators who seemingly have good relationships with their caregivers and are in seemingly healthy romantic relationships therefore cannot be a perpetrator of rape within this discourse. And those with a “chaotic” upbringing are again considered with suspicion or anticipation for perpetration.

2.2 Personality discourse

The personality discourse was produced by reference to ‘typical’ personality traits found ‘in’ perpetrators of rape. Within this discourse, perpetrators were constructed as having less “favourable” characteristics. In some instances, these constructions painted a coherent picture of the perpetrators. In other instances, perpetrators were constructed in contradictory ways. Regardless, the problem of rape perpetration was attributed to individual personality characteristics “inside” of the perpetrators.

Through explicit reference to *the big five personality traits* namely *neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness* (10; 111), perpetrators were constructed as *high in neuroticism* (86; 111). Being constructed in this way offers positions such as *emotionally reactive* or as having an *often negative affect* (10). From these subject positions then, legitimate forms of behaviour or practices include emotional acting out. Furthermore, this emotional acting out and possible experiences of, for instance, *depression* (52; 71), *anxiety, fear or anger* (5; 126), is attributed to their personality type. That is, their emotional adjustment and *predisposition to negative and varying affects* (10) are considered an internal and stable characteristic rather than, for instance, the result of their upbringing.

In addition to being constructed as neurotic, perpetrators were also as constructed as *introverted* (111) through explicit reference to *low extraversion scores* (10). This opens up positions of being *unfriendly, not sociable*, as being a *loner* (92), or as being *incapable of having positive interactions with other people* (10). The implications for practice and subjectivity then include perpetrators experiencing loneliness, they may withdraw and isolate themselves, and when coming to in contact with other people, their interactions would be of a “negative” nature. Furthermore, there is a tendency towards suspicion regarding individuals who keep to themselves, or who are considered “unfriendly”. Thus, the individual who scores high on extraversion, who engages in positive interactions with people and seeks the company of others, is regarded with less suspicion and further is distanced from the ‘perpetrator’ label.

Perpetrators of rape were further constructed as “having” *psychopathic traits* (2; 20; 42; 74; 86; 113). This construction offers positions as violent, *callous* (42;46; 72; 86), *lacking empathy and emotion* (42; 46; 86), and *self-serving* (46; 114). What perpetrators can do and experience from these positions then is violent behaviour against another person with a feeling of gratification and no remorse. That is, the discursive construction of “psychopathic”

does not allow for being sensitive to others' feelings, experiences, and rights. Rather, it creates the opportunity for 'deviance' and brings about an experience of fear and suspicion in society. In addition to being psychopathic, perpetrators were also constructed as having *narcissistic traits* (81). Being constructed in this way creates subject positions of *entitled*, *dominating*, *self-serving*, and as having *low empathy* (81;114). Thus, legitimate forms of behaviours would include taking from others what they feel they are owed, exerting power over others, and putting their own needs ahead of others. Further, from these positions, perpetrators are offered the experience of gratification, and a sense of power as well as no regard and remorse for others.

The above-mentioned discursive constructions of perpetrators within the wider discourse of psychology and sub-discourse of personality locates the problem of rape 'inside' of the perpetrator as they may "have" unfavourable personality traits that has been, in the data, associated with criminal and sexually violent behaviours. Furthermore, the personality of perpetrators is constructed as *stable throughout the life span* (37) in which case perpetrators are further positioned as inherently flawed. Within this discourse, agency is removed from perpetrators in that they cannot help their actions as it is part of 'who they are' and the issues of sexual violence could then be said to be an unchangeable result of unfavourable personalities.

Within a personality discourse, responsibility and agency is removed as rape is attributed to their internal characteristics. Thus, this discourse then normalises their actions in that it is considered part-and-parcel of those who are constructed in this way. This discourse also reinforces the view that perpetrators are different to and distinct from individuals with more so-called "favourable" personalities. The implication of this is that this discourse makes invisible perpetrators who may be considered as having more favourable personality traits. For instance, perpetrators who are not labelled "psychopathic" or who are considered to have relatively normal emotional reactions are not accounted for within this discourse. This not only allows for such perpetrators to distance themselves from the image of perpetrators but also to minimise their actions. It also allows for society to distance themselves from the reality of sexual violence as it is associated with a specific kind of person, an "other".

2.3 Internal chaos

The internal chaos discourse accounts for the deficits perpetrators of rape may have in self-control. Within this discourse, perpetrators were constructed as having *low self-control*

(4; 22; 33), as being *impulsive* (4; 8; 72; 114), as having *poor emotion regulation* (4; 25; 63; 66) and *problem-solving skills* (8), and as *having executive functioning deficits* (58; 121).

The internal chaos discourse accounts for executive functioning *as the ability to react in adaptive ways, conceptualize and modify plans, to monitor interpersonal interactions, to regulate emotions, and as necessary to navigate human interactions appropriately* (24). Thus, positions offered in this discourse are that of being out of control of one's behaviours as well as emotional reactions. In addition, perpetrators are positioned as maladaptive or as having an internal dysfunction. That is, in some ways, perpetrators approach and respond to the world in a disorganised way, they are not capable of managing themselves.

By taking up these positions, perpetrators are unable to claim responsibility for their actions as they are subjectively "out of their control". From within this discourse, perpetrators have no foresight regarding their behaviours in which case they act upon urges without recognising the consequences and effects. Being positioned in this way, perpetrators are offered the opportunity to act due to a difficulty in delaying gratification. Furthermore, from a wider psychological discourse, this "internal chaos" is said to be as a result of *critical events deemed traumatic which impairs information processing and self-control* (24). This then positions perpetrators as vulnerable or victims of circumstance. This resembles the victim-villain overlap previously discussed. It is also said that a *lack of self-control is predictive of sexually deviant behaviour* (4) in which case perpetrators are constructed as having a predisposition to rape. That is, perpetrators actions are framed as unintentional, as not their fault. From these positions, perpetrators may experience themselves as powerless to their internal dysfunction, as vulnerable or fragmented. They may feel that they need help in managing themselves. Without self-control it is suggested that perpetrators will continue to commit sex offenses. Thus, this discourse places responsibility outside of the perpetrators to stop behaviours. Subsequently, responsibility is then placed on others, for instance, members of society, professionals or their victims. This discourse also closes down the possibility for self-controlled, well-regulated or functioning individuals to be considered as perpetrators of rape. In which case, perpetrators are again 'othered'. Further implications include the creation of a sense of worry or suspicion of other people who have also been positioned as "out of control" to potentially end up as perpetrators of rape.

2.4 At the mercy of emotions

This discourse accounts for the way in which perpetrators of rape minimise or deny negative emotions and the way in which emotions find *another way out* (44). Thus, within this discourse, perpetrators were constructed as *emotionally incongruent* (12). Furthermore, this discourse accounts for perpetrators being *unable to regulate their emotions* (39) in which case they find ways to do so. Perpetrators are thus constructed as unable to cope with negative emotions, *as easily agitated, and as angry* (39; 73; 117; 126). The positions within this discourse then is that of either being *too far from emotions* (44) or being “too close to emotions”.

From the position of being too far from emotions, perpetrators may experience themselves as disconnected, as “out of touch” or empty. Also, from this position, perpetrators are powerless to their far away emotions in which case their actions are framed as these far away emotions seeking another way out. Within this discourse, emotions seeking a way out involves impulsive reactions as well as *taking refuge in sexual fantasies* (44). Thus, their actions, that is the perpetration of rape, become the result of impulsivity coupled with deviant sexual fantasies due not being in touch with their emotions.

Alternatively, from the position of being too close to emotions, perpetrators may experience themselves as overwhelmed by emotions and unable to process or regulate appropriately. From within this discourse, perpetrators actions are understood to be mood alleviating strategies or *coping strategies for negative emotional states* (25). Furthermore, their actions are seen as being motivated by their emotions, more specifically *anger* (98). Also, from this position of being too close to emotions, perpetrators’ sexually exploitative behaviours can be attributed to the *seeking of emotional needs* (52; 73). That is, *power, control and perceived intimacy* (4; 6; 52; 60) which is said to be gained from perpetration. This discourse accounts for emotions nearly as a separate entity which takes control of the perpetrator. Thus, perpetrators are then possibly deemed as at the mercy of (negative) emotions. This discourse does not account for the possibility of more ‘favourable’ emotions experienced by perpetrators. Thus, sexual perpetration becomes a result of negative emotions within an individual.

2.5 Cognitions and schemas: the criminal mind?

This discourse makes reference to *patterns of thinking, internal processes, views, and beliefs* (50; 122) that people ‘have’. In relation to perpetrators of rape, this discourse asserts

that perpetrators have *distorted cognitions* (20; 50; 60; 69; 116; 121). This is achieved in the discourse by presenting the argument that perpetrators of rape act in sexually deviant ways because they have a set of *beliefs that are considered rape supportive* (8; 115). Thus, perpetrators are constructed as a product of cognitive processes, more so as ‘having’ offence-supportive or wrong beliefs. Perpetrators are then offered the subject position of having a criminal mind, a mind that is different to or distinct from a non-criminal mind. Furthermore, this discourse accounts for different kinds of distorted cognitions such as hostility towards women, sexual entitlement, beliefs that their actions are unharmed, and that *women enjoy coercive sex* (20). This opens up various subject positions for which perpetrators can take up, for instance *hostile to women* (14; 107; 117), *entitled to sex* (107; 116), *as unharmed to children and women* (8; 107), and *giving women what they enjoy* (20). By taking up these positions, perpetrators may then act accordingly and achieve justification, denial or minimisation for their actions. By suggesting that perpetration occurs because of distorted cognition, it further implies that perpetrators are unaware of their wrongdoing or that they do not consider it as problematic. By implication then, perpetrators may experience less guilt and shame as well as deny responsibility for their actions. It also produces the idea that the cause of rape is rooted in the individual ‘criminal mind’ and denies the impact of social relations.

Furthermore, the subject positions available to perpetrators can be located within wider gender discourses. That is, taking up the position as being *entitled to sex* (116), for instance, is only available to men. This is consistent with traditional patriarchal ideas about men being superior to women in that they have the right, as men, to ‘take’ sex from women (Pemberton & Wakeling, 2009; Polaschek & Ward, 2002). Also, by taking up the position of giving women what they enjoy, male perpetrators are able to claim responsibility for women’s sexual pleasure and experience themselves as sexually competent and skilled. However, this is seemingly not available to female perpetrators. Furthermore, male perpetrators then can resist the label of offender by making claims of meeting the “masculine ideal” (Cowburn, 2005, p. 15). From the position of the masculine ideal, perpetrators may then experience themselves as powerful, right and justified. It could further be considered then, that the ‘criminal mind’ can only be located in the male mind. Thus, the female perpetrator is not accounted for within this discourse.

3. Pathology discourse: diseased bodies and minds

This discourse accounts for the way in perpetrators are pathologized. By drawing on symptoms, criteria and abnormalities, perpetrators are othered. Perpetrators are further produced as “the worst of the worst” by locating them at the pathological end of a normalcy spectrum. This becomes apparent by contrasting this discourse with the psychological discourse in which the perpetrator moves from being an unfavourable to a pathological. Furthermore, the problem of rape perpetration is attributed to diseased minds and diseased bodies.

3.1 Psycho-pathology

This discourse produces ‘internal badness’ in explanations for sexual offending. It functions to find or discover an underlying aetiology for perpetration. It also produces a spectrum of normalcy and places perpetrators on the abnormal end of this spectrum. That is, there is a shift from, perpetrators having ‘unfavourable’ personality traits, as in the psychological discourse, to perpetrators having ‘pathological’ personalities such as *Anti-social personality disorder* (42; 57; 69; 113; 127), *Borderline personality disorder* (15; 43; 103), *Narcissistic personality disorder* (81; 114). Furthermore, perpetrators are constructed as emotionally disturbed or unwell. However, considering the spectrum of normalcy, the pathology discourse places perpetrators on the pathological end of the emotion spectrum in which case, they are diagnosable, as emotionally disordered. For instance, instead of being understood as merely experiencing negative feelings, perpetrators meet criteria and can be classified as having *mood disorders* (6; 52). The pathology discourse also considers perpetrators as having *pathological sexual interests and arousal* (32) or a *sexual disorder* (49; 54; 108) in which case they are positioned as being inappropriately aroused because of a pathological sexual condition such as *Sadism* (6; 32; 79; 105; 122). Perpetrators are further positioned as out of control of their sexuality due to *recurrent, intense, or intrusive preoccupations* (54) with sex in which case, their interest in sex is shifted to the pathological end of the spectrum such as in *Hypersexual disorder*. The pathologizing of personality, emotions and sexuality is done through the explicit reference to the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM)* (9; 19; 32; 49; 57; 107) as well as the *International statistical classification of diseases and related health problems (ICD-10)* (32; 105). In doing so, perpetrators then “become” a disordered subject. The implication of this is that perpetrators are considered abnormal or damaged. It further creates a ‘patient’ position for perpetrators in which case their actions are a by-product of the symptoms and condition. By

taking up the position of a ‘mentally ill patient’, perpetrators’ behaviour can be justified and normalised. It further enables perpetrators to experience themselves as vulnerable and out of control which may strip them of their agency.

3.2 Medical-pathology

This discourse accounts for the causes of rape as being that of a physiological defect. For instance, in the data there was explicit reference to perpetrators of rape having some form of *brain jury* (9; 58), *hormonal abnormalities and neurophysiological deficits* (18; 24; 67; 110), as well as needing medications or *pharmacological treatments* (52; 123). Perpetrators were constructed as *disordered* (61), sick and as *sexually obsessed* (123) in a clinical sense. Within this discourse, claims are made about perpetrators needing medication to *inhibit physiological arousal/erection, sexual desire and orgasm* (73), that their behaviours are due to a *high level of testosterone* (58). The implication of this is that sexual violence is about sex and male sexual urges, in which case perpetrators are positioned as ‘sex-crazed’, as victim to their sexual urges, as out of control of their bodies, as *burdened by their hypersexuality* (123). There is a heavy presence of Holloway’s (1989) ‘male sexual drive’ discourse which is based on biological and reproductive reasoning which positions men as having a natural drive to have sex. An uncontrollable sex drive thus takes away from the responsibility of the perpetrator. It positions men as having little conscious control over their sexuality and since they are at the mercy of a sex drive, they cannot be held accountable either for becoming sexually aroused or for their actions thereafter (Anderson & Doherty, 2007). In terms of subjectivity, Willig (2013, p. 133) argues that the discourse of the male sexual drive allows a man not only to publicly disclaim responsibility for an act of sexual violence but to actually feel less guilty about it.

Furthermore, perpetrators’ behaviours are attributed to *neural pathways* that have been disrupted by *the overproduction of stress-related hormones* (18; 57; 66; 121), *endocrine abnormalities* (58) or to *brain injury* (69). According to this discourse, *inappropriate reactions* are influenced by *genetic and biological factors* associated with *neurodevelopmental deficits such as ADHD* (33; 58; 110). There is also the assertion that *uncontrolled diabetes* (58) could be the reason for *aggressive behaviours seen in perpetrators of rape*. This further positions perpetrators as out of control, it also opens up the positions of being sick, of being a patient rather than perpetrator, as in some way damaged. Being positioned in this way allows perpetrators to be medically justified in their behaviours, to feel somewhat different to other populations. From this position then, perpetrators might

experience themselves as helpless, powerless, vulnerable, and in need of care. This discourse also brings a scientific approach to human problems in which case perpetrators can be diagnosed and treated accordingly. However, the implication of this is that the onus is on relevant professionals to find, diagnose and treat perpetrators to reduce the problem of sexual violence. The problem then shifts from being in the individual mind to being in the individual body. By constructing perpetrators within this discourse, their actions are normalised as a by-product of these physiological symptoms. It is also the case that perpetrators are again deemed as ‘abnormal’. Sexual violence is then framed as a medical problem.

Within a discourse of pathology, perpetrators are able to continue to harm while relinquishing personal and moral responsibility. This discourse also shifts focus from problems at a societal level to an individualized account of pathology and abnormality. It reinforces the view that perpetrators are different to and distinct from so-called normal individuals. This discourse enables perpetrators of rape to be othered. It also denies the existence of ‘healthy’ perpetrators.

4. Treatment and prevention discourse

This discourse accounts for the ‘abnormalities’ and ‘dysfunctions’ found in perpetrators and the way forward in improving their conditions. Thus, within this discourse perpetrators were constructed as “treatable”. The treatment discourse, in conjunction with the psychological discourse and pathology discourse, served to position perpetrators as *patients* (27) or *clients* (44; 56; 69; 119; 121). From this position, perpetrators may experience themselves, or be understood as vulnerable, as needing the help or guidance from a professional to ‘improve’ or get better. This strips perpetrators of their agency and further allows them the opportunity to deny responsibility for their actions or to justify it. This is because, within this discourse the perpetration of rape is due to mental or medical illness. Furthermore, the treatment discourse reinforces the idea that problem of rape is rooted in the individual perpetrator by making explicit claims that *treatment should be tailored to their individual needs* (118). The individual needs of perpetrators as presented in the data included *decreasing heavy drinking* (62; 115) and *improve understanding of consent* (128). The implication then is that perpetrators engage in sexual violence when intoxicated. This positions them as having *lowered inhibitions* which makes them *vulnerable to risky behaviours* (125; 128). This allows for the justification of their actions as well as offers the opportunity to deny responsibility. Also, perpetrators are positioned as lacking understanding of consent, in which case their actions can be minimised and again justified as they were

acting within the ‘limits’ of their understanding. That is, perpetrators may not consider their actions as non-consensual. Furthermore, according to the treatment discourse other individual needs/problems for which intervention is needed include *problem-solving skills* (8; 101; 118), *coping strategies* (31;101; 121), *self-esteem* (106; 118), *self-efficacy* (16; 106; 118) and, *social skills* (15; 69; 118). By implication then, perpetrators are positioned as being unable to problem-solve and cope; as having low self-esteem and self-efficacy and having no social skills. The treatment discourse further draws on previously mentioned discourses of cognitive distortions, emotional disturbance, perpetrators as victims, attachment and pathology discourse to further position perpetrators as criminal minds, as at the mercy of their emotions, as victims, as insecurely attached, as clients or patients. The problem of rape is then understood as rooted in the individual as previously mentioned. The responsibility thus falls on professional mental health practitioners in ‘fixing’ the problem. And perpetrators of rape are considered a vulnerable population in which the site for change is located.

A discursive variation became apparent in the data through the acknowledgement of the social element in the prevention of rape perpetration. That is, in the data rape prevention strategies were aimed at *challenging rape myths and addressing gender socialization* (115; 128). Perpetrators are thus recognised as social participants, as products of the social environment which creates the opportunity for rape. Although these instances were limited in the data as they were not dominant themes but rather brief claims, they still constructed perpetrators in a different light. This discourse demonstrates a shift from ‘individual abnormalities’ to traditional views of masculinity and male sexual dominance that can be mobilised to legitimate an act of rape. By implication, then, the site for change is in cultural understandings that provide a social pattern for coercive sexuality. However, although within this discourse, rape is more of a social problem than an individual problem, female perpetration is unaccounted for. Thus, from a social perspective, perpetrators are understood to be males who have taken up the positions available to them in a gender discourse. That is, as masculine, superior, as sexually entitled. However, within a gender discourse of sexual violence, the positions available to women are that of ‘victim’, inferior, and sexual objects, and not perpetrator. Female perpetrators are then offered the opportunity to deny the label of perpetrator as they are excluded from the prevention of sexual violence.

5. Career discourse- Perpetrators as knowledgeable experts.

The career discourse accounts for the ‘career paths’ in which perpetrators may find themselves. That is, perpetrators start their careers at a particular point, they then obtain

knowledge and skills through their practices within their career, they use the *knowledge and skills* (17) gained and become *experts* (17). Thus, this discourse constructed perpetrators as *skilled and knowledgeable* (17) in their field of criminality. Furthermore, it is claimed that perpetrators *start their criminal career with less serious or non-sexual offences* (26; 93) and then *progress* (48; 76) and *develop* (36) as they gain more experience. This discourse then offers perpetrators a position on an ‘expert continuum’. By being constructed as skilled in the data, perpetrators were further positioned as *rational* (22; 99), *decision-makers* (22; 99), persuasive, problem-solvers, *allowing them to persist in their offending* (3). From these positions, perpetrators may experience themselves as competent. Their perpetration demonstrates an *ability to plan* (29; 33; 55), *achieve goals* (4; 55; 17) or *criminal aims* (29), to recognise problems such as *potentially getting caught and altering their approach, accurately and quickly appraise offense situations and act accordingly* (17). It was also noted that, within the career discourse, perpetrators were constructed as either *generalists* (3; 40; 113) or *specialists* (26; 36; 40; 68; 113). Generalists were understood to be perpetrators who are involved in *different types of sexual crimes* whereas specialists were understood to be involved in *a specific type of sexual crime* (48). These constructions of generalist and specialist positioned perpetrators as having different levels of *expertise* (17) according to their *interests* or *victim-preference* (60). The implications for subjectivity and practice include perpetrators feeling competent and accomplished when committing a sexual offence. That they are achieving goals and gaining knowledge and skill. Furthermore, perpetrators are thus self-creating agents in which their actions are attributed to consciousness and decision-making. Consequently then, as also apparent in the data, perpetrators of rape are offered a different opportunity for practice, that is as experts they are then *able to provide insights for prevention practices* (59), they are also able to claim responsibility through taking up the position as expert. This discourse serves to minimise the action of perpetrators by reducing it to *criminal careers* (33; 36; 48) or “business as usual”. Victims of sexual violence are thus collateral damage or objects in perpetrators’ professional development.

6. Gender discourse

In the data, male and female perpetrators were at times constructed differently by drawing on a gender discourse. Within a gender discourse, sex role stereotypes or *traditional gender roles* (14; 128) are produced that determine the appropriate social standards of behaviour for men and women (Burt, 1980). For instance, Prentice and Carranza (2002) illustrate the differences in gender roles for the masculine and the feminine. Individuals

positioned as female or feminine are typically characterised as affectionate, cheerful, childlike, compassionate, does not use harsh language, eager to soothe hurt feelings, gentle, gullible, loves children, loyal, sensitive to the needs of others, shy, soft-spoken, sympathetic, tender, understanding, warm, and yielding. The characteristics typically associated with the male or masculine position are aggressive, ambitious, analytical, assertive, athletic, competitive, defends own beliefs, dominant, forceful, has leadership abilities, independent, individualistic, makes decisions easily, self-reliant, self-sufficient, strong personality, willing to take a stand, and willing to take risks (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Furthermore, gender stereotypes assume that male sexual aggression is a natural and apparently hard-to-restrain part of men's genetic make-up (Weiss, 2009). Women on the other hand are seen as asexual beings for whom sex is a means to an end- that is monogamy, intimacy, partnership and family life (Gavey, 2005; Hollway 1989).

In the data, perpetrators were constructed as *mostly men* (115) or *traditionally male* (3). Furthermore, male perpetrators were implicitly constructed as having typical masculine traits. They were positioned as *threatening* (118), *dominant and aggressive* (98), as needing to achieve *sexual gratification* (118), *as needing to inflict physical pain* (6). In comparison, female perpetrators were implicitly constructed as having typical feminine traits. They were positioned as *less violent* (120), *as needing to inflict psychological or emotional pain* (94), *as seeking emotional connections* (30), *as dependent* (38; 40; 121) and, *as desiring affection* (43).

Rape and sexual violence are considered a male crime and, in the data female perpetrators of rape were recognised and constructed as *rare* (43), unknowable, and mysterious. However, it was also observed that female perpetrators became knowable in the data by constructing them in three different ways. Firstly, female perpetrators were constructed as *predisposed* (43) to perpetration. That is, they were positioned as *victims of prior sexual abuse* (40; 66; 120; 121) and as *psychologically disturbed* (30; 43; 118). This resembles positions available to perpetrators (male and female) in the previously discussed discourses. Secondly, female perpetrators were constructed as *intimacy seeking* (30). They were positioned as needing or desiring love and affection and their actions were constructed as *filling a void* (30), rather than as a form of violence. From this position, female perpetrators can subjectively experience gratification and positive affect. In this instance, their actions are constructed as 'sex', and in line with discourses of femininity, as being about emotional connectedness. They may experience their offence as some sort of *romantic*

relationship (43). This allows their actions to be minimised and justified in a different way to previously discussed discourses. Thirdly, female perpetrators are constructed as *male-coerced* (30; 40; 43; 118; 120). This positions them as passive, *subservient* (14) and *forced and coerced by males* (38; 43). This strips them of their agency and provided a discursive opportunity to disclaim responsibility. This is consistent with the way that heteronormative discourses link masculinity with aggression and dominance, and femininity with passivity, submissiveness and vulnerability (Butler, 1993). Thus, the gender discourse creates different opportunities for subjectivity and practice for male and female perpetrators with female perpetrators being largely unacknowledged, or explicitly accounted for in limited ways.

Concluding remarks

In this chapter, the findings of the analysis were presented and discussed. Six dominant discourses, some with sub-discourses embedded within, were described and linked to research and theory. Furthermore, to support the findings, excerpts from the data were included. The findings revealed multiple discourses, constructions and subject positions, as well as variations and contradictions between and within them. It also revealed complex connections across one another. The following chapter will further discuss these findings and integrate the discussion with the literature, thereafter, concluding the research with a reflexive account, as well as addressing limitations and future recommendations.

CHAPTER SIX: INTEGRATION AND CONCLUSION

This final chapter provides a further discussion of the way in which the discourses presented in the findings fit together in producing certain effects and functions. It also looks at contradictions and variations that were produced. Integrated into this discussion is situating the findings within the literature as well as a look at how psychology journal articles fit into larger societal discourses. This chapter then provides a reflexive account in which possible influences and effects on the research process is acknowledged. Following this, the research is concluded by addressing the limitations, further discussing recommendations for future research, followed by a brief concluding note.

Integration and discussion of discourses

The aim of the analysis was to explore the ways in which perpetrators of rape were discursively constructed in psychology journal articles. The findings of this research described six dominant discourses, namely a victim/villain discourse, a psychological discourse, a pathology discourse, a treatment discourse, a career discourse and a gender discourse, some of which had sub-discourses embedded within.

A discursive effect of the discourses presented was diminishing responsibility of perpetrators. This was possible through locating the blame in other factors outside of the perpetrators' control, for instance, their circumstances, psychological characteristics, and physiological deficits. This effect was produced specifically in the victim/villain discourse, the psychological discourse, the pathology discourse as well as the treatment discourse. Thus, there is a similar trend to attribute perpetrators' actions to uncontrollable urges, disorders and past suffering in both psychology journal articles and in the talk of police officers (Lea, Auburn, & Kibblewhite, 1999), social workers (Elias & Haj-Yahia, 2017), and general population (Weiss, 2009). Furthermore, perpetrators' diminished responsibility in psychology journal articles is consistent with perpetrators' obscured responsibility in news media (Bonnes, 2010).

Another discursive effect of the discourses was that of othering perpetrators of rape. That is, the pathology discourse together with the discourse of villains framed perpetrators as different to normal individuals. By drawing on symptoms, criteria and abnormalities and, by framing perpetrators as monstrous and violent criminals, psychology journal articles construct the perpetrator as an 'other' and sets up a false division between "normal" community members and perpetrators of rape and sexual violence. These discursive

constructions of perpetrators of rape resembled ideas of a rapist as a rare, marginal stranger, sexual psychopath or monster that has become common place in the wider cultural context (Brown & Walklate, 2011; Chasteen, 2001). Both instances exclude seemingly ordinary individuals from the offence. The findings in the analysis also demonstrated a consistency with rape myths presented in the literature. For instance, the discourses of pathology and villains reinforce the view that only crazy men rape, and that perpetrators are monsters who are abusive all the time (Burt, 1980; Gqola, 2016). The implication of this is that society can distance themselves from the reality of sexual violence as it is associated with a specific kind of person, an “other”.

The findings of this research also presented largely individualizing discourses. That is, human experience, or in this case rape perpetration, became psychologized and individualized (Parker & Revelli, 2018). The sub-discourses of attachment, personality, internal chaos, at the mercy of emotions and, cognitions and schemas worked together to form the dominant psychological discourse and, produced the effect of locating the problem of rape in individual perpetrators. Furthermore, the treatment discourse reinforces the idea that problem of rape is rooted in the individual perpetrator by making explicit claims that treatment should be tailored to their individual needs. This demonstrates a difficulty in psychology to transcend the individual-social dualism (Hollway et al., 2003; Lea & Auburn, 2001). This form of dualism according to Hollway et al., (2003) refers to the way in which vital concepts of ‘individual’ and ‘society’ are theorized as two separate entities, and no account is made of how the individual becomes social. This is consistent with Salazar and Cook's (2002) findings regarding psychological research and its reliance on individual psychology to reveal answers to sexual violence as opposed to the social and cultural context of the problem. Furthermore, by individualizing the problem of rape, wider society can resist any responsibility in social patterns that allow rape to become a legitimate form of behaviour (Parker et al., 1995). Reducing the actions of perpetrators to an individual level of analysis reinforces the view that sex offenders are different to, and distinct from, so-called ‘normal’ individuals (Bryden & Grier, 2011; Lea & Auburn, 2001; Scully & Marolla, 1984). This finding resembles the conceptualisation of rape in the twentieth century in which rape was believed to be a symptom of a perversion or that rapists were mentally ill (Donat & D’Emilio, 1992).

A further implication of the individualizing effect is that the responsibility falls on psychologists in ‘fixing’ the problem. That is, psychologists are positioned as experts; as holders of relevant knowledge about, in this case, perpetrators of rape, that can access their inner world, assess it and treat it (Hook, 2004c). Working together with the individualizing effect of the discourses is also a taxonomic function. That is, attempts to classify or group together typologies and profiles of perpetrators based on observations, assessments, profiles, biographical data and nature of their offences. In doing so, the data produced a set of descriptive categories which lay claim to ‘know’ perpetrators of rape. This further functioned to produce human problems, such as rape perpetrations, as scientific problems that must be studied, known, categorised, regulated and treated. According to Foucault (1978), the rise of human problems as scientific problems transformed the criminal into the mad who needed medical attention by scientific experts. If perpetrators are constructed in this way, then there is the implication that medical and mental health practitioners are the experts. It is here where the effects of disciplinary power can be observed. That is, perpetrators of rape are observed and classified, by persons who inhabit a position of disciplinary power, according to the prevailing standards of normality (Burr, 2015; Foucault, 1995).

In the analysis there were also variations. According to Potter and Wetherell (1987), talk, and in the case of this research text, constructs different versions of the world, variation is therefore expected between persons and within persons. Furthermore, the Foucauldian approach assumes there is no one ‘world’ that can be described and studied; rather, there are numerous versions, each of which are constructed through discourse and practice (Willig, 2013). Variations in the findings were noted in the career discourse as well as the treatment discourse.

The career discourse accounts for the perpetrator having a ‘career path’. This is consistent with discourses circulating in criminology literature which applies a criminal career approach to gain insight into the way sexual offending develops over the individual’s life span (Blokland & Lussier, 2015; Loeber & Farrington, 2012). Furthermore, from this perspective, perpetrators are framed as decision-makers in which case they make sexually coercive decisions to obtain desired outcomes (Pedneault, 2015). Thus, it is argued in the literature that even if traditionally described as irrationals and impulsive individuals, perpetrators are capable of making decisions and considering the advantages and disadvantages of their actions (Beauregard & Leclerc, 2007). This is consistent with the variation that emerged in which case the career discourse disrupted the assumption that

perpetrators of rape are dysfunctional or abnormal. The pathology, psychological and treatment discourses produced the perpetrator as lacking control, as having unfavourable characteristics and deviant fantasies, and their re-offending as a negative progression of their dysfunctions. However, the career discourse produced ideas of perpetrators being rational, knowledgeable, as having interests versus deviant fantasies, and their reoffending as progression and development in a career. Furthermore, the career discourse offers the position of expert to perpetrators as opposed to psychologists, psychiatrists or medical doctors. This is consistent with arguments made that offender-based research is a more effective method to understand crime events (Bernasco, 2013). That is, to learn about crime, including how to prevent it, criminologists should go to the source (Jaques & Bonomo, 2016). The argument is that criminals have a firsthand perspective on what motivates their decisions, they are also the experts on the process involved in perpetration thus they are positioned to provide richer information regarding their actions (Bernasco, 2013; Jaques & Bonomo, 2016). For instance, Budin and Johnson (1989) surveyed 72 incarcerated adult sex offenders of children regarding prevention methods and what works and what does not. Similarly, Elliott, Browne, and Kilcoyne (1995) surveyed 91 convicted adult child sexual offenders about what they could recommend to children, parents and teachers to prevent child sexual abuse. This is in line with the findings of this research where perpetrators of rape are offered a different opportunity for practice, that is as experts they are able to provide insights for prevention practices. On a broader level, this variation disrupts the power relations in terms of who is the 'knower'.

As previously discussed, the treatment discourse accounted for how the problem of rape can be located in the individual. However, a discursive variation became apparent in this discourse in which case perpetrators are recognised as social participants, as products of the social environment which creates the opportunity for rape. Thus, this discourse demonstrates a shift from 'individual abnormalities' to rape myths and gender socialisation. This variation is in line with more recent understandings of sexual violence: That culturally transmitted assumptions about men, women, violence, sexuality, and myths about rape constitute a rape supportive culture, which has sustained and justified sexual violence throughout history (Donat & D'Emilio, 1992; Edwards et al., 2011; Gqola, 2016). Thus, the site for change differs from that of individual intervention and treatment to the cultural understandings that provide a social pattern for coercive sexuality. This is consistent with the social learning theory discussed in the literature which proposes that individuals are taught, through the

socialisation process, the appropriate actions for their genders regarding expected behaviours in society and that sexual violence is normative (Deming, 2009; Ellis, 1989; Scully & Marolla, 1984). This variation troubles the notion that psychology lacks recognition of the social and cultural context of sexual violence.

In concluding this discussion, the findings demonstrated that research by experts within the discipline of psychology has the status of expert knowledge in which case it holds power (Foucault, 1980). This knowledge and power are carried out through and infiltrates everyday social discourses (Foucault, 1995; Parker et al., 1995; Woodward, 2009). Psychology has supplied us with concepts, languages and procedures and these have saturated popular culture. We see them in multiple forms of advice columns, in public forms of confession, in chatlines, talk shows, in documentaries and discussions of the mass media, and in self-help publishing (Hook, 2004c). Here, the psy-complex is relevant as it is a broad network of psychological knowledge and practices, both in their institutionalised/professional and popular/informal forms (Hook, 2004c). More relevant to this research, the discourses produced by psychology journal articles can also be seen in myths that permeate wider society, the news media as well as in the talk of the other professionals and the general population. Thus, according to Parker et al. (1995), it no longer seems sensible to talk of professional and lay concepts as separate things since the distinction between them is not so much in the kinds of discourses used by speakers but rather the position from which they speak.

Reflexive account

Being directly affected by sexual violence and believing opportunities for sexual violence are created through social processes and relations of power, played a role in my choosing of the research area and question. It was also something I had to constantly reflect on throughout the research process. I became aware that it was initially difficult to stand outside of my own understanding of ‘perpetrators of sexual violence’ and my experience of feelings and thoughts that accompanied it. I experienced an intense frustration when engaging with accounts in the data that I read as in some way diminishing the responsibility of perpetrators. This frustration made me want to further question the nature of psychology and the effects it might have on the people we work with. I also recognised the impact it would have on those who have been subjected to sexual violence. To deal with this, I made notes in my research journal and further recognised the position from which I was experiencing this

frustration. As it was not that of the researcher, I had to work at re-positioning myself and further ground myself in theory.

Being a counselling psychologist in training and being exposed to theories and knowledges like those presented in the data also contributed to a difficulty I encountered in doing the analysis. I had to work hard at putting my own understanding and interpretations of the psychological theories and concepts aside as much as possible and focus more on what was written in the articles. That is, in forming a construction, I had to reflect on whether it was based on what I have learned in my training, whether I was engaging with it as taken-for-granted knowledge, or if I was allowing the data to speak for itself as much as possible. Furthermore, my epistemological position calls for critical thought regarding constructions of 'normal' and 'abnormal', for instance. This became overwhelming for me as I found myself in somewhat of a discursive spiral paradoxically searching for some kind of objective truth. However, I acknowledged this early in my analytical process and had to 're-ground' myself in my theoretical paradigm. I also tried more to ground my analysis in the data.

Discursive constructions in the findings positioned psychologists as experts; as holders of relevant knowledge about, in this case, perpetrators of rape, and thus charged with the responsibility to intervene and treat. As I am training in the discipline of psychology, this position invoked an overwhelming pressure to be able to treat and intervene. I then found myself feeling defensive and annoyed at this position. This could be unpacked and understood in numerous ways. However, I recognised this as the relationship between power and knowledge playing out and having consequences for subjectivity. Also, by taking up the position as expert, I had to consider whether I am further constructing perpetrators as vulnerable and if I am stripping them of their agency. In doing so, I would be further perpetuating the power relations between the psychologist and the perpetrator of sexual violence.

Furthermore, in my training I am required to engage with psychological theories and practices. I am trained to observe, categorise and intervene. Thus, I recognise my own contribution to the psy-complex and the regulating effects of psychology, as well as to the perpetuation of wider societal discourses. However, as a researcher I am grounded in social constructionist and poststructuralist assumptions. This invoked a discomfort and personal conflict for me in which case I recognised how I separated these two identities (researcher and psychology trainee) in the research process and in practice as a psychologist. The effect

this had on my analytical process was that at times my readings of the data were strongly motivated by destabilising taken-for granted knowledge. Other times my readings of the data were motivated by a curiosity of the internal workings of those who sexually perpetrate which is not consistent with my epistemological framework. I will also point out here, that my ‘curiosity of internal workings’ also conflicted with my rage and passion toward sexual violence as a social phenomenon.

Researchers are responsible not only for what we write and produce but also how we write and produce (Parker, 2005; Pillow, 2010). Thus, I had to reflect on how my findings may represent perpetrators of sexual violence, researchers, journal articles, and psychology as a discipline. I also had to consider what the effect of such representation might be. The findings presented a resistance to perpetrators’ diminished responsibility accomplished through the psychological and pathology discourse. This may have a minimising effect on those, who are not necessarily perpetrators, but who identify with or relate to experiencing a diagnosis or disorder. The presentation of the victimhood discourse may also have an effect on those who identify with or position themselves as victims and survivors of various forms of trauma.

The findings also worked to destabilise the view of perpetrators as ‘Other’, as different to normal people. This may create somewhat of a discomfort in acknowledging that perpetrators are the effects of social processes that we are all in some way subjected to. Furthermore, there may be resistance towards acknowledging that we as a society draw upon available discourses which create the opportunity for rape to occur and to be disclaimed, justified or denied. Also, as there was a dominant finding of perpetrators as male, the discourses and constructions available in the findings may further represent perpetrators as typically male. In which case, female perpetrators are still constructed in limited ways.

Upon reflecting on insights from my supervisor, I became aware that the findings may represent perpetrators, as well as us members of society, as “puppets” or “manifestations of prevailing discourses” (Burr, 2015, p.121) in which case there is little space for agency and choice (Wetherell, 2001). However, from the theoretical perspective in which this research is grounded, although we are constituted by discourse, we are still able to exercise choice with respect to discourses, positions and practices that we take up (Burr, 2015). We may be limited and constrained by dominant discourses (Woodward, 2009), however meanings are multiple, and we are constituted from many contradictory discourses (Wetherell, 2001). Thus, we can

be active in repeating dominant discourses but also active in resisting and defying them (Shefer, 2004).

The dominance of the psychological discourse and the psy-complex in the findings may further represent the discipline of psychology and the journals and research produced within as powerful and as discursively limiting. As the alternative discourses are few, this may close down opportunities to resist the dominant discourses. However, the hope is that through acknowledging and presenting those alternative discourses, the dominant discourses may in some ways be disrupted. Furthermore, being critical about the expert position within psychology may have effects on subjectivity and practice of those within the discipline. I also am aware that the way in which the findings are presented may represent psychology as in some ways rape supportive. However, the findings are not to discredit but rather to destabilise taken-for-grant knowledge and create opportunity to become aware of different possible constructions.

Limitations and recommendations for future research

A limitation of this research, from a Foucauldian perspective, is that Willig's (2013) six stages of Foucauldian analysis did not address historicity and the evolution of discursive formations over time. Although in the literature there is a discussion on the way sexual violence has been conceptualised from the eighteenth century to the 21st century, the findings of this study did not focus on the changes in discursive constructions of perpetrators in psychology journal articles. A future recommendation would be to explore the historical formations of perpetrators in psychology articles which may allow for tracking changes and disrupting current constructions. Furthermore, the search criteria for the data used in this research included a date range of 2012 to 2016. In line with the above-mentioned recommendation, a larger date parameter may allow for the historical formations to be explored.

Another limitation relates to the exclusion and inclusion criteria of the data collected and analysed. Firstly, articles retrieved were accessible through the University of Pretoria. There may have been articles relevant to this research that were not accessible to me. Secondly, due to the size and scope of this research, articles were retrieved from only three databases namely EbscoHost, Proquest, and Taylor and Francis. Thus, I acknowledge that my collection of data may have been limited in which case constructions of perpetrators may

have been limited as well. Thirdly, in doing this research, there was an awareness in the literature of the complex nature of different types of sexual violence in which case those articles addressing paedophilia, sexual homicide, and serial rapists were excluded. This may have limited discursive constructions of perpetrators that were produced in the findings. Thus, by including and excluding data, I am aware that I have contributed to what may or may not have been produced. A recommendation would then be that research like this can be more inclusive regarding the collection of data. That is, it could involve efforts on gaining more access to articles through other databases and institutions. Also, it could include broader categories or types of sexual violence.

In addition, 128 psychology journal articles were analysed thus, as the researcher, I sat with a large amount of text that was transformed into research findings. Through the use of coding (Potter & Wetherell, 1987), thematic chunks (Macleod, 2002) as well as considering my position as the researcher and the possible influence thereof (Parker, 2014b), I acknowledge that discourses and meanings may have not been included in the findings. Furthermore, I recognise that findings of this research do not demonstrate an objective truth, but rather it is a version of reality produced by me as the researcher. Thus, I had to remain reflexive throughout the research process and have included in the report a reflexive account, detailed descriptions of the research process, as well as excerpts from the data to allow for a more rigorous and credible study, as well as to allow for the readers to make an informed evaluation of the findings (Davies & Dodd, 2002; Finlay & Gough, 2003; Parker, 2014b; Willig, 2013).

The data analysed comprised of psychology journal articles. However, journals have editorial boards and referees who are responsible for evaluating whether articles fit in with the disciplinary rules for discussing a particular subject and what it is possible to say (Mills, 2003). This could form as a limitation in what can be produced in this kind of study. Furthermore, each psychology journal article tended to focus on one aspect of perpetration which often times was individualizing. This may contribute to the assumptions about the discipline psychology being unable to transcend the individual-social dualism (Hollway et al., 2003; Lea & Auburn, 2001; Salazar & Cook, 2002). Therefore, journal articles may not be an entirely accurate representation of how perpetrators are constructed within the discipline of psychology. In expanding on this current research, a future recommendation is to explore constructions of perpetrators in the talk of psychologists through interviews or focus groups. This may allow for a more inclusive account of perpetrators of rape within the discipline.

Furthermore, in considering how psychology as produced concepts and languages, and how this is carried out and infiltrates everyday discourses (Foucault, 1995; Parker et al., 1995; Woodward, 2009), an interesting study might include investigating how perpetrators of sexual violence construct themselves and what the implications may be for subjectivity an practice.

Concluding note

Issues addressed in psychology journal articles influence practice and subsequent scholarship, as we are encouraged to remain engaged so practice is informed by scholarly research (Everett, 2015). Furthermore, the knowledge produced percolates back into popular culture (Parker et al., 1995). This research proceeds from a perspective where it is argued that professional or expert articulation of perpetrators of rape are produced within wider cultural context and have effects not only on our understanding, but on wider social discourses relating to sexual violence (Buiten & Naidoo, 2016)

The discipline of psychology should examine the effects which our theorizing of perpetrators of sexual violence may have on society and on the social phenomenon of sexual violence. We also need to consider the effect which the wider cultural context may have on the production of knowledge relating to sexual violence and the perpetrators thereof.

References

- Abel, G. G., Becker, J. V., & Cunningham-Rathner, J. (1984). Complications, consent, and cognitions in sex between children and adults. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 7(1), 89–103. doi:10.1016/0160-2527(84)90008-6
- Agger, B. (1991). Critical theory, poststructuralism, postmodernism: Their sociological relevance. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17(1), 105–131.
doi:10.1146/annurev.so.17.080191.000541
- Ahlmeyer, S., Kleinsasser, D., Stoner, J., & Retzlaff, P. (2003). Psychopathology of incarcerated sex offenders. *Journal of Personality Disorders; New York*, 17(4), 306–318.
- Allen, G. (2011). *Intertextuality* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Almond, L., McManus, M. A., & Ward, L. (2014). Male-on-male sexual assaults: An analysis of crime scene actions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(7), 1279–1296.
doi:10.1177/0886260513506282
- Anderson, I., & Doherty, K. (2007). *Accounting for rape: Psychology, feminism and discourse analysis in the study of sexual violence*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Archard, D. (2007). The wrong of rape. *Philosophical Quarterly*, 57(228), 374–393. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9213.2007.492.x
- Arribas-Allyon, M., & Walkerdine, V. (2017). Foucauldian discourse analysis. In C. Willig & W. S. Rogers (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research in psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 110–123). London, England: Sage.
- Auburn, T., & Lea, S. (2003). Doing cognitive distortions: A discursive psychology analysis of sex offender treatment talk. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(2), 281–298.
doi:10.1348/014466603322127256
- Baker, K. K. (1999). What rape is and what it ought not to be. *Jurimetrics*, 39(3), 233–242.

- Beauregard, E., & Leclerc, B. (2007). An application of the rational choice approach to the offending process of sex offenders: A closer look at the decision-making. *Sexual Abuse, 19*(2), 115–133. doi:10.1177/107906320701900204
- Beauregard, E., & Martineau, M. (2016). *The sexual murderer: Offender behaviour and implications for practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Becvar, D. S., & Becvar, R. J. (2014). *Family therapy: A systemic integration* (8th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Education.
- Beech, A. R., Parrett, N., Ward, T., & Fisher, D. (2009). Assessing female sexual offenders' motivations and cognitions: An exploratory study. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 15*(2–3), 201–216. doi:10.1080/10683160802190921
- Beech, A., Swaffer, T., Multra, V., & Fisher, D. (2009). Evaluating rapists' distorted beliefs and deviant sexual fantasies: A preliminary study. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research, 1*(1), 25–35. doi:10.1108/17596599200900004
- Bernasco, W. (2013). *Offenders on offending: Learning about crime from criminals*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Billig, M. (1997). Rhetorical and discursive analysis: How families talk about the royal family. In N. Hayes (Ed.), *Doing qualitative analysis in psychology* (pp. 39–54). East Sussex, UK: Psychology Press.
- Blake, E., & Gannon, T. A. (2010). The implicit theories of rape-prone men: An information-processing investigation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 54*(6), 895–914. doi:10.1177/0306624X09347732
- Blokland, A. A. J., & Lussier, P. (2015). *Sex offenders: A criminal career approach*. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

- Blumenthal, S., Gudjonsson, G., & Burns, J. (1999). Cognitive distortions and blame attribution in sex offenders against adults and children. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 23*(2), 129–143. doi:10.1016/S0145-2134(98)00117-3
- Bonnes, S. M. (2010). *Gender and racial stereotyping in rape coverage: An analysis of rape coverage in Grocott's Mail* (Unpublished master's thesis). Rhodes University. Grahamstown. Retrieved from <http://eprints.ru.ac.za/1786/>
- Bourke, J. (2015). *Rape: A history from 1860 to the present*. London, England: Hachette.
- Boyer, E. L., Moser, D., Ream, T. C., & Braxton, J. M. (2015). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, J. M., & Walklate, S. L. (2011). *Handbook on sexual violence*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Brown, L., & Strega, S. (2005). *Research as resistance: Critical, indigenous and anti-oppressive approaches*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will: Men, women, and rape*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- Bryden, D. P., & Grier, M. M. (2011). The search for rapists' "real" motives. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 101*(1), 171–178.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th ed). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Budin, L. E., & Johnson, C. F. (1989). Sex abuse prevention programs: Offenders' attitudes about their efficacy. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 13*(1), 77–87. doi:10.1016/0145-2134(89)90031-8
- Buiten, D., & Naidoo, K. (2016). Framing the problem of rape in South Africa: Gender, race, class and state histories. *Current Sociology, 64*(4), 535–550. doi:10.1177/0011392116638844

- Burr, V. (1998). Overview: Realism, relativism, social constructionism and discourse. In I. Parker (Ed.), *Social constructionism, discourse and realism* (pp. 13-25). London, England: Sage.
- Burr, V. (2015). *Social constructionism* (3rd ed). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(2), 217–230. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.38.2.217
- Cameron, D., & Panovic, I. (2014). *Working with written discourse*. London, England: Sage.
- Chan, O. (2015). *Understanding sexual homicide offenders: An integrated approach*. Hampshire, England: Palgrave Macmillan
- Chapleau, K. M., Oswald, D. L., & Russell, B. L. (2007). How ambivalent sexism toward women and men support rape myth acceptance. *Sex Roles*, 57(1–2), 131–136.
- Chasteen, A. L. (2001). Constructing rape: Feminism, change, and women’s everyday understandings of sexual assault. *Sociological Spectrum*, 21(2), 101–139.
doi:10.1080/02732170121403
- Christians, C. G. (2005). Ethics and politics in qualitative research. In Y. S. Lincoln & N. K. Denzin (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 139–164). London, England: Sage.
- Ciardha, C. Ó., & Ward, T. (2013). Theories of Cognitive Distortions in Sexual Offending What the Current Research Tells Us. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 14(1), 5–21.
doi:10.1177/1524838012467856
- Collins, S., & Nee, C. (2010). Factors influencing the process of change in sex offender interventions: Therapists’ experiences and perceptions. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 16(3), 311–331. doi:10.1080/13552600903497453
- Combs, G., & Freedman, J. (2012). Narrative, poststructuralism, and social justice: Current practices in narrative therapy. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 40(7), 1033–1060.

- Corey, G. (2013). *Theory and practice of counselling and psychotherapy*. Hampshire, England: Cengage Learning.
- Cowburn, M. (2005). Hegemony and discourse: Reconstructing the male sex offender and sexual coercion by men. *Sexualities, Evolution & Gender*, 7(3), 215–231.
doi:10.1080/14616660500231665
- Crawford, M., & Popp, D. (2003). Sexual double standards: A review and methodological critique of two decades of research. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 40(1), 13–26.
doi:10.1080/00224490309552163
- Cunniff Gilson, E. (2016). Vulnerability and victimization: Rethinking key concepts in feminist discourses on sexual violence. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 42(1), 71–98. doi:10.1086/686753
- Dant, T. (2013). *Knowledge, ideology & discourse: A sociological perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Davies, B., & Harre, R. (2001). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. Yates, *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 261–271). London, England: Sage.
- Davies, D., & Dodd, J. (2002). Qualitative research and the question of rigor. *Qualitative Health Research*, 12(2), 279–289. doi:10.1177/104973230201200211
- Deming, M. E. (2009). *Exploring the social context of rape and sexual assault among college women: a qualitative analysis*. (Master's thesis). University of North Carolina, Wilmington.
- Denov, M. S. (2001). A culture of denial: Exploring professional perspectives on female sex offending. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 43(3), 303–329.
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Derrida, J. (1998). *Of grammatology* (Corrected ed). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dickerson, V. C. (2010). Positioning oneself within an epistemology: Refining our thinking about integrative approaches. *Family Process*, 49(3), 349–368.
- Donat, P., & D’Emilio, J. (1992). A feminist redefinition of rape and sexual assault: Historical foundations and change. *Journal of Social Issues*, 48(1), 9–22.
- Dosekun, S. (2013). ‘Rape is a huge issue in this country’: Discursive constructions of the rape crisis in South Africa. *Feminism & Psychology*, 23(4), 517–535.
doi:10.1177/0959353513493614
- Dowling, M. (2006). Approaches to reflexivity in qualitative research. *Nurse Researcher*, 13(3), 7–21. doi:10.7748/nr2006.04.13.3.7.c5975
- Dowling, M. (2008). Reflexivity. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (Vol. 1 & 2, pp. 747–748). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Edwards, K., Turchik, J., Dardis, C., Reynolds, N., & Gidycz, C. (2011). Rape myths: History, individual and institutional-level presence, and implications for change. *Sex Roles*, 65(11/12), 761–773. doi:10.1007/s11199-011-9943-2
- Elias, H., & Haj-Yahia, M. M. (2017). Therapists’ perceptions of their encounter with sex offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 61(10), 1151–1170. doi:10.1177/0306624X16629972
- Elliott, M., Browne, K., & Kilcoyne, J. (1995). Child sexual abuse prevention: What offenders tell us. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 19(5), 579–594. doi:10.1016/0145-2134(95)00017-3
- Elliott, R., Fischer, C. T., & Rennie, D. L. (1999). Evolving guidelines for publication of qualitative research studies in psychology and related fields. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38(3), 215–229. doi:10.1348/014466599162782

- Ellis, L. (1989). *Theories of rape: Inquiries into the causes of sexual aggression*. Bristol, PA: Hemisphere Publishing Corp.
- Enger, K. B. (2003). *Analysis of articles published in eight selected higher education journals on selected variables to reveal scholarly development of the discipline* (Doctoral thesis) The University of North Dakota. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305314197/abstract/3B789F87B864E4BPQ/1>
- Eriksson, M. (2011). *Defining rape: Emerging obligations for states under international law?* Leiden, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Estrich, S. (1986). Rape. *The Yale Law Journal*, 95(6), 1087–1184. doi:10.2307/796522
- Everett, K. D. (2015). *Textual silences and the (re)presentation of black undergraduate women in higher education journals: A critical discourse analysis* (Doctoral thesis) Iowa State University. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1765206016/abstract/46B3EB002D3C4337PQ/1>
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Far, M. S., & Abedizade, M. (2017). Psychiatric and psychological support to reduce the psychological effects incurred to female victim in the crime of rape. *Journal of History, Culture & Art Research*, 6(1), 879–884. doi:10.7596/taksadv6i1.788
- Feild, H. S. (1978). Attitudes toward rape: A comparative analysis of police, rapists, crisis counselors, and citizens. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36(2), 156–179. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.36.2.156
- Ferfolja, T. (2008). Discourses that silence: Teachers and anti-lesbian harassment. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 29(1), 107–119. doi:10.1080/01596300701802805

- Finlay, L., & Gough, B. (2003). *Reflexivity: A practical guide for researchers in health and social sciences*. Oxford, England: Blackwell Publishing.
- Forde, C., & Duvvury, N. (2016). Sexual violence, masculinity, and the journey of recovery. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*. doi:10.1037/men0000054
- Forrester, M. A. (2010). *Doing qualitative research in psychology: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality: An introduction* (Vol. 1; H. Robert, Trans.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977* (C. Gordon, Ed.; C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, Trans.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777–795.
- Foucault, M. (1988). *The history of sexuality, Vol. 3: The care of the self* (Reprint edition; R. Hurley, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline & punish: The birth of the prison* (2nd edition; A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1997). *The essential works of Michel Foucault, 1954-1984* (P. Rabinow, Ed.). New York, NY: New Press.
- Fox, N. J. (2014). Poststructuralism and postmodernism. *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Health, Illness, Behavior, and Society*, 1855–1860.
doi:10.1002/9781118410868.wbehibs109
- Freedman, E. B. (1987). “Uncontrolled desires”: The response to the sexual psychopath, 1920-1960. *The Journal of American History*, 74(1), 83. doi:10.2307/1908506
- Freedman, E. B. (2013). *Redefining rape*. London, England: Harvard University Press.

- Frith, H. (2015). *Orgasmic bodies: The orgasm in contemporary Western culture*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Gannon, T. A., Rose, M. R., & Ward, T. (2008). A descriptive model of the offense process for female sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 20(3), 352–374. doi:10.1177/1079063208322495
- Garland, T. S., Branch, K. A., & Grimes, M. (2016). Blurring the lines: Reinforcing rape myths in comic books. *Feminist Criminology*, 11(1), 48–68. doi:10.1177/1557085115576386
- Gavey, N. (1989). Feminist poststructuralism and discourse analysis: Contributions to feminist psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 13(4), 459–475.
- Gavey, N. (2005). *Just sex? The cultural scaffolding of rape*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Gergen, K. J. (2001). Psychological science in a postmodern context. *American Psychologist*, 56(10), 803–813. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.56.10.803
- Goode, S. (2011). *Paedophiles in society: Reflecting on sexuality, abuse and hope*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Gough, B. (2003). Deconstructing reflexivity. In L. Finlay & B. Gough (Eds.), *Reflexivity: A practical guide for researchers in health and social sciences* (pp. 21–36). Oxford, England: Blackwell Publishing.
- Gqola, P. D. (2016). *Rape: A South African nightmare*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Jacana Media.
- Groth, A. N., & Birnbaum, H. J. (2013). *Men who rape: The psychology of the offender*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Hall, S. (2001). Foucault: Power, knowledge and discourse. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. Yates, *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 72–81). London, England: Sage.

- Hall, S. (1997). The work of representation. In *Representation: Cultural representation and signifying practices* (pp. 13–74). London, England: Sage.
- Hammersley, M., & Traianou, A. (2012). *Ethics in qualitative research: Controversies and contexts*. London, England: Sage.
- Harmon, G. A., Owens, R. G., & Dewey, M. E. (1995). Rapists' versus non-rapists' attitudes toward women: A British study. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 39(3), 269–275. doi:10.1177/0306624X9503900307
- Hayes, S., & Carpenter, B. (2013). Social moralities and discursive constructions of female sex offenders. *Sexualities*, 16(1–2), 159–179. doi:10.1177/1363460712471112
- Hepburn, A. (1999). Derrida and psychology: Deconstruction and its ab/uses in critical and discursive psychologies. *Theory & Psychology*, 9(5), 639.
doi:10.1177/0959354399095004
- Hesse-Biber, S. N. (2017). *The practice of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Hesse-Biber, S. J. (2012). *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Higgs, D. C., Canavan, M. M., & Meyer, W. J., III. (1992). Moving from defense to offense: The development of an adolescent female sex offender. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 29(1), 131–139.
- Hlavka, H. R. (2014). Normalizing sexual violence young women account for harassment and abuse. *Gender & Society*, 28(3), 337–358. doi:10.1177/0891243214526468
- Holdcroft, D. (1991). *Saussure: Signs, system and arbitrariness*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Hollway, W. (1989). *Subjectivity and method in psychology: Gender, meaning and science*. New York, NY: Sage.

- Hollway, W., Venn, C., Walkerdine, V., Henriques, J., & Urwin, C. (2003). *Changing the Subject: Psychology, social regulation and subjectivity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hook, D. (2004a). Critical psychology: The basic co-ordinates. In D. Hook, A. Collins, N. Mkhize, P. Kiguwa, I. Parker, & E. Burman (Eds.), *Critical psychology* (pp. 10–23). Cape Town, South Africa: UCT Press.
- Hook, D. (2004b). Foucault, disciplinary power and the critical pre-history of psychology. In D. Hook, N. Mkhize, P. Kiguwa, A. Collins, E. Burman, & I. Parker (Eds.), *Critical psychology* (pp. 210–237). Cape Town, South Africa: UCT Press.
- Hook, D. (2004c). Governmentality and technologies of subjectivity. In D. Hook, N. Mkhize, P. Kiguwa, A. Collins, E. Burman, & I. Parker (Eds.), *Critical psychology* (pp. 239–271). Cape Town, South Africa: UCT Press.
- Hook, D. (2007). *Foucault, psychology and the analytics of power*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Horvath, M., & Brown, J. (2013). *Rape: Challenging contemporary thinking*. London, England: Routledge.
- Jaques, S., & Bonomo, E. (2016). Learning from the offender's perspective on crime prevention. In B. Le Clerc & E. U. Savona, *Crime prevention in the 21st century: Insightful approaches for crime prevention initiatives* (pp. 8–17). New York, NY: Springer.
- Johnson, N. L., & Johnson, D. M. (2017). An empirical exploration into the measurement of rape culture. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1-26.
doi:10.1177/0886260517732347
- Jones, O. D. (1999). Sex, culture, and the biology of rape: toward explanation and prevention. *California Law Review*, 87(4), 827–941. doi:10.2307/3481020
- Jørgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London, England: Sage.

- Kaldine, F. (2012). Violence against women and children. In *Community psychology in South Africa* (2nd ed., pp. 285–302). Pretoria, South Africa: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Keenan, E. K. (2001). Using Foucault’s “disciplinary power” and “resistance” in cross-cultural psychotherapy. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 29(3), 211–227.
doi:10.1023/A:1010403627706
- Kendall, G., & Wickham, G. (1998). *Using Foucault’s methods*. London, England: Sage.
- Khoja-Moolji, S. S. (2014). Constructionist and poststructuralist theories. In M. J. Coleman, L. H. Ganong, & G. Golson (Eds.), *The social history of the American family: An Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from
https://www.academia.edu/4209541/Constructionist_and_Poststructuralist_Theories
- Koss, M. P., Leonard, K. E., Beezley, D. A., & Oros, C. J. (1985). Nonstranger sexual aggression: A discriminant analysis of the psychological characteristics of undetected offenders. *Sex Roles*, 12(9/10), 981–992.
- Kramer, S. (2015). Surfacing (im)possible victims: A critical review of the role of gender, sexuality and power in constructing the conditions of possibility for South African victims of female sex crimes. *Sexualities*, 18(3), 346–372.
doi:10.1177/1363460714544808
- Lamb, S. (1999). Constructing the victim: Popular images and lasting labels. In *New visions of victims: Feminists struggle with the concept* (pp. 108–138). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Lea, S. J., Auburn, T., & Kibblewhite, K. (1999). Working with sex offenders: The perceptions and experiences of professionals and paraprofessionals. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 43(1), 103–119.
doi:10.1177/0306624X99431010

- Lea, S. J. (2007). A discursive investigation into victim responsibility in rape. *Feminism & Psychology, 17*(4), 495–514. doi:10.1177/0959353507083101
- Lea, S. J., & Auburn, T. (2001). The social construction of rape in the talk of a convicted rapist. *Feminism & Psychology, 11*(1), 11–33. doi:10.1177/0959353501011001002
- Leon, C. S. (2011). *Sex fiends, perverts, and pedophiles: Understanding sex crime policy in America*. New York, NY: University Press.
- Lock, A., & Strong, T. (2010). *Social constructionism: Sources and stirrings in theory and practice*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Loeber, R., & Farrington, D. P. (2012). *From juvenile delinquency to adult crime: Criminal careers, justice policy and prevention*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1994). Rape myths. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18*(2), 133-164.
- Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1995). Attitudinal antecedents of rape myth acceptance: A theoretical and empirical reexamination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*(4), 704–711. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.68.4.704
- Macleod, C. (2002). Deconstructive discourse analysis: Extending the methodological conversation. *South African Journal of Psychology, 32*(1), 17–25.
- Mankayi, N. (2010). Male soldiers' constructions of masculinity, sexuality and sexual violence. *Journal of Psychology in Africa, 20*(4), 591–599.
doi:10.1080/14330237.2010.10820417
- Mann, R. E., & Hollin, C. R. (2007). Sexual offenders' explanations for their offending. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 13*(1), 3–9. doi:10.1080/13552600701365621
- Marsh, H. W., & Ball, S. (1989). The peer review process used to evaluate manuscripts submitted to academic journals. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 57*(2), 151–169. doi:10.1080/00220973.1989.10806503

- Marx, B. P. (2005). Lessons learned from the last twenty years of sexual violence research. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*(2), 225–230. doi:10.1177/0886260504267742
- Masessa, G. M. (2013). *Identification of trait factors in adult male rapists* (Doctoral thesis) The Chicago School of Professional Psychology. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/uplib.idm.oclc.org/docview/962229759/abstract/70614A8C32034DDCPQ/27>
- McCormack, J., Hudson, S. M., & Ward, T. (2002). Sexual offenders' perceptions of their early interpersonal relationships: An attachment perspective. *The Journal of Sex Research; New York, 39*(2), 85–93.
- McKenzie-Mohr, S., & Lafrance, M. N. (2014). *Women voicing resistance: Discursive and narrative explorations*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Melancon, T., & Braxton, J. M. (2015). *Black female sexualities*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Mertens, D. M., & Ginsberg, P. E. (2009). *The handbook of social research ethics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miller, T., Mauthner, M., Birch, M., & Jessop, J. (2012). *Ethics in qualitative research (2nd ed)*. New York, NY: Sage.
- Mills, S. (2003). *Michel Foucault*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Mirielli, E. J. (2003). *Exploring trends and patterns of scholarly discourse in sociology journals* (Doctoral thesis) University of Missouri, Columbia. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305324462/abstract/F1574599DE64D5CPQ/1>
- Morrissey, M. E. (2013). Rape as a weapon of hate: Discursive constructions and material consequences of black lesbianism in South Africa. *Women's Studies in Communication, 36*(1), 72–91. doi:10.1080/07491409.2013.755450

- Mortari, L. (2015). Reflectivity in research practice: An overview of different perspectives. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 14(5), 1-9.
doi:10.1177/1609406915618045
- Muchoki, S. (2011). Vocabulary used by sexual offenders: Meaning and implications. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 13(1), 101–113. doi:10.1080/13691058.2010.503971
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Rodgers, C. S. (1998). Token resistance to sex: New perspectives on an old stereotype. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22(3), 443–463.
doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1998.tb00167.x
- Namaste, K. (1994). The politics of inside/out: Queer theory, poststructuralism, and a sociological approach to sexuality. *Sociological Theory*, 220–231.
- O’Byrne, R., Hansen, S., & Rapley, M. (2008). “If a girl doesn’t say ‘no’...”: Young men, rape and claims of ‘insufficient knowledge.’ *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 18(3), 168–193. doi:10.1002/casp.922
- Ochse, A. (2011). “Real women” and “real lesbians”: Discourses of heteronormativity amongst a group of lesbians. *South African Review of Sociology*, 42(1), 3–20.
doi:10.1080121528586.2011.563532
- O’Hara, S. (2012). Monsters, playboys, virgins and whores: Rape myths in the news media’s coverage of sexual violence. *Language and Literature*, 21(3), 247–259.
doi:10.1177/0963947012444217
- Ortlipp, M. (2008). Keeping and using reflective journals in the qualitative research process. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 695–705.
- Palaganas, E. C., Sanchez, M. C., Molintas, M. V. P., & Caricativo, R. D. (2017). Reflexivity in qualitative research: A journey of learning. *The Qualitative Report*, 22(2), 426–438.
- Parker, I. (2002). *Critical Discursive Psychology*. New York, NY: Springer.

- Parker, I. (1992). *Discourse dynamics: Critical analysis for social and individual psychology*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Parker, I. (1997). Discourse analysis and psychoanalysis. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 36(4), 479–495. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8309.1997tb01145.x
- Parker, I. (1999). Varieties of discourse and analysis. In I. Parker and the Bolton Discourse Network (Eds.), *Critical textwork: An introduction to varieties of discourse and analysis* (pp. 1–13). Buckingham, England: Open University Press
- Parker, I. (2004). Discursive practice: Analysis, context and action in critical research. *The International Journal of Critical Psychology, Special Issue- Psycho-Social Research*, 10(1), 623–638.
- Parker, I. (2005). *Qualitative psychology: Introducing radical research*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.
- Parker, I. (2014a). *Discourse Dynamics (Psychology Revivals): Critical Analysis for Social and Individual Psychology*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Parker, Ian. (2014b). *Psychology After Discourse Analysis: Concepts, methods, critique*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Parker, I, Georgaca, E., Harper, D., McLaughlin, T., & Stowell-Smith, M. (1995). *Deconstructing Psychopathology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Parker, I, & Revelli, S. (Eds.). (2018). *Psychoanalytic Practice and State Regulation*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pedneault, A. (2015). *An analysis of decision making and criminal outcomes in sexual offenders* (Doctoral thesis) San Jose State University, California. Retrieved from <http://summit.sfu.ca/item/15632>

- Pelias, R. J. (2012). Writing into position: Strategies for composition and evaluation. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 659-669). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pemberton, A. E., & Wakeling, H. C. (2009). Entitled to sex: Attitudes of sexual offenders. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 15*(3), 289–303. doi:10.1080/13552600903097212
- Petrak, J., & Hedge, B. (2003). *The trauma of sexual assault: Treatment, prevention and practice*. West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Philadelphoff-Puren, N. (2005). Contextualising consent: The problem of rape and romance. *Australian Feminist Studies, 20*(46), 31–42. doi:10.1080/0816464042000334519
- Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse analysis: Investigating processes of social construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pillow, W. S. (2010). Dangerous reflexivity: Rigour, responsibility and reflexivity in qualitative research. In P. Thompson & M. Walker (Eds.) *The Routledge Doctoral Student's Companion* (pp. 270–282). Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- Polaschek, D. L. L., & Gannon, T. A. (2004). The implicit theories of rapists: What convicted offenders tell us. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 16*(4), 299–314. doi:10.1177/107906320401600404
- Polaschek, D. L. L., & Ward, T. (2002). The implicit theories of potential rapists: What our questionnaires tell us. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 7*(4), 385–406. doi:10.1016/S1359-1789(01)00063-5
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London, England: Sage.
- Powell, A. (2018). *Paedophiles, child abuse and the internet: A practical guide to identification, action and prevention*. Abingdon, England: Radcliff Publishing.

- Prater, L. (2013). Monstrous fantasies: Reinforcing rape culture in Fiona McIntosh's fantasy novels. *Hecate*, 39(1/2), 148–167.
- Prentice, D. A., & Carranza, E. (2002). What women and men should be, shouldn't be, are allowed to be, and don't have to be: The contents of prescriptive gender stereotypes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26(4), 269–281. doi:10.1111/1471-6402.t01-1-00066
- Proulx, J., Beauregard, E., Carter, A. J., Mokros, A., Darjee, R., & James, J. (2018). *Routledge international handbook of sexual homicide studies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Rabinow, P., & Rose, N. (2003). Introduction: Foucault Today. In P. Rabinow & N. Rose (Eds.), *The essential Foucault: Selections from Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984* (pp. vii–xxxv; By M. Foucault). New York, NY: New Press.
- Ramazanoglu, C. (2002). *Up against Foucault: Explorations of some tensions between Foucault and Feminism*. London, England: Routledge.
- Richardson, J. T. E. (Ed.). (1996). *Handbook of qualitative research methods for psychology and the social sciences*. Leicester, England: British Psychological Society.
- Rose, N. S. (1996). *Inventing our selves: Psychology, power, and personhood*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, N. S. (1985). *The psychological complex: Psychology, politics and society in England, 1869-1939*. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Russell, D. (2003). *The politics of rape: The victim's perspective*. Lincoln, NE: iUniverse.
- Salazar, L. F., & Cook, S. L. (2002). Violence against women: Is psychology part of the problem or the solution? A content analysis of psychological research from 1990 through 1999. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 12(6), 410–421. doi:10.1002/casp.691

- Sandler, J. C., & Freeman, N. J. (2007). Topology of female sex offenders: A test of Vandiver and Kercher. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, *19*(2), 73–89. doi:10.1177/107906320701900201
- Sattem, L., Savells, J., & Murray, E. (1984). Sex-role stereotypes and commitment of rape. *Sex Roles*, *11*(9/10), 849–860.
- Saussure, F. de. (1974). *Course in general linguistics* (C. Bally, A. Sechehaye, & A. Reidlinger, Eds.; R. Harris, Trans.). London, England: Fontana.
- Schinaia, C. (2010). *On paedophilia*. London, England: Karnac Books.
- Scully, D., & Marolla, J. (1984). Convicted rapists' vocabulary of motive: Excuses and justifications. *Social Problems*, *31*(5), 530–544. doi:10.2307/800239
- Seale, C., Gobo, G., Gubrium, J. F., & Silverman, D. (2004). *Qualitative research practice*. London, England: Sage.
- Segal, Z. V., & Stermac, L. (1984). A measure of rapists' attitudes towards women. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, *7*(3–4), 437–440. doi:10.1016/0160-2527(84)90023-2
- Shefer, T. (2004). Psychology and the regulation of gender. In D. Hook, A. Collins, N. Mkhize, P. Kiguwa, I. Parker, & E. Burman (Eds.), *Critical psychology* (pp. 187–209). Cape Town, South Africa: Juta and Company Ltd.
- Shields, W. M., & Shields, L. M. (1983). Forcible rape: An evolutionary perspective. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, *4*(3), 115–136. doi:10.1016/0162-3095(83)90026-2
- Sivakumaran, S. (2005). Male/male rape and the “taint” of homosexuality. *Human Rights Quarterly*, *27*(4), 1274–1306.
- Slater, C., Woodhams, J., & Hamilton-Giachritsis, C. (2014). Can serial rapists be distinguished from one-off rapists? *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *32*(2), 220–239. doi:10.1002/bsl.2096

Smith, O., & Skinner, T. (2017). How rape myths are used and challenged in rape and sexual assault trials. *Social & Legal Studies*, 0964663916680130.

doi:10.1177/0964663916680130

Stansell, C. (1987). *City of women: Sex and class in New York, 1789-1860*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Stead, G. B., & Bakker, T. M. (2010). Discourse analysis in career counseling and development. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 59(1), 72–86. doi:10.1002/j.2161-0045.2010.tb00131.x

Stevenson, K. (2000). Unequivocal victims: The historical roots of the mystification of the female complainant in rape cases. *Feminist Legal Studies*, 8(3), 343–366.

doi:10.1023/A:1009270302602

Strickland, S. M. (2008). Female sex offenders exploring issues of personality, trauma, and cognitive distortions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23(4), 474–489.

doi:10.1177/0886260507312944

Suls, J., & Martin, R. (2009). The air we breathe: A critical look at practices and alternatives in the peer-review process. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4(1), 40–50.

doi:10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01105.x

Terre Blanche, M., Durrheim, K., & Painter, D. (2006). *Research in practice: Applied methods for the social sciences*. Cape Town, South Africa: Juta and Company Ltd.

Tharp, A. T., DeGue, S., Valle, L. A., Brookmeyer, K. A., Massetti, G. M., & Matjasko, J. L. (2013). A systematic qualitative review of risk and protective factors for sexual violence perpetration. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 14(2), 133–167.

doi:10.1177/1524838012470031

The Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 32, 2007.

Retrieved from <http://www.justice.gov.za/legislation/acts/2007-032.pdf>

- Thornhill, R., & Palmer, C. T. (2001). *A natural history of rape: Biological bases of sexual coercion*. London, England: MIT Press.
- Turchik, J. A., & Edwards, K. M. (2012). Myths about male rape: A literature review. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 13*(2), 211–226. doi:10.1037/a0023207
- Van der Bijl, C. (2010). Rape as a materially-defined crime: Could “any act which causes sexual penetration” include omissions? *South African Journal of Criminal Justice, 23*(2), 224-238.
- Vandiver, D. M., & Kercher, G. (2004). Offender and victim characteristics of registered female sexual offenders in Texas: A proposed typology of female sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 16*(2), 121–137.
doi:10.1177/107906320401600203
- Ward, T., Hudson, S. M., Johnston, L., & Marshall, W. L. (1997). Cognitive distortions in sex offenders: An integrative review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 17*(5), 479–507.
doi:10.1016/S0272-7358(97)81034-3
- Ward, T., & Keenan, T. (1999). Child molesters’ implicit theories. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14*(8), 821–838. doi:10.1177/088626099014008003
- Ward, T., & Siegert, R. (2002). Rape and evolutionary psychology: A critique of Thornhill and Palmer’s theory. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 7*(2), 145–168.
doi:10.1016/S1359-1789(00)00042-2
- Weatherall, A. (2005). *Gender, language and discourse*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Wegner, R., Abbey, A., Pierce, J., Pegram, S. E., & Woerner, J. (2015). Sexual assault perpetrators’ justifications for their actions: Relationships to rape supportive attitudes, incident characteristics, and future perpetration. *Violence Against Women, 21*(8),
doi:10.1177/1077801215589380

- Weiss, K. G. (2009). “Boys will be boys” and other gendered accounts: An exploration of victims’ excuses and justifications for unwanted sexual contact and coercion. *Violence Against Women*, 15(7), 810–834. doi:10.1177/1077801209333611
- Wetherell, M. (2001). Minds, selves and sense-making. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse, theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 186–197). London, England: Sage.
- White, C., Woodfield, K., & Ritchie, J. (2003). Reporting and presenting qualitative data. In J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 287–320). London, England: Sage.
- Williams, J. (2014). *Understanding poststructuralism*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Willig, C. (2013). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology* (3rd ed). Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods for critical discourse analysis*. London, England: Sage.
- Wood, L. A., & Kroger, R. O. (2000). *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wood, L. A., & Rennie, H. (2016). Formulating rape: The discursive construction of victims and villains. *Discourse & Society*, 5(1), 125-148. doi:10.1177/0957926594005001006
- Woodward, K. (2009). *Social sciences: The big issues*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- World Health Organisation (WHO). (2002). *World report on violence and health*. Retrieved from https://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/publications/global_reports/en/
- Zinsstag, E., & Keenan, M. (2017). *Restorative responses to sexual violence: Legal, social and therapeutic dimensions*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Zverina, M., Stam, H. J., & Babins-Wagner, R. (2011). Managing victim status in group therapy for men: A discourse analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(14), 2834–2855. doi:10.1177/0886260510390949

APPENDIX A: List of psychology journal articles

The list of psychology journal articles has been numbered for ease of reference.

- 1) Abbiati, M., Mezzo, B., Waeny-Desponds, J., Minervini, J., Mormont, C., & Gravier, B. (2014). Victimization in childhood of male sex offenders: Relationship between violence experienced and subsequent offenses through discourse analysis. *Victims & Offenders*, 9(2), 234–254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2014.881763>
- 2) Akakpo, T. F., & Burton, D. L. (2014). Emergence of nonsexual crimes and their relationship to sexual crime characteristics and the deviant arousal of male adolescent sexual offenders: An exploratory study. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse: Research, Treatment, & Program Innovations for Victims, Survivors, & Offenders*, 23(5), 595–613. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2014.918073>
- 3) Almond, L., McManus, M. A., Worsley, J., & Gregory, P. (2015). Cold case reviews of serious sexual offenders: An exploration of pre- and post-index offending patterns. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, 15(3), 205–225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15228932.2015.1032143>
- 4) Aslan, D., Edelmann, R., Bray, D., & Worrell, M. (2014). Entering the world of sex offenders: An exploration of offending behaviour patterns of those with both internet and contact sex offences against children. *Journal of Forensic Practice; Brighton*, 16(2), 110–126. <http://dx.doi.org.uplib.idm.oclc.org/10.1108/JFP-02-2013-0015>
- 5) Balemba, S., & Beauregard, E. (2012). Reactions to resistance: The role of contextual factors in sex offending. *Violence and Victims; New York*, 27(2), 148–165. <http://dx.doi.org.uplib.idm.oclc.org/10.1891/0886-6708.27.2.148>
- 6) Banbury, S., Lusher, J., & Morgan, W. (2016). Male sexual aggressors in the British prison service: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 14(4), 370–384. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-016-9678-y>

- 7) Banks, N., & Ward, P. (2014). Sexually harmful behaviour and treatment within an attachment-based framework: An adolescent case study. *Educational and Child Psychology, 31*(3), 22–32.
- 8) Barnett, G. D., Wakeling, H., Mandeville-Norden, R., & Rakestrow, J. (2013). Does change in psychometric test scores tell us anything about risk of reconviction in sexual offenders? *Psychology, Crime & Law, 19*(1), 85–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2011.607820>
- 9) Baur, E., Forsman, M., Santtila, P., Johansson, A., Sandnabba, K., & Långström, N. (2016). Paraphilic sexual interests and sexually coercive behaviour: A population-based twin study. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour; New York, 45*(5), 1163–1172.
<http://dx.doi.org.uplib.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s10508-015-0674-2>
- 10) Becerra-García, J. A., García-León, A., Muela-Martínez, J. A., & Egan, V. (2013). A controlled study of the Big Five personality dimensions in sex offenders, non-sex offenders and non-offenders: Relationship with offending behaviour and childhood abuse. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology, 24*(2), 233–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2013.764463>
- 11) Beerthuizen, M. G. C. J., & Brugman, D. (2012). Sexually abusive youths’ moral reasoning on sex. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 18*(2), 125–135.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2010.519126>
- 12) Blagden, N., Winder, B., Gregson, M., & Thorne, K. (2014). Making sense of denial in sexual offenders: A qualitative phenomenological and repertory grid analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29*(9), 1698–1731. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513511530>
- 13) Blagden, N., Winder, B., & Hames, C. (2016). ‘They treat us like human beings’— Experiencing a therapeutic sex offenders prison: Impact on prisoners and staff and implications for treatment. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 60*(4), 371–396. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X14553227>

- 14) Blasko, B. L., & Jeglic, E. L. (2016). Sexual offenders' perceptions of the client–therapist relationship: The role of risk. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, 28(4), 271–290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214529802>
- 15) Boccaccini, M. T., Rufino, K. A., Jackson, R. L., & Murrie, D. C. (2013). Personality Assessment Inventory scores as predictors of misconduct among sex offenders civilly committed as sexually violent predators. *Psychological Assessment*, 25(4), 1390–1395. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034048>
- 16) Booxbaum, A., & Burton, D. L. (2013). Self-reported methods of cessation of adult male child abusers: A pilot study. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 83(1), 55–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajop.12000>
- 17) Bourke, P., Ward, T., & Rose, C. (2012). Expertise and sexual offending: A preliminary empirical model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(12), 2391–2414. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260511433513>
- 18) Bovard-Johns, R., Yoder, J. R., & Burton, D. L. (2015). Therapeutic alliance with juvenile sexual offenders: The effects of trauma symptoms and attachment functioning. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 54(4), 296–315. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2015.1025179>
- 19) Brankley, A. E., Goodwill, A. M., & Reale, K. S. (2014). Escalation from fetish burglaries to sexual violence: A retrospective case study of former Col, D Russell Williams. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, 11(2), 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jip.1406>
- 20) Brown, A. R., Dargis, M. A., Mattern, A. C., Tsonis, M. A., & Newman, J. P. (2015). Elevated psychopathy scores among mixed sexual offenders: Replication and extension. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 42(10), 1032–1044. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854815575389>

- 21) Brown, S. J., Walker, K., Gannon, T. A., & Keown, K. (2013). Creating a psychologically comfortable position: The link between empathy and cognitions in sex offenders. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 19*(3), 275–294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2012.747223>
- 22) Budd, K., & Desmond, S. A. (2014). Sex offenders and sex crime recidivism: Investigating the role of sentence length and time served. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 58*(12), 1481–1499. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X13507421>
- 23) Burchfield, K. B., & Mingus, W. (2014). Sex offender reintegration: Consequences of the local neighborhood context. *American Journal of Criminal Justice: AJCJ; Louisville, 39*(1), 109–124. <http://dx.doi.org.uplib.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s12103-012-9195-x>
- 24) Burton, D., Demuynck, S., & Yoder, J. R. (2016). Executive dysfunction predicts delinquency but not characteristics of sexual aggression among adolescent sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 28*(8), 707–721. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214556357>
- 25) Cale, J., Leclerc, B., & Smallbone, S. (2014). The sexual lives of sexual offenders: The link between childhood sexual victimization and non-criminal sexual lifestyles between types of offenders. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 20*(1), 37–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2012.736510>
- 26) Cale, J., Smallbone, S., Rayment-McHugh, S., & Dowling, C. (2016). Offense trajectories, the unfolding of sexual and non-sexual criminal activity, and sex offense characteristics of adolescent sex offenders. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 28*(8), 791–812. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063215580968>
- 27) Clarke, C., Tapp, J., Lord, A., & Moore, E. (2013). Group-work for offender patients on sex offending in a high security hospital: Investigating aspects of impact via qualitative analysis. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 19*(1), 50–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2011.595514>

- 28) Davis, K. C., Kiekel, P. A., Schraufnagel, T. J., Norris, J., George, W. H., & Kajumulo, K. F. (2012). Men's alcohol intoxication and condom use during sexual assault perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(14), 2790–2806.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512438277>
- 29) Dawson, P., Goodwill, A. M., & Dixon, L. (2014). Preliminary insights and analysis into weapon enabled sexual offenders. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research; Bingley, 6*(3), 174–184. <http://dx.doi.org.uplib.idm.oclc.org/10.1108/JACPR-10-2013-0029>
- 30) DeCou, C. R., Cole, T. T., Rowland, S. E., Kaplan, S. P., & Lynch, S. M. (2015). An ecological process model of female sex offending: The role of victimization, psychological distress, and life stressors. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 27*(3), 302–323.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214556359>
- 31) Draper, C. E., Errington, S., Omar, S., & Makhita, S. (2013). The therapeutic benefits of sport in the rehabilitation of young sexual offenders: A qualitative evaluation of the Fight with insight programme. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 14*(4), 519–530.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.02.004>
- 32) Eher, R., Schilling, F., Hansmann, B., Pumberger, T., Nitschke, J., Habermeyer, E., & Mokros, A. (2016). Sadism and violent reoffending in sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 28*(1), 46–72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214566715>
- 33) Ennis, L., Buro, K., & Jung, S. (2016). Identifying male sexual offender subtypes using cluster analysis and the Static-2002R. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 28*(5), 403–426. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214527481>
- 34) Evans, D. N., & Cubellis, M. A. (2015). Coping with stigma: How registered sex offenders manage their public identities. *American Journal of Criminal Justice: AJCJ; Louisville, 40*(3), 593–619. <http://dx.doi.org.uplib.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s12103-014-9277-z>

- 35) Felizzi, M. V. (2015). Family or caregiver instability, parental attachment, and the relationship to juvenile sex offending. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse: Research, Treatment, & Program Innovations for Victims, Survivors, & Offenders*, 24(6), 641–658.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2015.1057668>
- 36) Friestad, C., & Skardhamar, T. (2016). The criminal career of men convicted of rape: Evidence from a Norwegian national cohort. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 17(2), 150–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14043858.2016.1262595>
- 37) Gamache, D., Diguier, L., Laverdière, O., & Rousseau, J.-P. (2012). Development of an object relation-based typology of adolescent sex offenders. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic; New York*, 76(4), 329–364. <http://dx.doi.org.uplib.idm.oclc.org/101521bumc2012764329>
- 38) Gannon, T. A., Waugh, G., Taylor, K., Blanchette, K., O'Connor, A., Blake, E., & Ciardha, C. Ó. (2014). Women who sexually offend display three main offense styles: A reexamination of the Descriptive Model of Female Sexual Offending. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, 26(3), 207–224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063213486835>
- 39) Gerhard-Burnham, B., Underwood, L. A., Speck, K., Williams, C., Merino, C., & Crump, Y. (2016). The lived experience of the adolescent sex offender: A phenomenological case study. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 25(1), 93–109.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2016.1111965>
- 40) Gillespie, S. M., Williams, R., Elliott, I. A., Eldridge, H. J., Ashfield, S., & Beech, A. R. (2015). Characteristics of females who sexually offend: A comparison of solo and co-offenders. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, 27(3), 284–301.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214556358>
- 41) Grady, M. D., Swett, L., & Shields, J. J. (2016). The impact of a sex offender treatment programme on the attachment styles of incarcerated male sexual offenders. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 22(1), 123–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2014.894148>

- 42) Graham, N., Kimonis, E. R., Wasserman, A. L., & Kline, S. M. (2012). Associations among childhood abuse and psychopathy facets in male sexual offenders. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 3(1), 66–75. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025605>
- 43) Grattagliano, I., Owens, J. N., Morton, R. J., Campobasso, C. P., Carabellese, F., & Catanesi, R. (2012). Female sexual offenders: Five Italian case studies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(3), 180–187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.01.001>
- 44) Gunst, E. (2012). Experiential psychotherapy with sex offenders: Experiencing as a way to change, to live more fulfilling lives, to desist from offending. *Person-Centered & Experiential Psychotherapies*, 11(4), 321–334. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14779757.2012.740324>
- 45) Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Helmus, L., & Thornton, D. (2014). High-risk sex offenders may not be high risk forever. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(15), 2792–2813. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514526062>
- 46) Harkins, L., Beech, A. R., & Thornton, D. (2013). The influence of risk and psychopathy on the therapeutic climate in sex offender treatment. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, 25(2), 103–122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063212443384>
- 47) Harkins, L., Howard, P., Barnett, G., Wakeling, H., & Miles, C. (2015). Relationships between denial, risk, and recidivism in sexual offenders. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 44(1), 157–166. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-014-0333-z>
- 48) Harris, D. A. (2013). Age and type of onset of offending: Results from a sample of male sexual offenders referred for civil commitment. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 57(10), 1226–1247. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X12448649>
- 49) Harris, G. T., Lalumière, M. L., Seto, M. C., Rice, M. E., & Chaplin, T. C. (2012). Explaining the erectile responses of rapists to rape stories: The contributions of sexual activity, non-

consent, and violence with injury. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 41(1), 221–229.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-012-9940-8>

50) Hoor, N. M. ten. (2013). Treating Cognitive Distortions with EMDR: A Case Study of a Sex Offender. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 12(2), 139–148.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/14999013.2013.791350>

51) Ingevaldson, S., Goulding, A., & Tidefors, I. (2016). Experiences of intimate relationships in young men who sexually offended during adolescence: Interviews 10 years later. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 22(3), 410–422. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2016.1177125>

52) Jeglic, E. L., Mercado, C. C., & Levenson, J. S. (2012). The prevalence and correlates of depression and hopelessness among sex offenders subject to community notification and residence restriction legislation. *American Journal of Criminal Justice: AJCJ; Louisville*, 37(1), 46–59. <http://dx.doi.org.uplib.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s12103-010-9096-9>

53) Jumper, S., Babula, M., & Casbon, T. (2012). Diagnostic profiles of civilly committed sexual offenders in Illinois and other reporting jurisdictions: What we know so far. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 56(6), 838–855.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X11415509>

54) Kingston, D. A., & Bradford, J. M. (2013). Hypersexuality and recidivism among sexual offenders. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, 20(1–2), 91–105. (2013-13078-010).

55) Kingston, D. A., Yates, P. M., & Firestone, P. (2012). The self-regulation model of sexual offending: Relationship to risk and need. *Law and Human Behavior*, 36(3), 215–224.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093960>

56) Kras, K. R., & Blasko, B. L. (2016). Pathways to desistance among men convicted of sexual offenses: Linking post hoc accounts of offending behavior and outcomes. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 60(15), 1738–1755.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X16668178>

- 57) Krstic, S., Knight, R. A., & Robertson, C. A. (2016). Developmental antecedents of the facets of psychopathy: The role of multiple abuse experiences. *Journal of Personality Disorders; New York, 30*(5), 677–693. <http://dx.doi.org.uplib.idm.oclc.org/101521pedi201529223>
- 58) Langevin, R., & Curnoe, S. (2014). Psychological profile of sex offenders using weapons in their crimes. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 20*(1), 55–68.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2013.769636>
- 59) Leclerc, B., Feakes, J., & Cale, J. (2015). Child sexual abuse in youth-oriented organisations: Tapping into situational crime prevention from the offender’s perspective. *Crime Science; Heidelberg, 4*(1), 1–12. <http://dx.doi.org.uplib.idm.oclc.org/10.1186/s40163-015-0044-3>
- 60) Leclerc, B., Wortley, R., & Dowling, C. (2016). Situational precipitators and interactive forces in sexual crime events involving adult offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 43*(11), 1600–1618. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854816660144>
- 61) Lee, S. C., & Hanson, R. K. (2016). Recidivism risk factors are correlated with a history of psychiatric hospitalization among sex offenders. *Psychological Services, 13*(3), 261–271.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/ser0000081>
- 62) Levenson, J. (2016). Adverse childhood experiences and subsequent substance abuse in a sample of sexual offenders: Implications for treatment and prevention. *Victims & Offenders, 11*(2), 199–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2014.971478>
- 63) Levenson, J. S., & Grady, M. D. (2016). The influence of childhood trauma on sexual violence and sexual deviance in adulthood. *Traumatology, 22*(2), 94–103.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/trm0000067>
- 64) Levenson, J. S., Sandler, J. C., & Freeman, N. J. (2012). Failure-to-register laws and public safety: An examination of risk factors and sex offense recidivism. *Law and Human Behavior, 36*(6), 555–565. <https://doi.org/10.1037/b0000002>

- 65) Levenson, J. S., & Socia, K. M. (2016). Adverse childhood experiences and arrest patterns in a sample of sexual offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 31*(10), 1883–1911.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515570751>
- 66) Levenson, J. S., Willis, G. M., & Prescott, D. S. (2015). Adverse childhood experiences in the lives of female sex offenders. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 27*(3), 258–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214544332>
- 67) Levenson, J. S., Willis, G. M., & Prescott, D. S. (2016). Adverse childhood experiences in the lives of male sex offenders: Implications for trauma-informed care. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 28*(4), 340–359. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214535819>
- 68) Lin, J., & Simon, W. (2016). Examining specialization among sex offenders released from prison. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 28*(3), 253–267.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214547581>
- 69) Looman, J., Abracen, J., & Di Fazio, R. (2014). Efficacy of group versus individual treatment of sex offenders. *Sexual Abuse in Australia and New Zealand; Haymarket, 6*(1), 48–56.
- 70) Mann, R. E., Webster, S. D., Wakeling, H. C., & Keylock, H. (2013). Why do sexual offenders refuse treatment? *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 19*(2), 191–206.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2012.703701>
- 71) Margari, F., Lecce, P. A., Craig, F., Laforteza, E., Lisi, A., Pinto, F., ... Grattagliano, I. (2015). Juvenile sex offenders: Personality profile, coping styles and parental care. *Psychiatry Research, 229*(1–2), 82–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2015.07.066>
- 72) Marini, V. A., Leibowitz, G. S., Burton, D. L., & Stickle, T. R. (2014). Victimization, substance use, and sexual aggression in male adolescent sexual offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 41*(5), 635–649. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854813507567>

- 73) Martin, G. M., & Tardif, M. (2015). Examining sex offenders' intimacy deficits: Their nature and their influence on sexually abusive behaviours. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 21*(2), 158–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2013.849768>
- 74) McAnena, C., Craissati, J., & Southgate, K. (2016). Exploring the role of locus of control in sex offender treatment. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 22*(1), 95–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2015.1023374>
- 75) McKillop, N., Brown, S. J., Smallbone, S., & Wortley, R. (2016). Sexual offenders' parental and adult attachments and preferences for therapists' interpersonal qualities. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 22*(2), 177–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2015.1057243>
- 76) McKillop, N., Smallbone, S., & Wortley, R. (2016). Predicting multiple victim versus single victim sexual abuse: An examination of distal factors and proximal factors associated with the first abuse incident. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 22*(1), 52–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2014.971892>
- 77) McKillop, N., Smallbone, S., Wortley, R., & Andjic, I. (2012). Offenders' attachment and sexual abuse onset: A test of theoretical propositions. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 24*(6), 591–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063212445571>
- 78) Miller, H. A. (2015). Protective strengths, risk, and recidivism in a sample of known sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 27*(1), 34–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214564389>
- 79) Mokros, A., Schilling, F., Weiss, K., Nitschke, J., & Eher, R. (2014). Sadism in sexual offenders: Evidence for dimensionality. *Psychological Assessment, 26*(1), 138–147. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034861>
- 80) Morgan, L., Brittain, B., & Welch, J. (2012). Multiple perpetrator sexual assault: How does it differ from assault by a single perpetrator? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(12), 2415–2436. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260511433514>

- 81) Mouilso, E. R., & Calhoun, K. S. (2016). Personality and perpetration: Narcissism among college sexual assault perpetrators. *Violence Against Women*, 22(10), 1228–1242.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801215622575>
- 82) Mouilso, E. R., Calhoun, K. S., & Rosenbloom, T. G. (2013). Impulsivity and sexual assault in college men. *Violence and Victims; New York*, 28(3), 429–442.
<http://dx.doi.org.uplib.idm.oclc.org/10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-12-00025>
- 83) Moyano, N., & Sierra, J. C. (2016). Sexual victimisation, sexual cognitions, desire and excitation/inhibition in community Spanish male and female sexual aggressors. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 22(1), 36–51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2014.996614>
- 84) Navathe, S., & Ward, T. (2014). Relationship frames in action: A case study of the Sex Offender Relationship Frame model. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 21(3), 406–426.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2013.818522>
- 85) Navathe, S., Ward, T., & Rose, C. (2013). The development of the Sexual Offender Relationship Frames Model. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 20(1), 60–72.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2011.619061>
- 86) Netland, J. D., & Miner, M. H. (2012). Psychopathy traits and parental dysfunction in sexual offending and general delinquent adolescent males. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 18(1), 4–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2011.632696>
- 87) Nicholaichuk, T. P., Olver, M. E., Gu, D., & Wong, S. C. P. (2014). Age, actuarial risk, and long-term recidivism in a national sample of sex offenders. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, 26(5), 406–428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063213492340>
- 88) Nunes, K. L., & Jung, S. (2013). Are cognitive distortions associated with denial and minimization among sex offenders? *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, 25(2), 166–188. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063212453941>

- 89) O'Halloran, D. M., O' Reilly, G., Travers, O., Quinn, P., Stack, J., Cartin, M., ... Ewart-Boyle, S. (2016). Exploring client and therapist experiences of sexual offender intervention: Developing a model of "significant events." *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, 28(4), 314–339. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214535815>
- 90) O'Toole, M. J., & Jeglic, E. L. (2014). The relationship between childhood family environment and adult sexual offending in a sample of sexual offenders. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research*, 19(4), 173–182. (2014-55457-003).
- 91) Park, J., & Kim, S. (2016). Group size does matter: Differences among sexual assaults committed by lone, double, and groups of three or more perpetrators. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 22(3), 342–354. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2016.1144801>
- 92) Pedneault, A., & Beauregard, E. (2014). Routine activities and time use: A latent profile approach to sexual offenders' lifestyles. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, 26(1), 34–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063212470705>
- 93) Pedneault, A., Harris, D. A., & Knight, R. A. (2015). An examination of escalation in burglaries committed by sexual offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 59(11), 1203–1221. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X14533109>
- 94) Pflugradt, D., & Allen, B. (2012). A grounded theory analysis of sexual sadism in females. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 18(3), 325–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2011.597058>
- 95) Pflugradt, D., & Allen, B. (2014). Static risk factors predict sexual misconduct among incarcerated female sexual offenders. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 20(1), 85–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2012.758786>
- 96) Pflugradt, D. M., & Allen, B. P. (2015). An exploration of differences between small samples of female sex offenders with prepubescent versus postpubescent victims. *Journal of Child*

Sexual Abuse: Research, Treatment, & Program Innovations for Victims, Survivors, & Offenders, 24(6), 682–697. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2015.1058876>

- 97) Pullman, L. E., Leroux, E. J., Motayne, G., & Seto, M. C. (2014). Examining the developmental trajectories of adolescent sexual offenders. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 38(7), 1249–1258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2014.03.003>
- 98) Ramirez, S. R., Jeglic, E. L., & Calkins, C. (2015). An examination of the relationship between childhood abuse, anger and violent behavior among a sample of sex offenders. *Health & Justice; Heidelberg*, 3(1), 1–10. <http://dx.doi.org.uplib.idm.oclc.org/10.1186/s40352-015-0025-3>
- 99) Rebocho, M. F., & Gonçalves, R. A. (2012). Sexual predators and prey: A comparative study of the hunting behavior of rapists and child molesters. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(14), 2770–2789. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512438280>
- 100) Reckdenwald, A., Mancini, C., & Beauregard, E. (2013). The cycle of violence: Examining the impact of maltreatment early in life on adult offending. *Violence and Victims; New York*, 28(3), 466–482. <http://dx.doi.org.uplib.idm.oclc.org/10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-12-00054>
- 101) Reddon, J. R., Takacs, S., & Hogan, S. (2013). Sex Offender Situational Competency Test (SOSCT) pretreatment and posttreatment effects for inpatient sex offenders in hypothetical high-risk situations. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 52(1), 16–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2012.720958>
- 102) Rettenberger, M., Briken, P., Turner, D., & Eher, R. (2015). Sexual offender recidivism among a population-based prison sample. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 59(4), 424–444. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X13516732>

- 103) Schroeder, M., Iffland, J. S., Hill, A., Berner, W., & Briken, P. (2013). Personality disorders in men with sexual and violent criminal offense histories. *Journal of Personality Disorders; New York*, 27(4), 519–530. <http://dx.doi.org.uplib.idm.oclc.org/101521pedi201226050>
- 104) Sea, J., Kim, K., & Youngs, D. (2016). Behavioural profiles and offender characteristics across 111 Korean sexual assaults. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, 13(1), 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jip.1430>
- 105) Seto, M. C., Lalumière, M. L., Harris, G. T., & Chivers, M. L. (2012). The sexual responses of sexual sadists. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 121(3), 739–753. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028714>
- 106) Sheehan, P., & Ware, J. (2012). Preparing sex offenders for treatment: A preliminary evaluation of a preparatory programme. *Sexual Abuse in Australia and New Zealand; Haymarket*, 4(2), 3–12.
- 107) Sigre-Leirós, V., Carvalho, J., & Nobre, P. (2016). Preliminary findings on men’s sexual self-schema and sexual offending: Differences between subtypes of offenders. *Journal of Sex Research*, 53(2), 204–213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2015.1012289>
- 108) Smid, W. J., Kamphuis, J. H., Wever, E. C., & Van Beek, D. (2013). Treatment referral for sex offenders based on clinical judgment versus actuarial risk assessment: Match and analysis of mismatch. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(11), 2273–2289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512475313>
- 109) Tewksbury, R., Mustaine, E. E., & Rolfe, S. (2016). Sex offender residential mobility and relegation: The collateral consequences continue. *American Journal of Criminal Justice: AJCJ; Louisville*, 41(4), 852–866. <http://dx.doi.org.uplib.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s12103-016-9341-y>

- 110) Tidefors, I., & Strand, J. (2012). Life history interviews with 11 boys diagnosed with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder who had sexually offended: A sad storyline. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, *13*(4), 421–434. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15299732.2011.652344>
- 111) van der Put, C. E. (2013). The prevalence of risk factors for general recidivism in female adolescent sexual offenders: A comparison of three subgroups. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *37*(9), 691–697. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2013.05.010>
- 112) van der Put, C., van Vugt, E. S., Stams, G. J. J. M., & Hendriks, J. (2014). Psychosocial and developmental characteristics of female adolescents who have committed sexual offenses. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, *26*(4), 330–342. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063213492342>
- 113) Vugt, E. S. van, Asscher, J. J., Hendriks, J., Stams, G. J. J. M., Bijleveld, C. C. J. H., & Laan, P. H. van der. (2012). The relationship between psychopathy and moral development in young sex offenders. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *18*(7), 655–667. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2010.533177>
- 114) Wegner, R., Abbey, A., Pierce, J., Pogram, S. E., & Woerner, J. (2015). Sexual assault perpetrators' justifications for their actions: Relationships to rape supportive attitudes, incident characteristics, and future perpetration. *Violence Against Women*, *21*(8), 1018–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801215589380>
- 115) Wegner, R., Pierce, J., & Abbey, A. (2014). Relationship type and sexual precedence: Their associations with characteristics of sexual assault perpetrators and incidents. *Violence Against Women*, *20*(11), 1360–1382. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801214552856>
- 116) Weldon, S. (2016). Implicit theories in intimate partner violence sex offenders: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Journal of Family Violence; New York*, *31*(3), 289–302. <http://dx.doi.org.uplib.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s10896-015-9774-y>

- 117) Widman, L., Olson, M. A., & Bolen, R. M. (2013). Self-reported sexual assault in convicted sex offenders and community men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *28*(7), 1519–1536.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512468237>
- 118) Wijkman, M., Weerman, F., Bijleveld, C., & Hendriks, J. (2015). Group sexual offending by juvenile females. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, *27*(3), 335–356.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214561685>
- 119) Willemsen, J., Seys, V., Gunst, E., & Desmet, M. (2016). “Simply speaking your mind, from the depths of your soul”: Therapeutic factors in experiential group psychotherapy for sex offenders. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, *16*(3), 151–168.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15228932.2016.1172423>
- 120) Williams, K. S., & Bierie, D. M. (2015). An incident-based comparison of female and male sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, *27*(3), 235–257.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214544333>
- 121) Willis, G. M., & Levenson, J. S. (2016). The relationship between childhood adversity and adult psychosocial outcomes in females who have sexually offended: Implications for treatment. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, *22*(3), 355–367.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2015.1131341>
- 122) Wilson, N. J., Kilgour, G., & Polaschek, D. L. L. (2013). Treating high-risk rapists in a New Zealand intensive prison programme. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *19*(5–6), 527–547.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2013.759007>
- 123) Winder, B., Lievesley, R., Kaul, A., Elliott, H. J., Thorne, K., & Hocken, K. (2014). Preliminary evaluation of the use of pharmacological treatment with convicted sexual offenders experiencing high levels of sexual preoccupation, hypersexuality and/or sexual compulsivity. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, *25*(2), 176–194.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2014.903504>

- 124) Wrighten, S. A., Al-Barwani, M. B., Moran, R. R., McKee, G. R., & Dwyer, R. G. (2015). Sexually violent predators and civil commitment: Is selection evidence based? *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, *26*(5), 652–666.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2015.1040439>
- 125) Yeater, E. A., Lenberg, K. L., & Bryan, A. D. (2012). Predictors of sexual aggression among male juvenile offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *27*(7), 1242–1258.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260511425243>
- 126) Yoder, J. R., Hansen, J., Lobanov-Rostovsky, C., & Ruch, D. (2015). The impact of family service involvement on treatment completion and general recidivism among male youthful sexual offenders. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *54*(4), 256–277.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2015.1025177>
- 127) Zinzow, H. M., & Thompson, M. (2015a). A longitudinal study of risk factors for repeated sexual coercion and assault in U.S. college men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior; New York*, *44*(1), 213–222. <http://dx.doi.org.uplib.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s10508-013-0243-5>
- 128) Zinzow, H. M., & Thompson, M. (2015b). Factors associated with use of verbally coercive, incapacitated, and forcible sexual assault tactics in a longitudinal study of college men. *Aggressive Behaviour*, *41*(1), 34–43. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21567>

APPENDIX B: Initial stages of analysis (diagrams)



APPENDIX C: Table of discourses and supporting quotations

Due to the length of the text in the data, extracts have been edited for length and readability. However, there was careful consideration to not change the meaning. Italics are used for text taken directly from the data. The article number is also produced and corresponds with the list of articles provided in Appendix A.

Table 3

Discourses and supporting quotations

Discourse	Quotations	Article number
Discourse of victimhood	<i>Providers can promote more effective strategies for management of trauma symptoms related to sexual victimization</i>	18
	<i>offenders in our sample (47.2%) reported being sexually victimized prior to adulthood</i>	25
	<i>...early victimization has a unique impact on sexual development....and possibly the emergence of adolescent sex offending against children...</i>	26
	<i>A hypothesized etiologic connection between the childhood victimization of the offender, and his offense pattern later in life, seems important</i>	50
	<i>Sex offenders have higher rates of adverse childhood experiences</i>	62
	<i>These findings revealed that the prevalence of early trauma is significantly higher for sex offenders than for males in the general population</i>	67
	<i>...this study's findings suggest that offenders who were sexually abused as children committed sexual offences against minors...</i>	90
	<i>Sexual offenders demonstrate heightened levels of...and, traumatic experiences...</i>	119
Discourse of villains	<i>...clues to the suspect may lie in police records that were created after the commission of a serious sexual assault</i>	3

	<i>...it supports the notion that the offender is motivated to hurt the victim more than is necessary...</i>	5
	<i>sexual aggressors...</i>	6
	<i>sexually abusive youth...</i>	11
	<i>(perpetrators of sexual violence) ...members of a dangerous group who invoke serious public concerns</i>	61
	<i>The most dangerous sex offenders are those who are afflicted not only with deviant sexual preferences, but who also possess the capacity to act on those interests with little regard for the consequences to others</i>	63
	<i>... which results in physical injury to the victim</i>	98
	<i>Violent criminals are predators—they search for human victims in manners similar to carnivores hunting for animal prey. And like wildlife, they employ various hunting styles in their efforts to seek out and attack victims.</i>	99
Attachment discourse	<i>Results support the hypothesis that these early experiences, with respect to the quality of the object relationship, prevented subjects from developing a secure attachment</i>	1
	<i>The childhoods of offenders were frequently problematic, lacking parental nurturance and with periods of separation from parents</i>	4
	<i>Many researchers have found a link between insecure attachment styles and sexually harmful behavior</i>	7
	<i>Sexually abusive behaviours seem to have some roots in early attachment disruptions, whereby attempts are made to satisfy unmet emotional needs and to connect with others through sexual or aggressive means.</i>	63
	<i>These findings provide tentative evidence that directly and indirectly implicate offenders' attachment problems specifically in the onset of their sexual abuse behaviour</i>	77
	<i>Research has suggested that sexual offenders display insecure attachments styles, which are thought to be a</i>	90

	<i>reflection of undependable relationships with caregivers during infancy and early childhood</i>	
Personality discourse	<i>...which led them to develop personality problems</i>	4
	<i>Knowing these probable personality profiles is potentially useful for... clinicians and criminologists, as they provide a broad description of the offender's personality, the individual's particular personality difficulties and aspects of life they may have particular difficulties with...</i>	10
	<i>(results) ...suggests that these individuals share substantially more psychopathic features</i>	20
	<i>linkages have been identified between callous, unemotional, or antisocial characteristics and sexual criminality</i>	24
	<i>The clusters identified here appear to be distributed along a continuum...including adolescents with psychopathic, antisocial and exploitative features and adolescents with narcissistic features</i>	37
Internal chaos	<i>Lack of self-control was a central factor across all participants</i>	4
	<i>(results)...suggesting that critical events deemed especially traumatic may relate to impairments in information processing, impulse control, or neuropsychological development</i>	24
	<i>However, it is also crucial to consider whether and to what extent other psychosocial deficits such as impulsivity and, under-developed abstract reasoning about the future consequences of behaviour...play a role in this context</i>	26
	<i>offenders begin to engage in antisocial</i>	33
	<i>behaviour in early childhood as the result of neuropsychological deficits that impair the individual's capacity for behavioural self-management</i>	
	<i>Impulsive individuals may lack the self-control necessary to refrain from aggressive behaviour when provoked</i>	82

	<i>...Offenders therefore consider the consequences of their actions less</i>	91
	<i>Sex offenders demonstrate heightened levels of ... and emotional dysregulation</i>	119
	<i>As predicted, male juvenile offenders who reported higher levels of sensation seeking, impulsivity, and externalizing behaviours also reported engaging in more severe sexual aggression</i>	125
At the mercy of emotions	<i>...who are motivated by the need to demonstrate power over their victims and use the assault as a means of releasing high levels of anger they feel</i>	6
	<i>Some of this incongruence centered on a concealment of their true feelings ...</i>	12
	<i>It is also common for clients to be unable to control their feelings, being either not in contact or too much in contact with their emotions</i>	44
	<i>Problematic emotional functioning is seen as a central factor in the etiological models of sexual abuse</i>	44
	<i>sex offenders may engage in deviant sexual behavior as a coping strategy to deal with negative affective states</i>	52
	<i>Sexually abused children may grow up to use sex to compensate for feelings of invalidation or powerlessness</i>	63
	<i>Sexualized coping can offer a way of soothing distress and/or meeting needs for intimacy, affection, attention, and control</i>	63
	<i>Juvenile sexual offenders compared to nonsexual offenders, make more use of sex, especially non-consensual sexual activities, as a coping strategy</i>	71
	<i>...the propensity to use sexuality as a strategy for adapting to stressful situation</i>	73
	<i>According to this model, pervasively angry sex offenders express anger and aggression in their sexual assaults</i>	98

	<i>Sexual aggression had come to serve as the primary means of gratifying not only sexual motives but rather a diverse range of motives like expression of anger, reduction in stress, or the gratification of intimacy needs.</i>	102
	<i>Sex offenders demonstrate heightened levels of negative emotions...</i>	119
Cognitions and schemas: a criminal mind	<i>The interviews suggest that cognitive distortions play an important role in offending behaviour</i>	4
	<i>...many of the schemas and cognitive distortions of rapists are centered on beliefs and attitudes about women</i>	14
	<i>Such implicit schemas are hypothesised to skew offenders' offence-related interpretations resulting in erroneous conclusions and subsequent decision-making</i>	21
	<i>Cognitive distortions/thinking errors have long been recognized as a serious treatment issue in maladaptive sexual behaviours</i>	39
	<i>How the adolescent inaccurately perceives his environment—in essence what he tells himself and continues to tell himself to make sense of his world—are building blocks in the development and continuation of thinking errors/cognitive distortions used to commit and justify sexual offending behaviours.</i>	39
	<i>Our results are generally consistent with past research finding that greater endorsement of cognitive distortions is associated with greater denial/minimization</i>	88
Psycho-pathology	<i>They may also have more challenges in suppression of deviant sexual interests</i>	2
	<i>Sex offenders present with increased pathology</i>	14
	<i>The present study provides strong support for previous findings linking the sex offender to psychopathy</i>	20
	<i>A diagnosis of sadism in sexual offenders is commonly regarded as indicative of high risk for violent reoffending</i>	32

	<i>Across samples, 72.7% of sexually violent persons were diagnosed with a personality disorder, with antisocial personality disorder the most prevalent</i>	53
	<i>These results support the notion that hypersexuality is a relatively strong individual predictor of sexually violent recidivism and that the construct represents a psychologically meaningful risk factor</i>	54
	<i>Recurrent and intense sexual fantasies and urges that circle around the infliction of pain or humiliation on another human being may predispose individuals toward acts of sexual aggression against nonconsenting victims</i>	79
	<i>As hypothesized, NPD (Narcissistic Personality Disorder), measured by... were significantly associated with perpetration of both sexual assault and rape</i>	81
	<i>Rapists also appear to have high rates of personality disorder</i>	122
Medical-pathology	<i>...neurological differences that lead to greater criminal behaviours</i>	2
	<i>Traumatized youth may have neurological deficits...trauma-induced neurological deficits can elicit fear... such fear can provoke compensatory behaviours (i.e., sexual offending)</i>	18
	<i>There is growing evidence that abuse is a stressor that dysregulates HPA (hypothalamus, pituitary gland, and adrenal glands) axis functioning and leads to subsequent adverse effects on neurodevelopment</i>	57
	<i>The most accepted explanation of ADHD has its roots in theories about biological changes in brain function ...They spoke of being inattentive and restless in school and impulsive before and during their sexual offenses.</i>	110
	<i>Pharmacological treatment has been shown to contribute to individuals being able to control their sexual urges and arousal, and reduce hypersexuality</i>	123
	<i>SSRIs work to increase serotonin and it has been evidenced that serotonin inhibits physiological arousal</i>	123

	<i>/erection, physiological orgasm, sexual desire and psychological arousal</i>	
	<i>Anti-androgens, specifically Cyproterone Acetate (CPA; the medication used in this study) have their anti-libidinal effect by directly reducing testosterone levels to a point where sexual arousal is substantially reduced</i>	123
Treatment and prevention	<i>Adolescents must learn the adverse health effects of drug use and how it contributes to their inappropriate sexual behaviours</i>	2
	<i>This research concludes that prisons, such as the one under investigation, which foster therapeutic and rehabilitative climate, can help facilitate change</i>	13
	<i>(results)...can assist in developing and tailoring innovative and individualized treatment strategies</i>	26
	<i>Offenders in this study demonstrated that they can change and make shifts in treatment.</i>	41
	<i>Importance is being placed on individualized treatment planning that adapts interventions to match the clients' needs...</i>	67
	<i>The present research adds to our understanding of what clients identify as significant in their intervention</i>	89
	<i>Moreover, prevention strategies attending to developmental and socialization experiences about gender-role stereotyping could be implemented</i>	107
	<i>Instead, programs are needed in middle school that dispel common rape supportive attitudes, as well as double standards about sexuality and alcohol consumption that underlie many common rape supportive attitudes.</i>	114
	<i>The widespread nature of sexual entitlement beliefs suggest that they are an integral component of gender socialization and need to be addressed in universal prevention programs</i>	115

	<i>Thus, it may be important to address the relationship between sexual aggression and the uses of these substances in interventions</i>	125
	<i>our study suggests that one way for prevention programs to reduce risk for sexual violence is to change rape supportive peer norms...hostility towards women, male sexual dominance, and traditional views of masculinity</i>	128
Career discourse	<i>...sexual offenses are increasingly a sequence following these nonsexual offenses</i>	2
	<i>sexual offenders can differ in the extent to which their criminal careers are characterized by specialism or generality</i>	3
	<i>Whereas sexual offenders may display deficiencies in some aspects of their lives, there are domain-relevant competencies such as selection and manipulation of victims, decision making and problem solving, and eluding detection, in which some individuals appear to excel</i>	17
	<i>This supports a dynamic understanding of criminal careers by emphasizing the development of behaviour over time</i>	36
	<i>These results indicate that a more dedicated understanding of the beginning of one's criminal career is a beneficial direction for future study</i>	48
	<i>In fact, only offenders are present from start to finish during crime events, that is, from crime preparation to completion. Therefore, only</i>	59
	<i>with offenders is it possible to reconstruct the complete crime-commission process and understand what may have prevented them from acting in a particular way or how they may have overcome obstacles during the course of actions leading to crime.</i>	
	<i>...demonstrated that they are, in fact, decision makers and act in a rational, though sometimes bounded, manner during the commission of their crimes</i>	99

	<i>...we note that our sample of young sex offenders mainly consisted of solo sex offenders who had abused younger children, a type of sex offender known to commit relatively many sexual offences over their criminal career</i>	113
	<i>It would be useful to study the role of this particular group of sexual offense in the criminal career...to examine whether it was an once-only act, or the start-or maybe the end- of a criminal career</i>	118
Gender discourse	<i>Research into sexual offending patterns traditionally concentrated on male perpetrators and female victims...and this was also the case in the current research</i>	3
	<i>...there is evidence suggesting that rapists hold more negative attitudes toward women</i>	14
	<i>There are several characteristics of female sex offenses that differ from those perpetrated by males.</i>	30
	<i>Females more often commit crimes in the presence of a co-offender and offend against known victims within the context of a caregiving role</i>	30
	<i>Predisposed women ... appeared to be characterized by anger, low self-esteem, emotional instability</i>	38
	<i>male-coerced women appeared to be characterized by low self-esteem, lack of assertion, and powerlessness and seemed to abuse for fear of losing their intimate relationship with a male</i>	38
	<i>Women who sexually abuse children are rare</i>	43
	<i>women appear to be motivated by desires for intimacy and sexual satisfaction</i>	43
	<i>...particularly because little is known about pathways into sexual offending by females</i>	66
	<i>Therefore, compared to male sexual aggression, female sexual aggression does not seem to be motivated by dominance and power, as previously suggested</i>	83

<i>In contrast to male sadists, however, the deviant sexual arousal appeared to be associated more with the infliction of psychological rather than physical pain.</i>	94
<i>In females as revealed by the data indicated that it (the offense) is highly relational in nature</i>	94
<i>Little is known about female sexual perpetrators...</i>	95
<i>Rapists (male)... were more likely to hold the powerful-aggressive sexual self-view (i.e., traits that are congruent with stereotypical male characteristics, such as being independent, domineering, powerful, and direct)</i>	107
<i>Sexual offending by female adolescents is an understudied area mainly due to the small number of female adolescents who commit sexual offenses</i>	111
<i>Men's sexual aggression toward women is a pervasive problem</i>	114
<i>Not much is known about female sexual offenders</i>	118
<i>Differences have emerged between male and female sexual abusers</i>	121
