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This thesis explores social perceptions of the assumed male rape dynamics, and the diverse dimensions it inhabits through the lens of normative masculinity and victimhood constructions. As a society, we are highly engaged in the aid, prevention and raising awareness of sexual violence. This thesis will limit its focus to rape victimization, as an exemplification of sexual violence categories. Typically, female victims of rape or other forms of sexual violence are regularly acknowledged in academic, societal and cultural spheres whereas men are rarely discussed as potential victims of rape. One might assume that well-established societal and cultural perceptions of the traditional gendered rape; whereby women are the victims and men the rapists, has contributed in concealing potential male rape victims. Subsequently, its divergent dimensions and dynamics. The main objective of this thesis is therefore; to investigate how the perceived dynamics of male rape interact with notions of victimhood and norms of masculinity. Additionally, to disclose the gendered dimensions of male rape dynamics, and illustrate how criminological academic contributions, alongside the modest empirical sample, might aid in the comprehension of these phenomena.
To answer this objective, a qualitative approach was deemed most appropriate. Subsequently, semi-structured interviews, in addition the theoretical framework, were applied. The sample, harvested through purposive sampling and flyers, consists of young resourceful Norwegian adults; six females and two males between the ages of 20-28. Audio recordings were utilized. The analytical and practical approach when processing the data material, through HyperResearch, consisted of 54 codes printed into a paperback ‘codebook’ of 172 pages, and a mainly discursive analysis to understand the rationales the participants held. In addition, the data was analyzed within a framework made of primarily criminological contributions, as well as some sociological contributions. The backbone of this thesis is largely grounded in the idealization of victimhood and normative masculinity, namely Christie’s (1986a) notion of an ‘ideal victim’ and Messerschmidt (1993), Connell (1995) and Jon (2014) take on normative masculinities. In addition, diverse contributions on the ways in which these concepts and notions intersect with regards to male rape. These contributions, as well as other relevant criminological and sociological research, will be present in both analysis chapters and further considered in concluding remarks.

As presented in the analysis chapters 4 and 5, the participants were typically eager to dissociate their own opinions on these phenomena to the societal ones seemingly as to avoid saying something deemed ‘insensitive’ or ‘inappropriate’, subsequently, they typically reflected upon these subjects with quite ambivalent means. Which one could argue is rather distinctive for Nordic cultures (Gullestrad, 1996). For instance, by rejecting such a concept of ideal victim, only to later in the conversation identify rather clear traits. Interestingly though, most seemingly partake in negotiations with themselves as to the various dimensions within the dynamics of rape victimization. Therefore, a characteristic trait of this thesis is how the participants oftentimes seemed to ambivalently negotiate the conditions for what constitutes as male rape, through the overarching male rape dynamics further sorted into specific dimensions, and then the perceived consequences of these dimensions. Male rape is indeed perceived as a potential rape dynamic, but only when placed within certain dimensions and ascribed conditions. They negotiate the interacted transferability of male rape dynamics into idealizations of rape victimhood and masculinity, and the ways in which these polarizing idealizations intersect. One defining feature of this interaction is evident in the fractured status when attempting to align these idealizations. On the one hand, there are some dimensions of male rape dynamics that somewhat align with both normative masculinity and idealized victimhood. On the other hand, there are dimensions which contradict these notions,
consequently rendering the male rape victims’ status fractured regardless. In this sense, the outcome of these constructions suggest that male rape victims do not fully live up to the idealization of a victim and still maintain the normative masculine identity. This is evident in how the participants subscribed, for instance, feminized characteristic when describing a male rape victim. Furthermore, the outcome of the negotiations of the specific exemptions when considering male rape dynamic as legitimate indicate that there are some determining dimensions such as; the perpetrators gender, victims age, whether the victimized man was under the influence of drugs, situational and relational contexts. As well as, the consequences of the dimensions within specifically female on male rape mounted to; principle of resistance, sexual integrity and how they presumed the male victim would governed this fractured masculine identity. Subsequently, this thesis has facilitated contextual access to defining features and structural dimensions within the dynamics of male rape. As suggested in concluding remarks, the phenomena of male rape and its dynamics warrant further attention and research, it is necessary to expand the knowledge of these rather neglected rape dynamics.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Grounding the relevance of male rape

As a society, we are highly engaged in the prevention and raising awareness of sexual violence, evident through official discourses, news media outlets, awareness campaigns and extensive academic work (Grøvdal, 2012; Walklate, 2007). Although sexual victimization oftentimes is regarded as having a sensitive and taboo nature, it is extensively debated. This thesis will mainly limit its focus to rape victimization, as an exemplification of sexual violence categories. Typically, female victims of rape or other forms of sexual violence are regularly acknowledged in academic, societal and cultural spheres whereas men are rarely discussed as potential victims of rape. One might assume that well-established societal and cultural perceptions of the traditional gendered rape; whereby women are the victims and men the rapists, have contributed to conceal potential male rape victims. One might argue that the discourse of radical feminism has assisted in the construction of contemporary understandings of sexual victimhood, whereby the rape victim position is reserved for women and children (Grøvdal, 2012). So where does that leave the potential male victims of rape in relation to the cultural constructions of sexual victimhood? The establishment of rape and other forms of domestic or sexual violence towards women are oftentimes regarded as legitimate issues of concern for both civil and state institutions, criminal justice legislation and international human rights. Nonetheless, it is crucial to introduce a gendered perspective and legally acknowledge men as potential victims of rape. The international shift towards a gender neutral legal definition of rape has been significant, even though the national and regional definitions vary and are thought to be dependent on the concept of consent. Nevertheless, the term ‘consent´ and what this entails also varies (Munro, 2001). Consequently, it has transferred the focus from solely penile penetration toward respect for persons’ right to sexual autonomy and bodily integrity (Munro, 2001). Thereby, rendering the Norwegian legal definition gender-neutral and includes ‘violations which influence and is committed by both women and men’ (Skilbrei et al. 2013: 8)\(^1\).

\(^1\) See appendix F - Legal Definition of Rape
It follows, according to one of the main sources of statistical data in Norway on the extent of male rape victims, Kripos, the percentage of males identified as the victims of most serious sexual offences is less than 7% per cent (87 out of 1309) (Kripos, 2016). Self-reporting studies with NKVTS\(^2\) show that 1.1% of the male respondents (9.4% women) reported being raped when over eighteen. Although one in ten men (11.3%) stated that they had been subjected to some form of sexual violence. In addition, out of the twenty-four men who reported being subjected to rape, only four (16.7%) reported their victimization to law enforcement (Thoresen and Hjelmdal, 2014). This low reporting of male victims is well reflected in terms of policing this phenomenon as a public concern, which contrasts sharply to the extensive research and policy aimed to aid and police female rape victims. In total, there are twenty-three rape crisis centers in Norway, which include Dixi\(^3\) and SMISO\(^4\). As well as, Reform\(^5\) and Utsattmann\(^6\) exclusively directed at aiding males. Although there is reason to believe that women are, more often than men, subjected to sexual violence and rape, one might presume that it does not indicate that male victims are, irrelevant or less important group to focus on, not politically, socially or academically (Houge, 2015: 81). The under-reporting of male rape and male sexual violence is generally accepted and, to some extent, acknowledged as an existing phenomenon, evident in, for instance sexualized war violence. Yet the extent of male rape victimization in the general population is still relatively unexplored (Houge, 2015). Furthermore, one might suspect that the nature of rape victimization is perceived as challenging to reconcile with men being potential victims of rape. The thought that they would not be able to resist the potential attack hardly complies with the hegemonic masculine norms; the culturally constructed normative masculinity in which men often aspire to (Connell, 1995; Messerschmidt, 1993). By extension, Sivakumaran (2007) argues that this is also how they are viewed by others. When adult male rape is considered, it is often contextualized as male on male rape, situated within specific settings such as prison or other forms of institutional settings, whereby the victimized man is subordinated or vulnerable (Burcar, 2014; O’Sullivan, 2013). Similarly, when acknowledged outside these settings, the likeliness that the rape had components of subduing affects such as drugs or having a lessened awareness, is evident through various mass media portraits. One might draw on the rape victimization of Karsten Nordal Hauken as an illustration; who

\(^2\) Norwegian centre for violence and traumatic stress studies (Nasjonalt kunnskapssenter for vold og traumatisk stress)  
\(^3\) https://www.dixi.no  
\(^4\) https://www.sentermotincest.no  
\(^5\) https://reform.no  
\(^6\) http://utsattmann.no
voiced his rape through both the mediatised documentary ‘Jeg mot meg’ and other forms of new media outlets. Extracted from the documentary: the male perpetrator forced Karsten to consume methamphetamine in order to gain further control, then proceeded to force Karsten to perform oral sex (NRK, 2016). On the contrary, female on male rape is hardly recognized as a potential dynamic, in illustration; one woman has been convicted of male rape in a Norwegian context. Nonetheless, the organization Utsattmann emphasize that female on male rape is not as uncommon as one might assume ‘we experience men who, for instance, tell us that their wife uses her power to make herself comfortable. Many experience that their mind is telling them no, but the erection remains, especially when there is substance use involved’. This might indicate one of the manifold dimensions of male rape dynamics, and the complexities of sexual violence when attempting to align it with the cultural notions of masculinity. By extension, Viktor Inge spoke to Nettavisen about being raped by a woman, when he was under the influence of alcohol at the time of the assault and raped in his own living room. He chose to refrain from reporting the rape to law enforcement, because he felt ‘the threshold was too high’. Viktor Inge advocates the need to speak openly about male rape and the societal responsibilities of removing taboo (Wessel-Hansen, 2016).

1.2 Research aim

The presumed complexities that surround male rape victimization, puts forward several interesting criminological questions. It is, indeed, of importance to investigate the cultural and societal perceptions when attempting to gain insight into rare and relatively unexplored fields such as the male rape phenomena, as one might assume it influences the ways in which we police and view male rape victims as a society. I will be looking at the situational and relational understandings of male rape; how the assumed dimensions influence the various constructions of male rape. In this thesis then, I explore social and cultural understandings of

---

the understandings of male rape, victimhood constructions and masculinity constructions, through various theoretical contributions and empirical data consisting of qualitative interviews with eight University students. In light of this, my research aim is; how do the perceived dynamics of male rape interact with notions of victimhood and norms of masculinity?

1.3 Thesis outline

This thesis will firstly present the academic framework with regards to male rape victimization in light of norms of masculinity and idealized victimhood in Chapter 2 Theoretical framework, which grounds the establishment of this thesis. Secondly, it will consider the methodology utilized in order to harvest empirical data on these phenomena, such as volunteer sampling, primarily discursive analysis and ethical concerns in Chapter 3 Methodology. Thirdly, it will present, discuss and analyze the empirical findings in relation to the academic framework, in Chapter 4 Constructions of victimhood and Chapter 5 Male rape victimization and Masculinities. Lastly, this thesis will conclude with identifying the key findings and finally proposing areas of further research in Chapter 6 Conclusion.
2 Theoretical framework

This chapter will introduce relevant theoretical contributions which help with gaining insight into the cultural and social understandings of male rape dynamics, and the ways in which it interacts with notions of victimhood and norms of masculinity. The theoretical framework presented below serves as the grounding anchor of this thesis, for which it has constituted the planning and execution when exploring these phenomena.

2.1 Constructions of victimhood

The socially constructed process whereby one becomes identified as a victim is highly complex, in which victims are ranked according to legitimacy and distinct characteristics whereby few are able to obtain a legitimate victim status. Nils Christie (1986a), put forward the concept of an ‘ideal victim’ arguing that there are certain assumptions associated with the label ‘victim’. Christie (1986a: 18) identified the ‘ideal victim’ as ‘a person or category of individuals who – when hit by crime – most readily are given the complete and legitimate status of being a victim’. This category includes individuals perceived as defenseless, innocent, vulnerable and worthy of compassion and sympathy (Greer, 2007). By extension, elderly women, young women and children are most likely to be subscribed this label (Greer, 2007). Moreover, Christie (1986a) views the ‘ideal victim’ similarly to the Red Riding Hood fairytale; a young, innocent woman out doing good deeds who is attacked by unknown stranger. This conforms to the stereotypes of the ‘legitimate victim’ of rape, in other words, argued from a positivist victimological perspective, some individuals are considered the ‘deserving’ victim; they acquire the label of victim readily and easily in the hierarchy of victimization. Whereby the woman must be capable of claiming her rightful status as a victim, yet being careful not to surpass the expectation of her vulnerability. On the other hand, if one obtains what one might refer to as the stereotypical societal views of rape, the ‘undeserving’ victims are often identified as men, ethnic minorities, homosexuals, may not require the label of victim altogether (Walklate, 2007). Furthermore, it is also of great importance to recognize the dynamic between the victim and the offender, hence; Christie’s (1986a) concept of an ‘ideal offender’. He continues, ‘ideal victims need – and create – ideal
offenders… the two are interdependent’. This is emphasized by his last characteristic; the ‘ideal offender’ is unambiguously big and bad (Christie, 1986a: 25) thus; the idealization of victims is a mediated process coupled with the demonization of offenders. Although interdependent, Christie (1986a) draws stark contrasts between the concept of an ‘ideal victim’ and a ‘ideal offender’; the ‘ideal victim’ is vulnerable, blameless, innocent, considered ‘good’ and on all levels undeserving of their victimization, whereas the ‘ideal offender’ possess all evil characteristics resulting in a situation of ‘them against us’ mentality. He defines the ‘ideal offender’ as: ‘a person, or rather, a non-person who creates anxiety’, before claiming, they are ‘morally speaking, black against the white victim’ (Christie, 1986a: 28). Moreover, he proposes a de-humanized picture; a real and distant offender coming from afar. The more foreign and less humane the better, he argues. This recognition of the imperative dynamic between the victim and offender is frequently ignored in the victimological domain, and as Christie certainty initiates; there cannot be a victim without an offender.

Moreover Carrabine et al. (2004) translate the cultural power of the ideal victim into a hierarchy of victimization, which reflects and reinforces the idealization of victims through mass media outlets and official discourses, with the ‘ideal victim’ at the top of the hierarchy and the non-deserving victims at the bottom (Greer, 2007)\(^\text{13}\). Furthermore, evident in news media biases and prejudices, there is a clear tendency to emphasize those victims considered being ‘one of us’, rather than those considered being the ‘other’ (Greer, 2007). Consequently, some individuals who are considered ‘deserving’ victims may attract extensive media attention and generate collective mourning on both a national and international scale. On the other hand, those deemed as ‘undeserving’ victims might never acquire the status of victim at all and may receive little, if any, media attention (Greer, 2007). Furthermore, victim demographic characteristics such as gender, age, and class, to name only a few, can in many cases contribute to the determination of the news media’s interest in the crime and its victims (Greer, 2007).

The notion of a victim is quite intricate. The word ‘victim’ is widely introduced as female, for instance in French, being la victime, signifies that the same passivity and defenselessness associated with the term ‘victim’ can also be applied when being female (Walklate, 2007;
Daly, 2013). As a consequence of this link, some prefer to utilize the term ‘survivor’ to emphasize their resistance to sexual victimization. Furthermore, there is a host of complex expectations aimed at individuals subjected to sexual violence in order to conform to the notion of a victim. Cultural expectations of women create a gendered paradox. For instance, women are expected to internalize and practice sexual autonomy, and demand sexual equality (Phillips, 2000:47). This is grounded as a product of the women’s movement, yet female victims are also being prescribed expectations of being sexually pure, nurturing and compassionate, which in turn harmonize with the traditional notions of femininity (Phillips, 2000:39). Similarly, men are expected to be capable of both embodying roles such as protector/provider capable of empathy and the deviant emotionally unavailable villain14. ‘Male victims radically counter the idealized and indeed feminized understandings of victims and victimhood’ (Houge, 2015:167) Consequently, it is not hard to imagine the challenges one might experience when attempting to unify these expectations, especially in plights of sexual, more specifically rape, victimization. Studies conducted on this field, particularly within the scope of grey area rape15, indicate that individuals who have been sexually victimized might refrain from identifying themselves and their sexual violation as victims altogether, this is due to the difficulties with labeling their experience and the legal definitions of rape and sexual assault (Stefansen and Smette, 2006). Furthermore, the implication grounded in the concept of a victim indicates and expects victims to display behavior and emotions consistent with helplessness and passivity, coupled with the expectation of reacting to their victimization (Lamb, 1999; Stefansen and Smette, 2006). Jacobsen and Skilbrei (2010) frame this female rape dynamic recognizable as ‘reproachable victims’. Whereby female victims typically have access to a legitimate victim status, yet this availability is still constructed within specific premises. Although the construction of female sexual victimhood connotes accessibility, it does not completely emancipate the victim of accountability. Consequently, it is, to some extent, expected that the victim acknowledges accountability for what happened to them and, for instance, report their victimization to the police or terminate the relationship with the perpetrator. Similarly, Lamb (1999) examines the narratives of a victim, the implications it entails and how the victims fulfill the societal expectations of being a victim. Arguing that the sphere of sexual violence, previously preserved for the political and feminism movement and viewed as a collective and moral

14 Cultural and societal expectations of men will be further examined in 2.3 ‘Masculinity and Victimhood’.
15 A term which refer to grey areas in which sex is situated someplace amidst consensual and non-consensual (Munro, 2001; Vislie, 2015)
societal issue, has converted into a societal view focused on mental health and individualism (Lamb, 1999). Which, Lamb (1999) argues, amplify and reproduce unfavorable portrayals of victims as dispositioned to mental health issues, which in turn is perceived as weakness and vulnerability. Furthermore, a report from the Norwegian Ministry of Children and Equality (2008-2009: 136, italics in original) state that: The role of the victim is a heavy load to carry. A victim is perceived as passive, helpless and pitiable and negative associations such as unfree, ruined, loser and unsafe are inherent in the word’. Additionally, it considers ideas of a victim as being feminine and unlikely to harmonize with the image of being a “real man”.

Moreover, the discipline of victimology has been criticized for failing in acknowledging men as victims of crime (Newburn and Stanko, 1994) and put forward the implication that men generally are not at high risk of being criminally victimized, yet statistically this is not the case as there is predominantly male victims in crimes such as robbery (Walklate, 2007). Consequently, questioning whether the influence of cultural narratives of masculinity contribute in concealing the extent of male victims. This on the grounds that narratives of masculinity and sexual victimization are in opposition (Ericsson, 2000). Nonetheless, solely within the area of interpersonal victimization, such as sex crimes and domestic violence, females are indeed more likely to be victimized (Walklate, 2007). Furthermore, there are many barriers to reporting rape and one of them is the victim’s perceived disbelief and disrespect communicated from police officers (Hohl and Stanko, 2015). Thereby, this might be viewed as a contributing factor which might lead victims of either gender to withdraw from the process altogether (Stanko, 1985).

2.2 Masculinities

‘Masculinity and femininity are inherently relational concepts, which have meaning in relation to each other, as social demarcation and cultural opposition’ (Connell 1995: 44)

The socially constructed notion of gender is considered to be a network of identities, behaviors, characteristics, and attributes that a given culture associates with either femininity or masculinity (Daly and Chesney-Lind, 2004; Walklate, 2007). Moreover, Judith Butler (1997: 411) argues: ‘gender reality is performative which means, quite simply, that it is real only to the extent that it is performed’. Consistent with Ervin Goffman’s dramaturgical
approach to social actions whereby one constantly produces and performs a host of divergent identities in order to conform to the given cultural norms, beliefs and values as the person interacts with others (Goffman, 1959).

The work put forward by second wave Feminism on gender awareness lead to the emergence of diverse forms of masculinities located within various cultures. In doing so, providing a springboard for theorists, such as Raewyn Connell and James Messerschmidt, to investigate the complex nature of male domination and the construction of the male role (Wedgewood, 2009). Connell’s theory of masculinity spurred from radical feminism and is considered one of the most influential academic contributions in the sphere of men and masculinity studies, additionally; it is viewed as a crucial development in gender theory (Messerschmidt, 2000).

Connell (1995) set forward the notion of *hegemonic masculinity*, as an expression of normative masculinity, which generally is defined as ‘the set of ideas, values, representations and practices associated with ‘being male’’ (Jefferson, 2001: 138), which is constructed both in relation to subordinate masculinities and to women. Connell (1995) argues that the way in which men express their masculinity is through the presumption of *normative heterosexuality*, which refers to the ‘ideal type’ of manliness as the white, heterosexual male. Moreover, hegemonic masculinity is the most idealized form of masculinity in contemporary western societies, where by ‘most men benefit from the subordination of women and the hegemonic masculinity is the cultural expression of this ascendancy’ (Connell, 1987: 185).

Consequently Messerschmidt (1993: 83) argues, ‘most men engage in practices that attempt to sustain hegemonic masculinity’.

Messerschmidt (1993: 93) further discusses the notion of hegemonic masculinity and expands the scope of masculinity theory by introducing the notion of ‘*opposition masculinity*’. Messerschmidt (1993) argues that juvenile boys and later adult men develop opposition masculinities, because of their shortcoming in successfully ‘doing masculinity’16, whereby the typically legitimate means are discarded in favor of illegitimate means, which more readily demonstrates their manliness. Therefore, one must, in the quest of understanding of what constitutes ‘male’ behavior, recognize the historical and structural conditions that constitutes the masculinities that structure male social action, thus; ‘crime by men is not simply an extension of the ‘male sex role’ or some male trait' (Messerschmidt, 1993: 85).

---

16 See West and Zimmerman (1987) reference on ‘doing gender’ in the following paragraph
Significantly, men are presumed to actively engage and react in situations where their sense of masculine identity is threatened or compromised, when aspiring to the normative masculinity. Messerschmidt (1993) argues that men, in any given social situation, are confronted with the assignment of accomplishing their masculinity, by establishing their manliness. Nonetheless, the construction of masculine identities is dynamically reproduced and reaffirmed within given social situations, consequently masculinity is a product which never will be stationary nor a finished product (Messerschmidt, 1993). Due to this ongoing construction of masculine identities, men also recreate social structures. Giddens (1976: 138) argues: ‘every act which contributes to the reproduction of a structure is also an act of production, a novel enterprise, and as such may initiate change by altering that structure at the same time as it reproduces it’.

West and Zimmerman (1987) coined the term ‘doing gender’ by conceptualizing gender as a ‘situated accomplishment’, whereby Connell (1995) and Messerschmidt (1993) further established a correlation to ‘doing masculinity’ and gender relations of power. In this framework ‘doing gender’ is a mechanism of performing gender identity by exhibiting themselves as masculine or feminine. i.e. ‘doing masculinity’. By conceptualizing their gender, men are engaged in a ‘self-regulating process’ whereby they constantly evaluate and supervise ‘their own and others gendered conduct’ (West and Zimmerman, 1987: 142). Subsequently, it is of importance to recognize that masculinity is performed and accomplished, but it is too a product which can be revoked.

Moreover, Messerschmidt further weighs in on the concept of hegemonic masculinity and the construction of masculinities by stating that ‘hegemonic masculinity emphasizes practices toward authority, control, competitive individualism, independence, aggressiveness, and the capability of violence’ (1993: 82). Consequently, all men strive to perform their gender often restricted to the dominant perception of masculinity which advocate the superiority of heterosexual males within given cultural scripts (Messerschmidt, 1993). Whereby ‘the only way others can judge their ‘essential nature’ as men is through their behavior and appearance’ (Messerschmidt, 1993: 84).

This interpretation of masculinity commands a great degree of power, comparatively to other forms of manhood, which is indeed downgraded and subordinated (Walklate, 2007). This well established societal expectation of what being a man entails is evident in a series of
social relations. By illustration, traditional perceptions of manliness such as men as the breadwinner or the criminalization of homosexuality, ground the concept of normative heterosexuality (Walklate, 2007, Messerschmidt, 2000). According to Connell (1995) these presumptions define the structure of manhood in which any man ought to aspire to, creating an internal conflict between the societal, cultural expectations and the autonomy of self-identity. Nonetheless, Nordic countries present a handful of diverse approaches towards masculinities as constructed and positioned against a hegemonic masculinity (Ervø and Johansson, 2003; Reuterstrand, 2004; Jon, 2014). Contemporary understandings of masculinity, suggest that men are to a greater extent involved in caretaking and the compassionate segments in life, such as child care within the family structure, which might signify a process in with the concepts of masculinities are softening (Jon, 2014: 33).

Jon (2014) states the concept of *cowboy masculinity*, in which men with limited legitimate recourses might resort to illegitimate resources as a means of achieving masculinity. As a reaction to Messerschmidt’s oppositional masculinity and Connell’s protest masculinity, which both integrate key components of hegemonic masculinity and has opposition or protesting against something as its focal points whereby delinquent boys establish subcultures of masculinity, Jon (2014) develops an approach which advocates the importance of cultural inspirations. Whereby men, and their perception of masculinity, are influenced and inspired by heroic figures produced in a host of divergent cultural wrappings. Much due to the immense societal impact of thriving mass media and social media outlets, not solely limited to their peer group and their construction of subcultures (Jon, 2014). Furthermore, the concept of cowboy masculinity is not merely limited to delinquent boys and criminal subcultures. It can Jon (2014: 22) argues, also be highly applicable for other groups of men such as police officers which express their masculinities through the characteristics of their occupation.

### 2.3 Masculinity and victimhood

#### 2.3.1 Recognizing male rape as a social phenomenon: Societal attitudes

‘Rape… attacks the very essence of what it is to be masculine and male’ (Ellis, 2002: 36)
Although the victimological sphere of sexual violence and domestic violence are often considered an issue reserved for women and children only, men are recognized and perceived as credible victims in other forms of criminal victimization. It is acknowledged that men are more at risk of being victims of street-related crime, notably in crimes such as robberies and assaults, often involving physical violence (Burcar, 2014; Jon, 2017). Furthermore, engaging in physical violence and verbal banter is considered a cultural approach men, particularly adolescent boys and young men, might apply in order to further others perceptions of their masculinity, thus achieving their masculinity and gaining respect of other men (Messerschmidt, 1993). Thereby crime can be a strategy for ‘doing masculinity’, and uphold their identity as ‘real men’; one cannot simply be tough and loose-lipped only to back down when it comes to breaking a cultural rule (Jon, 2014: 20-21). Therefore, when men engage in fights, by illustrating their willingness to socially manifest their manliness, they may be able to acquire status and self-respect within their respected milieus. Femininity is regularly associated with vulnerability and masculinity with strength and dangerousness, although ‘many men do not regularly act out aggression, they are seen by others as having the capability to do so (Hollander, 2001: 87). By extension, masculinity is fundamentally measured ‘in relationship to what is ‘unmanly’ (Lorentzen, 2011: 114). Consequently, it is not laborious to imagine that when men are victimized their perception of their own masculinity might fluctuate; the concept of masculinity too conditioned in such a manner that masculinity is a product which can be nullified (Messerschmidt, 1993; Jon, 2017; Connell, 1995).

Dunn (2012) claim males are internally conflicted when attempting to reconcile being a victim with the notion of being masculine, as though these conditions are incompatible. Likewise, Burcar (2014) questions this reconcilement, furthermore claiming that these characteristics are, in their nature, colliding. By extension, Walklate (2007) argues that men struggle with being labeled a victim due to it being highly contradictory to the demands of conforming to the notion of what is considered masculine. The complex construction of a victim constitutes a binary condition. Firstly, when being recognized, and by recognizing oneself, as a victim one is exempt of their victimization. Secondly, by assimilating the role of a victim one is habitually regarded as passive, deplorable and helpless (Jon, 2017). Naturally, conceptualizing oneself as a passive object is oppressive regardless of gender, yet men might experience the victimization, decidedly when raped, as a particularly harsh blow directed at their masculine identity which surely counteracts the cultural image of men often associated
with strength and control, furthermore, what being a ‘real man’ entails (Burcar, 2014).
Consequently, men might experience their victimization as a loss of their masculine identity (Jon, 2017; Burcar, 2014). Likewise, Burcar (2014) argues, men might be expected to *use* violence, not to become victims as this indicates (notions which correspond with) being feminine and contradict both the image of a ‘real man’ and the notion of an ideal victim.

In light of this, male victims are less likely to achieve legitimate victim status and successfully climb in the hierarchy of victimization. Men are from a criminological perspective routinely associated with violence, therefore when challenging these sets of ideas, it upsets our notions and seems to threaten the general discourse (Burcar, 2014; Holstein and Miller, 1990). Furthermore, the expectation of successfully fending for oneself and retaliating against their oppressor seems to be a habituated component of the cultural understanding of the masculine norm (Bäcklin et al. 2013). Subsequently, when contextualized within rape, ‘the masculine victim is a paradox, seen both from a hegemonic masculinity perspective and from an ideal victim perspective’ (Burcar, 2014: 114). By extension, Durfee (2011: 329) findings on the ‘victimized masculinity’ indicate that when men are subjected to the interpersonal crimes, they do not consider themselves within the traditional ideal victim discourse; ‘although the man claims that his (female) partner is an abuser, the man is not a powerless victim in need of protection’.

Even though male rape often goes unrecognized, there are specific settings in which men are, at least to some extent, acknowledged and legitimized. The occurrence of adult male rape victimization is often associated with male on male institutional sexual abuse in prisons and homosexuality. Consequently, this is one of the few avenues where discussions of male rape are highlighted. It is generally considered common knowledge that men, particularly young men, without ‘protection’ in the context of an older protective figure or a gang environment, have an increased likelihood of being sexually victimized (O’Sullivan, 2013). Consequently, male on male rape, regardless of the perpetrators sexuality, is perceived as more likely to occur in settings where individuals are deprived of their traditional heterosexual outlets, thereby grounding the interpretation of homosexual actives notorious for prisons (King, 1992). This mundane portrait of male rape generates the cultural understandings of this phenomena and consequently produces the ‘myth of prison rape’ (Fleisher and Krienert, 2009: 56-7).
As previously mentioned, sexual victimization is often associated and confined to feminine attributes, consequently, male rape victims fundamentally counteract the idealized and feminized understandings of victimhood (Houge, 2015). Notably, the risk of failing tests of manhood, and the associated shame that entails, is key to understanding the ‘man-making process’ (Goldstein 2001: 269). Subsequently, Houge (2015: 173) argues, that ‘male victims of sexual violence are subjected to a symbolic feminization process and/or possibly homosexualizing process’. Illuminated by traditional militant sets of beliefs and military conduct, which emphasizes physical and mental strength, the deeply embedded cultural context of femininity and homosexuality lends itself as a symbolic contradiction to what is considered as manliness, consequently, embodying what masculinity is not (Houge, 2015). This feminization is also recognizable within the construction of male on male prison rape, whereby male rape victims are oftentimes regarded as having been ‘converted to women’ or ‘made into homosexuals’ (Mariner, 2001: 90). This feminine status however, does not imply that men are women now, instead it produces new meanings of ‘queer’ styles. Being raped then, male victims as queer subjects, in this manner male rape victims are socially disowned rather than recovered by their feminization (Kaye, under publication). As a result, the raped man’s social and moral status is governed in such manner that he is now regarded as the laughing stock (Kaye, under publication).

Even though male on male rape within these specific institutional settings is to some extent recognized for its existence, the phenomenon of male rape and its various dynamics has historically been severely downplayed and labeled as implausible, perhaps even non-existent, especially by female offenders (Coxell and King, 1996). However, social researchers have acknowledged the demand for research activity examining the effects of male rape and the social attitudes of our society (Davies and Rogers, 2006). Scholarly responses have greatly contributed in the quest for conceptualizing the prevalence, nature, dynamics and impact of adult male rape. This work, in addition to those previously outlined, include male sexual victimization within the gay community (Kendall and Martino, 2006), in the general population (Coxell et al, 1999) and general construction of male sexual victimization (Allen, 2002; Mezey and King, 2000; Light and Monk-Turner, 2008). By extension, Elliot et al. (2004) conducted a comparative analysis of female and male rape. Attitudes towards rape suggest that men in general display more negative, stereotypical attitudes than women much due to the societal pressure of ‘living up to’ to traditional idea of masculinity (Davies and Rogers, 2006). Furthermore, it is transparent that notions of masculinity and male sexuality
are tangled in a habitual conditioned way. Normative masculinities in Western societies are indeed intertwined with notions of men as sexual beings where in which men readily seize and conquer any given opportunity for sex. Notably, traditional notions showcase men as consistently sexually aroused, whereby male sexuality is paraded as a self-centered and objectified entity which manifest the prevalent perception that men are hormonally and biologically governed (Jon, 2017). In light of this, it indeed might present itself challenging to perceive men as victims of rape in the cultural scripts of western societies.

Research on perceptions of male rape is relatively limited, comparatively to that of female rape, whereby the lack of research indicatates that attitudes of male rape victims surround issues corresponding to the perceived lack of masculinity. Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson (1992) suggest perceived lack of masculinity is due to the fact that men are often viewed as the dominant sex, thus being able to fend for themselves, in this regard they have failed to fight back against their rapist, thus failed in acting as ‘real men’. Moreover, contrasting parallels can be drawn between the lack of research awarded male rape attitudes and the ‘extensive academic literature that surround female rape myths’ (Davis, Gilston and Rogers, 2012: 2809). As a result of the research conducted by Davis et al. (2010) they argue that men are more likely to be judged more harshly, even blamed, due to not sufficiently fighting back against or escaping their rapist, comparatively to their female counterparts. By illustration, Rumney and Henley’s (2006) study found that the notion of resistance is integral in the process of deciding the culpability of the victim, whereby credibility is highly problematized and conditioned to whether the crime was lacking victim resistance or not. Nevertheless, Burt (1980: 217) argues our society generally holds ‘false beliefs about rape, rape victims and rapists’. Moreover, latent ideologies that assist in the development and maintenance of female rape attitudes acceptance have produced ongoing research over four decades (Davies, Gilston and Rogers, 2012). Yet the research activity on male rape attitudes were at the time of Burt’s research severely limited and biased in relation to heavy focus directed toward women, thus in the contemporary scope of criminological research, this is a subject of debate. Contemporary research examining attitudes towards male rape victimization found that being perceived as a legitimate and credible victim is often conditioned by the victims sexuality. By extension, homosexual male rape victims are consistently considered more blameworthy than heterosexual victims (Davies and Rogers, 2006; Wakelin and Long, 2003). Additionally, the conjunction of social attitudes and law enforcement might be a troublesome one (Rumney and Hanley, 2006). Law enforcement are
obliged by law to limit their own prejudices when on the job, however, a British survey of the UK Metropolitan Police officers examining their attitudes towards male rape victims found that officers expected men would successfully fight their attacker and subsequently be able to extricate themselves from the situation (Abdullah-Khan, 2008). Furthermore, Abdullah-Khan (2008: 171) study concluded that ‘it is difficult for officers to see how an adult male can let himself get into a situation where he can get raped and be unable to physically protect himself’. In light of this, one can draw parallels to the societal expectations of resistance in rape situations, clearly it does not acknowledge the multitude of ways in which rape victims respond to being raped.

It follows, perceptions of male rape victims established as stereotypical attitudes are extensive. These include general attitudes such as; men cannot be forced to have sex against their will (Gonsiorek, Bera and LeTourneau, 1994); men who rape other men must be gay (Hodge and Canter, 1998); women are incapable of sexual aggression (Sarrell and Masters, 1982); female offenders might leave men less traumatized than sexual assaults by males due to it being less of a risk for physical force (Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson, 1992); an erection or ejaculation implies consent on behalf of the victim (Gonsiorek, Bera and LeTourneau, 1994). The later evoked commentaries resulting in discrediting the perception, Kinsey et al (1948) study regarding young men’s sexual responses suggested that sexual responses are a physiological process of emotional responses such as anger or pain, thus implying that erection or ejaculation is not exclusively limited to lust, which generally represents the perception of male sexuality. By extension, Sarrell and Masters (1982) found that high levels of psychological arousal, such as fear, could involuntarily contribute to an erection. Furthermore, Coxell and King (1996) claim that society’s ignorance towards sex crimes perpetrated by females on males is damaging for equal distribution support for male victims, before stating that society is more accepting of male on male rape.

2.3.2 Adult male victims of sexual abuse studies

The research conducted on male victims of sex crimes is limited and in most cases discussed with the term sexual assault not rape. By extension, male victims of sexual abuse became an area of research in the early 80s’, nevertheless; most research is non-empirical or small-scale clinical studies (Coxell and King, 1996). Similarly, the majority of contemporary research
surrounding this topic is located within the domain of psychology and the victims’ psychological effects. Based on such, Hart et al (1998) found that male victims are more likely to encounter secondary victimization, which suggests that victims are additionally traumatized in environments normally perceived to be legitimate environments to seek refuge and help, such as the police force, rape crisis centers or even the individuals’ community because the victim has to relive their victimization. Furthermore, although these institutions are put in place as a means of ensuring the protection of the public and providing aid, they found that these institutions often cave to the deeply embedded preexisting stereotypes of male victims of sex crimes, thus contributing to sustaining the negative perceptions surrounding these victims (Hart et al, 1998).

By extension, studies conducted on perceptions of their own criminal victimizations, yet not limited to sexual victimization, Burcar (2014) found that men talk about their victimization as though they systematically neglect and renounce the traditional characteristics of a victim by portraying themselves as in control of the situation in order to avoid portraying themselves as weak. Similarly, Durfee (2011: 331) study on men who were sexually victimized by a female partner, found that

‘… through this ‘new official discourse’ men are reconstructing victimization, claiming victimization in a way that is consistent with hegemonic masculinity, which emphasizes strength, power and control’.

Consequently, in the process of reproducing perceived masculine ideals, the participants likewise empower the implications of the victim. Notably, the general image of the passive victim is modified in men’s narratives whereby the passive victim is discarded while the accomplished victim arise (Burcar, 2014; Durfee, 2011).

The theoretical concepts and notions that have been presented in this chapter will be useful in the attempt to understand the different dimensions that impact how men and women understand male rape. Consequently, this theoretical framework of victimhood constructions, masculinity discourses and the ways in which these intersect has both informed the whole research project and will feature in the analysis chapters. But firstly, the next chapter will describe the methodologies applied to investigate this further.
3 Methodology

Considering that the aim of this study is to explore how the perceived dynamic of male rape interacts with notions of victimhood and masculinity norms, I found a qualitative approach to be most applicable, namely semi-structured interviews. The sample, harvested through purposive sampling and flyers, consists of young resourceful adults; six females and two males between the ages of 20-28. One pilot interview was conducted beforehand. The analytical and practical approach when processing the data material, through HyperResearch, consisted of 53 codes and a discursive approach. It is of importance to recognize that my comprehension of the phenomena in question constitutes the contour and direction of this study and thus serves as a point of reference. As well as, the choices made with regards to determining the methodological approach and the ways in which the data material was gathered, processed and analyzed.

3.1 Reasoning the choice and beneficial qualities of qualitative interviews

Applying a qualitative approach enabled me to gain productive insight into a social phenomena, namely perceptions of male rape dynamics and how these interact with notions of masculinity and victimhood, based on how my participants themselves understood these phenomena. I am mindful that these phenomena might be considered a sensitive and highly complex subject of study, and consequently, have resilient taboos attached to them. According to Thagaard (2002), qualitative research methods are the most valuable approach when aspiring to gain insight into personal and sensitive subjects. Although my aim in this project will not be directed at obtaining insight into personal experiences of sexual or rape victimization, it clearly is a subject which for many are greatly uncomfortable and unwilling to talk about. As with all subjects considered taboo or of a sensitive nature, most individuals prefer to refrain to publically/officially speak about their attitudes with regards to societal issues, as one might be frightened of the reactions of others (Gullestad, 1996). Customarily, the Norwegian society is noticeably concerned with behaving in a diplomatic manner. Individuals refrain from speaking out of turn and offending someone or sensitive issues where ‘stepping out of bounds’ or have a drastically different opinion might be culturally
frowned upon (Gullestad, 1996). Nevertheless, the flexibility of qualitative methods lends itself well by facilitating original responses in a free-flowing stream of information and the opportunity to further identify in-depth experiences or attitudes when in inquiry of knowledge(production) (Thagaard, 2002; Bryman, 2012). Considering this, I found the inductive methodology of in-depth semi-structured interviews as the most appropriate method when harvesting perceptions of male rape dynamics and its meeting with normative masculinity and idealized victimhood. Moreover, in-depth interview offers a unique means of understanding the complexities of human thoughts and perceptions because the method is not limited by predetermined factors, which is a feature of deductive studies. Rather, this method allows for the generating of large amounts of valuable data accessed from a free-flowing communication process (Bryman, 2012). When conducting social research in which the aim is to illuminate social perceptions and attitudes towards a sensitive, somewhat ambiguous societal issue, it is necessary to provide some guidelines. Both as an aiding tool for the researcher, by securing relevant data, and for the participants by allowing a certain degree of predictability and a point of reference to further elaborate. Additionally, it can be beneficial in stimulating thought processes. In their nature, semi-structured interviews provide structure to the conversation with the participants. Comparatively to an open interview, whereby one risks that the participant preempts too much of the direction and context of the interview, consequently the analytical position of the researcher is compromised. Furthermore, semi-structured interviews allow for a two-way communication and follow up questions, which results in more rich and detailed data when one can clarify the respondents’ responses. In-depth interviews provide access to sensitive information regarding perceptions of sexual victimization and are helpful to those who are likely to be hesitant in discussing such a sensitive topic, because the interviewer can react sympathetically to any signs of distress and change the direction of the discussion accordingly. Additionally, this methodology is often viewed as a favorable means in setting the scene for a participant to be more comfortable discussing sensitive and personal topics, as opposed to, for instance, the more exposed setting of focus groups (Bryman, 2012). Considering this, the aim for this project is to explore perceptions and attitudes, the interviewing process focal point is directed toward the participants’ comprehension of the phenomena in question. Whereby the intention is to gain new knowledge on a rather unexplored subject, thus attempting to provide a humble contribution to the comprehension of male rape dynamics. Furthermore, my desire was to select an interview method which allowed the participants to freely express their opinion and comprehension.
3.2 Principles for sampling and the practical approach when recruiting

Having decided on exploring how presumed dynamics of male rape interact with notions of victimhood and masculinity norms and the methodological approach I wanted to utilize, the process of recruiting and collecting a sample for my research followed. Thagaard, (2002) suggest that recruiting individuals willing to participate in a study which explores sexual victimization might present itself challenging and time-consuming. Particularly when the phenomena in question require the potential participants to reflect upon their own attitudes and thoughts, which are quite complex and sensitive in their nature. I was concerned with not being able to obtain interest in my project from the outset, specifically from men. Which required that I, as a researcher, had to prepare for alternative avenues, such as modifying my expectations and preconditioned elements I wished to recruit such as age range, gender distribution, education level etc. Additionally, I was concerned with not being able to obtain enough participants and, consequently, the qualitative data to suitably explore these phenomena within my modest project. Fortunately, I obtained rather satisfying interest, more than I initially thought. Yet, as the nature of the project eclipses perceptions and attitudes, as opposed to personal experiences to draw from, my concern was whether they would provide sufficient data due to the difficulties of grasping these phenomena. Nevertheless, their responses would be valuable.

I decided early on that I had to condition my requirements for participants in the project in such a way that it could be applicable for as many as possible, expecting that I would receive limited interest. Considering that the aim for this project is to gain insight into societal and cultural perceptions, however mindful that it will not provide representative insight, I was able to broaden the requirements for participating. Firstly, I decided on an age range of 18 to 35. Whereby it meant that the potential participants to be young resourceful adults, which in turn allowed for them to more readily relate to the continuous modifications in society and express themselves through the lens of contemporary attitudes of male rape dynamics. Taking into consideration that the attitudes towards, coupled with the legal legislations, of rape and the construction of sexual victimhood are currently undertaking a rather extensive revision and are up for heated societal debate. Consequently, I assumed the younger generation would, to a greater extent, be educated and engaged in these phenomena. Secondly, the
potential participants preferably had, or are currently undertaking, higher education. Therefore, I predicted that I would be more successful by recruiting from a cluster of current, or recently graduated, students at the University of Oslo. Thirdly, participants had to master the Norwegian language, and preferably had lived in Norway over a long period of time, as the aim is to explore perceptions within a Norwegian context. Finally, I aspired to achieve an equal, or close to equal, gender distribution in my sample. Although this proved itself challenging, as most respondents were female.

I mainly recruited a volunteer sample of participants through the usage of flyers, nevertheless I obtained three participants through snowball sampling. Moreover, I considered flyers a more anonymous form of recruitment, decreasing the risk of harm because it is more private, as opposed to other forms of sampling. The flyers, which stated the details of the project, were distributed at different University of Oslo campus and buildings; including a stack left in various student hot spots such as SiO Athletica Blindern, additionally, hung at both male and female toilets in the different buildings at Blindern. Due to time constraint and the topic’s sensitivity, this form of sampling seemed like the most efficient approach and secure method. The participants contacted me via email, where they received a more detailed overview of the project, interview topics and could obtain further information before agreeing to take part in the project. Those recruited by snowball sampling contacted me via mail, and stated that they had heard of the project and were interested in participating. They too were emailed with the detailed overview of the project.

Through purposive sampling (Bryman, 2012), which is frequently used for obtaining data in qualitative research, I managed to recruit twelve potential participants, however, three withdrew before I conducted the interviews for reasons I do not know. I received initial emails from all three, yet they did not respond further. I additionally conducted one Skype interview, due to the participant’s restraint in mobility at the time scheduled. Nonetheless, the quality of this interview was not optimal due to the poor quality of the technological service, and in terms of audio recording, therefore this participants interview is not included in this sample. Moreover, this methodology is both highly suitable and challenging for researching perceptions of sexuality and sexual victimization (Wiederman and Whitley, 2012).
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By extension, purposive sampling is often used when small samples are studied using intense, focused methods such as in-depth interviews (Curtis et al. 2000). Consequently, this modest sample consists of six females and two males, all of which were young adults between the ages of 20-28, Norwegian and are, either currently undertaking higher education, or have recently graduated.

### 3.2.1 Reflections of the sample

The participants in this project has been recruited based on availability and relevance. Which in effect signify that the sample is selective and does not strive to be representative to the general perceptions and attitudes of the Norwegian population, as a result it might imply a lack of balance, likewise with regards to the unequal gender distribution in the sample (Bryman, 2012; Thagaard, 2002). As previously mentioned the majority of the sample consists of females, therefore it naturally would favor a female perception of the phenomena, additionally, reflect and illuminate the female diversity within my sample. The reserved male sample grounds the limitations with producing an authentic portrayal of male perceptions of these phenomena within my sample. By extension, it presents itself terribly intricate to offer a solid male perspective, additionally, it signifies that adequately contrasting the gendered perspectives within the sample would be unfeasible. Although the methodological approach of this project inhibits the prospect of embodying a representatively clear-cut portrait of perceptions of male rape victimization conceptualized within the notions of masculinity, it is not the intention of the project. Consequently, its focal point will remain on exploring and identifying the various attitudes towards these phenomena, rather than being able to imply how representative or ordinary the findings are viewed through a macro perspective of the Norwegian society.

### 3.3 Planning the interviews

#### 3.3.1 Preparations and interview guide

In light of my ambition to conduct qualitative interviews, which offer a unique manner of understanding the complexities of human thoughts and perceptions, and considering that the aim is to explore how presumed male rape dynamics interact with notions of victimhood and
masculinity norms I initiated the planning of semi-structured interviews. I firstly established main themes based on theoretical perspectives and academic contributions to the field of victimology, the context of rape, constructions of victimhood, masculinities and other relevant topics in relation to the main themes outlined in Chapter 2 Theoretical framework. From the outset and throughout, I strived to explore the gendered relationship within the position of a rape victim, and to a lesser extent, the position of the offender. The focal point being problematizing the traditional gendered roles in rape, the female victim and male offender, and exploring the paradoxical perceptions of a male victim raped by a female offender. Therefore, I conditioned the interview questions, by constructing an interview guide, in such a manner that the participants naturally contrasted and reflected on this gendered aspect. For instance, by asking ‘when you visualize a victim of rape is it a man or a woman?’, further following up with ‘how would you describe her/him?’, before posing the same question but the reversed gender.

It follows; as previously mentioned I distinguished four main themes in the interview guide. Firstly, I sought to ease the participants into the interview and the construction of victimhood, followed by their comprehension of rape by posing general and relatively open ended questions in order to establish a general understanding of how these phenomena are conceptualized according to the participant. Additionally, it governed the interview process by allowing the participant to freely express their initial thoughts of the subject, before the questions became further specified. This method was consistent throughout when introducing new themes. This section included questions such as; ‘How would you define rape?’ and ‘When you imagine the ‘ideal victim’ (of any crime), which characteristics do you think the person holds?’. Secondly, I sought to explore the participants’ perceptions of masculinity. Again opening this section with an open ended question; ‘What do you associate with masculinity?’, before directing it specifically to male victims of rape and how the notion of masculinity interacts to the male victim position. Furthermore, I constructed a scenario of a rape victims initial encounter with law enforcement, also in a gendered perspective. Thirdly, I sought to explore the participants thought surrounding male victims of female offenders, before finally seeking to explore the thoughts on ‘common’ attitudes about rape victims and offenders, extracted from empirical studies on the subject. This section included questions such as ‘men are less affected by sexual assaults than females’, ‘men cannot be forced to

---
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It was important that the participants felt as secure and comfortable as possible, both with me as a stranger and my role as a researcher, as well as the physical interview setting. This, I reasoned, is essential to harvest adequate data and extract the divergent perceptions within this sample (Thagaard, 2002). Due to the complex nature of masculinity and gendered rape victimization, it was necessary to allow for the participants to freely narrate their perceptions of these phenomena, without feeling prejudice or judgement. Subsequently, I attempted to organize the interview settings in such a way that the participants would be able to speak undisturbed. Therefore, the interviews were conducted in a semi-secluded library room. These rooms are often not as inviting, they are rather sterile and standardized, therefore I tried to make sure to organize the room in such a way that it would be inviting and create a comfortable atmosphere for a conversation by setting the table with ordinary commodities such as cookies, water and coffee. Additionally, I attempted to be mindful of my body language and facial mimic by, for instance, not crossing my arms, be engaged and compassionate, and sit positioned on the same side of the table slightly off to the side of the participants, as opposed to across from.

It follows, I conducted one pilot interview prior which enabled me to identify which questions that would most likely be appropriate and relevant, and those who for different reasons was unfitting. Additionally, it enabled me to test the structure and the logical sequence of the interview guide, the themes and formulation. One might argue that the phenomena at the core of this thesis is, to many, broad, abstract and oftentimes surrounded by taboo. As a result, these phenomena might be challenging to grasp in its entirety, as it is oftentimes not something that one reflects upon in daily life. Therefore, it was important to consider the complexities when navigating the interview process and the preliminary
interview questions in such a manner that it is easily understood and, to the best of abilities, precise. Yet, at the same time, allowing for the flexibilities of their narratives. Through the pilot interview I could adjust and readjust the questions to these qualifications. The pilot interview also indicated approximately how long the interviews could be. The pilot interview mounted to fifty minutes. Therefore, I found that one hour would be fitting as an estimate, taking into account that it is important to establish a good relationship with the participant and allow for the participants to reflect upon these rather complex phenomena at their own pace.

Six interviews were conducted in the space of three weeks, additionally three were conducted two months later. Due to various factors such as, yet not limited to, the accessibility of the participants. As mentioned previously, I conducted one Skype interview, on the request of the participant. I attempted on several occasions to schedule an interview, yet there were challenges with the participant’s flexibility at the time of the interviews. Therefore, I accepted the request to conduct the interview through Skype, which Iacono, Symonds and Brown (2016) argues could be a globally time efficient and financially affordable manner of conducting qualitative interviews. However, the audio recording was unfortunately insufficient, subsequently, I withdrew this particular interview from the sample. Nonetheless, when conducting the interviews, I began by instigating a causal conversation about various subjects, whereby we make ourselves comfortable in our seats and offered water/coffee/cookies etc. I proceeded by presenting myself, the project and handed out the information sheet and the consent form, although they had been emailed this information prior to the interview. We looked at the consent form and information sheet together, whereby the participant could ask questions. They were all reminded that the interviews will be anonymized, were confidential, stored in an ethically appropriate manner on a password locked computer and will be destroyed as the project concluded. I informed that I would be using an audio recorder to transcribe the interviews at a later point and that I might take notes throughout the interview. Furthermore, I emphasized that they could at any point during the interview withdraw their contribution and consent, and that they could notify me if they needed a break, although none did. Once the participants signed the consent form, the interview commenced.

It follows, I attempted to the best of my ability, to maintain an overarching control of the interview process, but careful not to undermine their thought process and individual approach
to these phenomena. Which was challenging at times, the overlapping and abstract nature of
these phenomena often resulted in somewhat disorganized reflections where the participants
regularly shifted from one narrative to the other, additionally, from one theme to another, and
occasionally spoke with great ambivalence. Which might signify that, within my sample, the
participants found it challenging to form a precise assessment of these phenomena.
Subsequently, I attempted to flow with their thought process when appropriate and steer them
in on the theme in question when necessary. By extension, I found that it was oftentimes
necessary to clarify their perception by posing additional questions such as ‘would you care
to elaborate?’, ‘when you say x, what do you mean by that?’, ‘Am I understanding you
correctly when I say that you interpret x as x?’. Therefore, some preliminary questions were
set aside as new themes emerged, although the interviews typically remained quite consistent
with the overarching themes of interview guide. As the interviews concluded we typically
reflected on the interview and how they experienced it, some were keener than others. By
extension, all the participants were at the end of their interview asked if they wanted a list of
informal support organizations they could contact in case the conversation had invoked
unsettling feelings of past experiences. Although none of the participants expressed prior to
the interview that they had experiences with sexual abuse, it is an ethical and moral
obligation as a researcher to provide them with the option of reaching out to support
organizations if they felt it was beneficial post interview. I reasoned that due to the sensitive
and greatly personal nature of rape victimization that it is not a given that they would have
informed me if they had experiences with sexual abuse, therefore, one could never be too
careful. Regardless, all participants respectfully rejected the inquiry.

3.4.1 Reflections of the interview process and the participants’ motivation to participate

By inviting the participants to explore their own attitudes toward these phenomena it
seemingly created reflections of the ways in which they conceptualized their individual
interpretations of rape, masculinity and victimization. Oftentimes they narrated their
perceptions through examples and experiences from their own lives, but also the mediatized
understandings, which resulted in that they throughout the conversation were made aware of
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unexplored aspects of their understandings. For instance, several participants stated during, or afterwards, that they were not aware that they ‘thought of it like that’. Consequently, one might suspect that the produced knowledge not only is valuable for this thesis, but also provided some insight of oneself. A few participants stated their motivation for participating, mostly spontaneously either during or after the interview, such as being curious and engaged by societal conceptualizations of these phenomena. In short, the participants typically gave the impression that they found these phenomena intriguing and of great importance to research due to its complexities, although they frequently emphasized that they ‘didn’t know much about it’. Furthermore, I got the impression that they found it meaningful to contribute in producing new knowledge on these rather unexplored phenomena and took on this task with great seriousness. Also, it is important to mention the quality of the data, as with qualitative approaches it might be challenging to assess the authenticity and trustworthiness of the participants (Bryman, 2012). Yet, one might argue that the intention of this study is not to generalize or evaluate statistical implications, rather it is focused toward contextual uniqueness of this samples’ perceptions, thereby grounding its transferability.

3.5 Processing the data material

I made a conscious decision to utilize audio recordings and transcribing all my interviews as it aids in correcting the natural limitations of our memories. Additional advantages of recording and transcribing one’s interviews are that it allows for more thorough examination, and permits repeated examinations of the participants’ answers and it opens the data to public scrutiny by other researchers. Thereby, others can evaluate the analysis that is carried out by the original researcher of the data; this helps to counteract accusations that my analysis might have been heavily influenced by my personal values and biases (Bryman, 2012). The practical approach required for this project is verbatim transcription. This approach assists me in preserving the actual words spoken, as well as any additional verbal material captured on the recording such as the participants use of pauses, intonation, rhythm and hesitation, including mine as the interviewer. However, I do not include back channel utterances i.e. my words: ‘yeah’, ‘right’ or utterances such as ‘mhm’ whilst the participant is speaking. This function only serves as a method of encouragement and reassurance for the participant.
Once the interviews were transcribed, I initially categorized the participants’ responses based on the preliminary, which became rather repetitive in all the interviews, questions from the interview guide in word documents. This to gain a rough overview of the responses on the various themes (related to questions), such as ‘how do you understand masculinity?’ or ‘when imaging a rape victim, how would you describe her/him?’. From there, I proceeded to utilize a computer-assisted form of qualitative data analysis, namely, HyperResearch (Bachmann and Schutt, 2007), predicting that this approach would speed-up the systematization process of the data and provide a structured overview of the divergent codes scattered in various documents. By utilizing HyperResearch I was able construct codes as I worked through the data and assign codes to already developed text segments. Furthermore, it allowed for an inductive approach to the data by altering the codes and applying numerous codes to the same sentence or word (Bachmann and Schutt, 2007). The data was assigned a total of 45 codes, further revised to 53 codes. When coding the data in such a manner, it allowed for a transparent and systematic approach when harvesting quotes for the analysis and the forthcoming themes. By extension, the coded material consisted of several themes, although it generally maintained its frame within the overarching themes such as; the construction of gendered victimhood, gendered sexual perpetrator, masculine norms and societal perceptions and attitudes towards rape victims. It follows, when I had finished the coding process in HyperResearch to my satisfaction, the codes were printed and collected in a paperback ‘code book’ consisting of 172 pages. Before it was further color coded into everything associated with masculinity and a male victim as green, the general discourse of rape victimization as orange, the participants’ individual interviews as pink and other variables such as alcohol, age, media representations and law enforcement as yellow. I decided to include the full transcripts of the individual interviews, due to the fact that it was not a feature available in HyperResearch, at least not one I was able to locate, therefore when navigating the responses for the analysis, it was important that it was assigned to the correct participant.

Furthermore, my analytical approach was primarily discursive analysis with a bit of informal expansion of the reasons they gave for their views, in order to identify and summarize the themes and thoughts that emerged from my conversation with my participants (Bauer and Gaskell, 2000). Moreover, in order to explore the nuances further, I utilized content analysis where relevant, essentially as a rough commentary on which themes were more frequent or less frequently mentioned. Additionally, I used rhetorical analysis where relevant to comment on the logic of my participants’ views and the way in which they express their arguments,
such as implying words (Bauer and Gaskell, 2000). By extension, I utilized this to in order to understand the rationales that they held.

3.6 Ethical considerations

In addition to the various ethical considerations outlined throughout this chapter, there are some more overarching principles that is important to highlight.

3.6.1 Reflections of the role as a social researcher

Before conducting the interviews, I was unsure and a bit anxious for the interview process in general, despite a great deal of preparations beforehand. Would the participants feel that these phenomena were too abstract therefore rendering the data without profitable substance? Would I be able to help them navigate their thoughts, if needed, yet restrict that my own comprehension of these phenomena was transferred to them? I felt that I was rather well prepared in terms of the existing literature and the necessary arrangements such as a structure for the themes I wanted to explore in the interviews. Nonetheless, I had only interviewed in one project previously – my undergraduate dissertation, so I tried to draw from those experiences. Would the participants tell me what they thought I wanted to hear? Conform to the accepted way of speaking about sexual victimization? This time around I was more mindful of how to interact with my participants, and was more aware of what my role as a researcher truly entails. I attempted to monitor my interaction, such as body language, facial mimic and verbal expressions, in such a manner that the participants felt compassion, respect and attentiveness when sharing their thoughts. Typically, the participants found it difficult to express and formulate their perceptions, in the attempt, I sensed, to maintain a rather respectful and diplomatic viewpoint of these phenomena. Furthermore, concerned with how their thoughts would reflect in terms of saying something they thought would be stigmatic or inappropriate due to the sensitive and complex nature of rape victimization. The fact that the participants typically added utterings such as ‘but I don’t know, it might also be this’, ‘but obviously, I know that it is not necessarily true’, ‘that was a bit stigmatizing of me to say, what I mean by that was…’, might serve well as an illustration of the challenges of navigating rationales on this field. Subsequently, I stated before the interview that there are not any wrong or right answers, emphasizing that I was interested in their thoughts on the subjects.
Also, encouraging during the interviews when needed. As a social researcher I am also obliged, to the best of my ability, to respect the values and motives of others both during the interview and when processing the data\textsuperscript{23}. Nonetheless, it is challenging to entirely exclude researcher bias. They ways in which I, as a researcher, understand these phenomena naturally permeate the course of the interviews, the statements and themes I found interesting, the formulation of the interview questions, the participant information sheet and the flyer. However, I attempted, to the best of my ability, to limit researcher bias and prejudices. Yet, how I present the project would to some extent influence the participants and serve as an indication of what I was looking for, both consciously and unconsciously, thus prompting the participants to make up an opinion on what they think I want them to say. A good relation to the participants was therefore key, I reasoned that if I could establish a good relationship and trust with the participants they might be more willing to express their natural thoughts in, perhaps, a more unfiltered manner. I felt that I generally accomplished this as the conversations progressed, although there are, naturally, a cluster of other aspects that might determine the ways in which people reflect and form opinions. As a result, it has challenged my role due to, yet not limited to, the complexities of repeatedly constructing and inspiring the participants to partake in complex and ambivalent reflections on these phenomena.

3.6.2 Confidentiality and anonymity

The participants were recruited in such a manner as to aspire to create a high degree of confidentiality. This decision was based on conditioning the interviews in such a manner that the participants were provided with an arena where in which they could freely express their thoughts, therefore, it might allow for the participants to reflect on aspects of their own attitudes that might be regarded as ‘taboo’ or out of the norm. Steps were taken to ensure the participants anonymity and confidentially when processing the personal data of each participants. All the personal data that emerged from the interviews, were further anonymized in the processed data material, this includes the extraction of true names, work/school, living areas, essentially anything that would be directly or indirectly identifying\textsuperscript{24}. To identify the different participants, I created pseudonyms; Ida, Nora, Anniken, Fredrik. Silje, Tiril,


Kristine and Lars. The project is approved by the Norwegian Centre for Research Data\textsuperscript{25}, although the due date for this thesis was pushed back six months, I have received confirmation of them registering that the project has been extended.

It follows, the audio recording was only listened to and transcribed by myself, thereby making me the only one with access to the raw data material\textsuperscript{26}. The Dictaphone I utilized for the interviews were held at my desk in a card access study hall at most times, when not transported for another interview. Once transcribed the data material was analyzed with my supervisor, for at which point they were already made anonym. Furthermore, the audio recordings, along with the email correspondence during the recruitment process, was deleted once the project commenced.

\textsuperscript{25} See appendix A NSD approval
4 Constructions of victimhood

As indicated by the aim of this thesis, one of my main interests to explore further was how the understandings of male victimhood norms is constructed, while utilizing specifically rape victimization as a reference point. Before analyzing how male victims of rape are perceived within my modest sample, I found it logical to question how a general victim of any crime is perceived as a main point of reference. This enabled me to compare the divergent dimensions of criminal victimization, before proceeding to the specifics of gender and the crime considered in this study; presumed male rape dynamics in relation to notions of victimhood. As demonstrated in Chapter 3 Methodology, the interviews were conditioned in such a manner to explore and, hopefully instigate, gendered reflections of the constructions of victimhood, yet most drew these conclusions beforehand. Additionally, it will draw upon the concepts and approaches introduced in Chapter 2 Theoretical Framework.

4.1 “Anyone can be a victim... well on second thought…”

Logically then, Christie’s (1986a) highly influential notion of an ideal victim, was the most sensible a venue to pursue and regard as the fundamental anchor when examining the constructions of rape victimhood. I questioned whether the participants could imagine an ideal victim of any crime, if there was such a notion within their perception of criminal victimization, before asking them to reflect upon whether they associated any noticeable characteristics they assumed the person holds, such as values, physical appearance, personality and so forth. This in order to establish how the participants reflected upon criminal victimization and the preliminary narratives of victimhood within the sample. It became quite evident rather quickly that the participants often reflected upon these notions with conflicting norms and multiple narratives, regularly discussed with ambivalence, although this was not unconditionally consistent with all participants’ narratives. The participants typically declared from the outset that ‘anyone can be a victim’. Well illustrated by;

Kristine: ‘I do not think there is any specific characteristics, because anyone can be a victim’
Silje: ‘Anyone can become a victim, regardless of gender or looks’

On all accounts when the participants discussed the construction of victimhood, the aspect of gender emerged promptly. Silje and Kristine both shed light on the manners of speaking of victimhood in our society that are considered “appropriate”, the keenness to give of the impression that one readily recognizes any person as being potentially victimized, thus essentially achieving a legitimate victim status, is transparent. This socially acceptable narrative of victimhood is recognizable in the official societal debate of criminal victimization, and can be considered the appropriate method of approach. This approach complies with the modern ways of official victimization discourses, the notion that we are all the same, equal, whereby no one is valued higher than others (Gullestad, 1996). Why is that we are conditioned to speak of sensitive issues with diplomacy? One might argue that the principle of equality is a core value in the Norwegian society. Civil and criminal laws, as well as human rights principles, are grounded in the concepts that everyone have the right to be treated with integrity, be heard and considered honorable until proven otherwise. Certainly, the participants were eager both to present themselves as decent moral beings, but also, attempt to emancipate the positions of victimhood from traditional views. When taking a closer look at Siljes´ statement, she firstly discards all distinctive features of an ideal victim by claiming that ‘anyone can be a victim’. Yet, she proceeds be saying ‘regardless of gender or looks’, indicating that there is a correlation, at least traditionally, between looks and gender in the plight of victimization, ultimately granting the victim features and presuming that the gender the victim identifies with and the ways in which the victim visually present themselves does indeed influence the perception of what is deemed an ideal victim. It follows, Kristine is not completely opposing the idea that a victim has characteristics, it might be interpreted as if she does not think one can assign a distinctive feature to the victim. Rather, it is determined by external elements and is not predetermined, not generalized. Ida elaborated further and expressed that

‘It is the perpetrator that decides the characteristics of its victim... (dependent on) what the perpetrator is looking for’

Clearly introducing the thought that there is an underlying relationship between the perpetrator and the victim, often detectable within the sphere of sexual and rape
victimization. Interestingly, Ida puts forward the thought that the person being victimized is acquitted of being to some extent culpable of their victimization. Rather it is not because the victim embodies certain features associated with victims of sexual offences, such as vulnerability and defenselessness (Daly, 2013; Walklate, 2007), one falls victim of the criminal act; it depends upon the perpetrator and his or her preferences. In light of Ida’s narrative, one can recognize the crucial dynamic of them versus us attitude in the construction of victimhood, both Greer (2007) and Christie (1986a) highlights. In Ida’s narrative, the victim is relieved of accountability as a consequence of ingrained values of innocence and trustworthiness, whereas the perpetrator displays a sense of hunting for its pray, whereby the crime is premeditated, further, indicating that the crime was executed by what one might identify as a suitable enemy (Christie 1986b).

It follows, even though the participants were keen to emphasize that anyone could be subjected to criminal victimization and therefore rejecting the notion of a culturally idealized victim, they typically elaborated further than these rather customary expressions as the conversation progressed. As though they negotiated the conditions. Interestingly, one could observe that the participants either spoke of a victim as being or as having distinctive characteristics. Frequently the same participant started the conversation by stating that anyone could be a victim, yet at a later stage in the conversation they listed distinctive identifications. By illustration, Nora, who from the outset considered an ideal victim within a rape narrative, stated that she did not have any specific thoughts of what constitutes an ideal victim, yet as the conversation progressed she stated that

‘Actually, when reading news articles online about rape it is often that it is rape in relation to partying... or being attacked on the streets, also without alcohol... for instance on your way home at night’

One can easily draw similarities with the notion of Christie’s (1986a) ideal victim; illuminating the comparison to the Red Riding Hood fairytale. Further illustrated by Tiril ‘I envision either a young woman at a party, or an eighty-year-old woman attacked by a stranger on her way home with the bus’. Although one can assume that Tiril assimilates the ideal victim with a rape victim. Furthermore, Nora and Tiril, similar to the concept of
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27 Culpability often recognized rape victimization, will be further discussed in 4.2.1 Accountability
Christie (1986a), recognizes the divergent components that frame a legitimate victim. It is necessary to acknowledge that it is not solely the personifications of the victim, the situational circumstance or the relational dynamic that individually constitutes a culturally idealized victim; these aspects are often intertwined and integral in the comprehension of victimhood. It quickly became evident that the participants typically conditioned age of the victim and whether alcohol or drugs were involved as a focal point for their perception and what constitutes a legitimate victim (Walklate, 2011). Additionally, the concept of an ideal victim and the construction of victimhood was often discussed in a mediatized sphere, whereby the participants often relied on what they had read through mass media outlets as their point of reference (Greer, 2007; Carrabine et al. 2004). Nevertheless, some stressed that the construction of an ideal victim, particularly a rape victim, was often and intensely discussed in their peer groups, by sharing both personal experiences and hearsay stories, often with greatly conflicting point of views. Indicating that the phenomena of rape and victimhood is a heatedly debated societal issue both in the political and judicial field, but also, within young adult peer groups.

It follows, the participants’ inclination to shift between several narratives and display ambivalent means of reflecting upon what they viewed as an idealized victim might be viewed as evidence of the participants desire to create a distance between their personal opinions and societal stereotypy. Could this inclination to separate oneself from societal stereotypy be a consequence of the long-established prejudices surrounding these phenomena, as a part of an opposition? Could one be perceived by mainstream society as both virtuous yet embracing prejudiced assumptions of gendered rape? On the one hand, the pressure to conform to appropriate manners of speaking of sensitive issues by constantly producing and reproducing moral and social identity discourses, by performing the social identity they deem appropriate for the situation (Gullestad, 1996; Goffman, 1959). On the other hand, it is transparent that the participants yearn to dissociate themselves from traditional discursive practices. Interestingly though, they regularly mirror the societal stereotypy of rape, victimhood and gender. Evident in the ways in which some participants first claim that there is no such thing as an idealized victim perceived as more credible or legitimate than others, followed by identifying an ideal victim in a similar way as the traditional understandings, such as submissive and defenseless (Greer, 2007; Carrabine et al, 2004; Christie, 1986a). Illuminated by:
Ida: ‘I guess I envision a person that is like small and vulnerable, perhaps even a bit submissive’

And

Lars: ‘I think that an ideal victim could be someone who looks a bit... small and like defenseless... like you know that you will be able to ‘take’ this person, because of that...’

Consequently, the participants identified three key characteristics they assume the person holds; defenseless, vulnerable and young. These characteristics harmonize rather well with the notion of the ‘ideal victim’. Correspondingly, the participants typically visualized the situational conditions as to be situated within a public sphere whereby the ideal victim is attacked on the streets or their way home. Additionally, that the victim is either young or elderly, clearly illuminating the perception that these positions are most likely to be victimized from an idealized perspective. Yet in contrast to Christie’s (1986a) notion, several participants also sanctioned situational conditions such as parties often involving alcohol. This evolvement might be considered as modernized scripts of cultural discourses, keeping in mind that the sample of this thesis consists of young adults, often ingrained with student cultures whereby partying and alcohol often is a major part of student life.

4.2 Social constructions of a rape victim

Although legal definitions of rape and its implications is not the focal point in this thesis, it was considered of importance to establish the ways in which the participants understood the notion of rape and sexual violence to contextualize their narratives. Naturally then, it was asked how they understood rape, and if they could define rape. The participants typically spoke about what constitutes as rape in rather ambivalent means, ranging from ‘any sexual contact without consent’ to ‘penetrative actions with objects and body parts’. Nonetheless, it appears that the participants found it challenging to decidedly present a clear definition. Illustrated by Ida;

‘If I were to kind of hook up with a guy, and I didn’t want to have sex, but he is like really ready but I might have said no... and I still continue making out with him, then he might
interpret that as me being good to go. Because my actions say something other than what I verbally said... and then he might penetrate me, and I give in, then I would not think of that as rape, because I kind of had it coming... also I had the chance to properly put my foot down and say, 'I said no', so if he did not respect that and just continued, that would’ve been rape’

Surely, Ida’s narrative highlights the complexities that eclipse rape victimization, and the prospect of manifesting efficient and appropriate legal legislations which should be able to incorporate everyone in need of protection from sexual violence. Ida suggests, one might argue, the intricacy of sexual interactions and the notion of informed consent, coupled with the unspoken social codes that one ‘must know’ when engaging in sexual encounters. Furthermore, one might argue, that individuals might find it hard to harmonize their sexual encounter with the rigid legal definition of rape evident in what one might refer to as gray area rape (Stefansen and Smette, 2006; Vislie, 2015). Due to mixed signals individuals might be uncertain if their sexual encounter falls under the category of sexual victimization, due to her saying ‘no’ yet continuing to ‘make out with him’, consequently making her ‘give in’. However, Ida also presents it as though it would only be considered rape if she had ‘put her foot down and said, ‘I said no’ while the person proceeded. Interestingly, one might recognize the societal focus of ‘No means No’ in sexual interactions, clearly highlighted by Amnesty International’s campaign (2016)28 which emphasizes, among others, the right to sexual autonomy. Moreover, it is seemingly important to Ida that she ‘had the choice’, yet when not ceasing this opportunity she ‘kind of had it coming’ due to her mixed signals. This narration of rape victimization within the Norwegian society is crucial to recognize, it implies, to some extent, victim culpability29 and an added dimension in the ideal victim perception.

The participants typically manifested victimization in relation to rape, as opposed to other forms of criminal acts, from the outset and throughout, too when the question did not specify the crimes nature. One might assume that this is a result of the information provided in advance30, and them possibly preparing for the interview, consequently entering the interview with their minds conditioned toward rape victimization. It follows, much like the reflections

28 Amnesty International (2016) (unofficial translation) (available online at: https://www.amnesty.no/aktuelt/ nei-er-nei-stopp-voldtek)
29 Which will be discussed further in 4.2.1 Accountability.
30 See appendix C Participant information sheet
of what constitutes as an idealized victim, the participants harmonized certain characteristics with a victim of rape as well, once more with reasonably ambivalent notions. However, the participants remained much more consistent when reflecting on a rape victim as opposed to an ideal victim, where they all quite readily described and discussed the divergent aspects of a rape victim from the outset and throughout. Often from a gendered perspective, switching back and forth between female and male victim. It follows, when questioned whether they envisioned a rape victim as female or male, the participants echoed each other and all agreed that the initial thought of a rape victim was portrayed as a female. By illustration, Lars stated that

‘… I think whenever we speak of a victim of rape its automatically female’

Additionally, Nora weighs in by saying that:

‘... when I think of a rape victim, I must admit that I do think it’s a woman… often pretty young, like from sixteen to like thirty, but she might also be younger…’

Notably, they mirror some of the reflections of an ideal victim; young and female. Loyal to the often established theoretical and mediatized image of a rape victim, likewise, to Christie (1986a) analysis. One might presume that Nora anticipates that what she is saying is slightly inaccurate and prohibited, evident when she says, ‘I must admit that I do think it’s a woman’, as if she was expected to adopt a more neutral position to the question by including men in her narrative and thereby assimilate diplomatic cultural norms. Additionally, Bourdieu’s (1972) concept of doxa becomes evident in Lars’s narrative; it is taken for granted, naturalized, that women are ‘automatically’ what one thinks of in terms of rape victimization. In the description of a female rape victim from their discursive, several emphasized features which exhibited characteristics correlating to femininity; such as ‘naïve’, ‘attractive’ and ‘defenseless’ coupled with how Anniken describes as ‘having difficulty to yield resistance’ (Daly, 2013; Walklate, 2007; Daly and Chesney-Lind, 2004). Fredrik offers an elaboration on the aspect of attractiveness:
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31 These contrasting reflections will be further discussed in 4.3 Male rape: a restricted category within conceptualizations of rape victimhood?
‘If you were to rape someone I think it would have to be someone you would not stand a chance with normally, like looks-wise... she would have to be attractive and like womanly... you know, feminine’

One can interpret Fredrik’s narrative as a high risk and high reward situation, where it is unfruitful to rape a woman if the symbolic prize, the attractiveness and perceived femininity of the woman, was not present. Additionally, he says ‘if you were to rape someone...’ as if once you decide you are actually going through with the rape, the compensation truly must outweigh the risks which accompany raping someone and that it is not a decision taken lightly. Why would one rape someone who one most likely and successfully could have consensual sex with on a regular night out? Signifying that the woman must be out of his league to be ‘worth it’. Although Fredrik utilizes the position of the perpetrator and rape motivation as a reference point when describing a female rape victim, which is not the main aim to examine in this thesis, it is still interesting to observe his narrative. In light of this, Fredrik, and several other participants, indicate that the perceived femininity which include, yet not limited to, being considered physically attractive and ‘womanly’ are grounding characteristics of a female rape victim within this sample. Moreover, as previously mentioned several participants often adopted mediatized lenses when reflecting upon rape and victimization. Therefore, would it be viable to assume that the perception within this sample too is influenced by media coverage of rape? As illustrated by the selective processes of news media outlets and official discourses, rape victims who are considered ‘deserving’ in the hierarchy of victimization, are, to name a few, likely to be attractive and ‘photogenic’, consequently the legitimate victim status are often readily available to them (Greer, 2007: 143; Carrabine et al, 2004). One might presume then, that the participants is to some extent frequently circling back to the idealized construction of a victim, by harmonizing their perception of a rape victim with an ideal victim. Thereby, illuminating the relevance of the attractiveness of the woman into the host of divergent manners one might categorize female rape victims. Nevertheless, not all conformed to the characteristics outlined thus far. A few participants consistently recited that ‘she could be anyone’, much like some of the reflections of an ideal victim, and that she was not conditioned by alcohol consumption, choice of clothing or her behavior, often introduced through mass media outlets (Greer 2007).

Illustrated by Kristine,
'I definitely think that she could be anyone, I know that people often say that she must have been drunk or you know, (that) it is dependent on what she is wearing, but I do not think that is necessarily true...'

Interestingly though, Kristine narrates it as not ‘...necessarily true’, which might signify that she is not entirely convinced that it does not, to some extent, present itself as potential co-dependent dimensions of female rape victims. Regardless, it is evident that there resides assumption that a rape victim equals female. Providing support to Walklate (2007) and Daly (2013), among others, when argued that the notion of a victim is widely generated as female. Moreover, that being a victim is conditioned in such a manner to signify passivity and defenselessness indeed associated with traditional notions of femininity.

4.2.1 Accountability

It follows, although an idealized image of a rape victim is often emphasized too within this sample, one must consider the conditions for when the concept was constructed. It is transparent that the concept of an ideal victim is decisively valuable as a reliable springboard within the academic sphere, yet one must acknowledge the constant progression of ever modifying societies and the societal perceptions within them. As an additional aspect to the concept, the participants call attention to the important function of cultural expectations of the rape victim, applicable for both women and men\(^{32}\). More specifically, the cultural expectations of a female rape victim clearly feature the assumption of internalizing accountability for their function in their victimization, furthermore the responsibility of practicing sexual autonomy and integrity (Phillips, 2000; Lamb, 1999; Stefansen and Smette, 2006). As indicated by Kristine:

‘(she) might not be as equipped to properly care of herself and protect herself from being put in situations where she might be taken advantage of due to her own naivety or gullibility... and if she was raped she definitely should report the rape, no one deserves such an experience’

\(^{32}\) Cultural expectations of the male rape victim will be further examined in 5.2 A masculine rape victim?
In this sense, it is of importance to recognize the construction and representation of the self within Western cultural scripts. The notion of agency is crucial when examining contestations of victimhood due to the influence agency conveys upon the assertiveness of accountability (Asad, 2003). In this regard, Asad (2003: 79) argues, agents, those who portray themselves as responsible and intentional, and victims, those who are passive objects of cruelty or opportunity, are indeed established as opposites. Firstly, Kristine indicates that the female victim ‘might not be as equipped to properly take care of herself and protect herself...’ whereby one might interpret that she acquits the woman of culpability and gain sympathy, she is indeed a legitimate victim (Christie, 1986a; Greer, 2007; Carrabine et al, 2007). Yet, Kristine ambivalently goes on to state that ‘...put in situations where she might be taken advantage of due to her own naivety or gullibility’, which might indicate the woman should have been aware of her ‘naivety’ and ‘gullibility’, therefore she has, to some extent, contributed in her victimization. It was a conscious choice to risk being ‘put in situations where she might be taken advantage of’. Here, it clearly illustrate the negotiations. Furthermore, it is argued that discourses of choice are fundamental in the Westernized production of ideas of individuality, which in turn is translated as an essential indicator of agency (Skeggs, 2004). In light of this, one might recognize the paradoxical expectation of women as both practicing sexual autonomy and individuality, yet internalizing what has happened to them in order to prevent rape victimization by reporting to law enforcement. By extension, one might identify this added dimension of an idealized rape victim positions females within what, Jacobsen and Skilbrei (2010), coins as ‘reproachable victims’. Females are oftentimes acknowledged as victims of rape, subsequently readily positioned with in a legitimizied victimhood, nonetheless, some forms of victimhood, also connote the notion of culpability. Rape victims are subscribed a sense of responsibility, one might interpret from this sample, due to the extensive societal, academic and official work conducted, encouraging individuals to take responsibility in actively partaking in the prevention of sexual violence. Interestingly, Kristine implies that one should know that one must actively take preventative measures into account to not be subjected to rape, thereby automatically shifting the accountability of rape to the victim, when one is ‘naïve’ and ‘gullible’. As though one must be quite alert when inhabiting these characteristics, yet once sexually victimized, the proceedings are clear ‘she definitely should report the rape, no one deserves such an experience’. By extension showcased by Anniken: ‘one must police oneself to not be drawn into situations where one might be manipulated’
And Fredrik: ‘I think that there is a societal focus where women are supposed to be more alert, women are kind of taught to be careful with what they say and what they share on for instance the internet, as a preventative measure to not be subjected to potentially dangerous situations such as rape’

Indicating that women indeed are conditioned by societal norms, official discourses and mass media outlets to take precautions and monitor their behavior and choices (Lamb, 1999; Stefansen and Smette, 2006). Signifying that the rape victim is to an extent held responsible for their victimization, the victim is expected to conform to certain notions associated with a rape victim in order to acquire a legitimate victim status, viewed in the light of both the mediatized construction of a hierarchy of victimization (Lamb, 1999; Carrabine et al. 2004; Greer, 2007). Furthermore, it illustrates Phillips (2000) argument that women are expected to internalize and practice sexual autonomy, yet not to the extent that they are ‘too strong’ or independent to be considered a credible victim which acquire legitimacy and sympathy. Consequently, one might identify a advanced idealized form of rape victimhood, from the traditional understandings of ideal victims (Christie, 1986a), emerging as what Jacobsen and Skilbrei (2010) coin as ‘reproachable victim’; whereby a legitimate victim is, on the one hand passive and compliant with the established feminine connotations of victimhood, on the other hand they are morally presumed as actively taking responsibility for their victimization subsequently aiding in the prevention of rape.

4.3 Male rape: a restricted category within the conceptualization of rape victimhood?

The participants themselves claim that some of the themes discussed, specifically male rape is often regarded as a taboo, whereby it stands in opposition to and serves as a fraction to a given moral, social or cultural order or norm (Cohen, 2014). Further, it is transparent that the participants often take for granted that the rape victim position is reserved for women, illuminated by the fact that they all identified a rape victim as female and that this was the ‘automatic thought when thinking of rape victimization’. Before, at a later point in the conversation, emphasizing that men can be sexually victimized too. One might argue that Bourdieu’s (1972) concept of doxa, additionally the concept of taboo, is rather prevalent in this sample, and the ways in which the participants narrates and negotiate the sphere of
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33 See chapter 5 Male rape victimization and Masculinities
34 See chapter 5 Male rape victimization and Masculinities
gendered sexual victimization and the implications of gender roles. In this sense, the doxa can be recognized as an expression of how rape is reserved as men’s domination of women and it ‘goes without saying because it comes without saying’ in modern cultural scripts (Bourdieu, 1972: 167). One might argue that it is a result of the extensive body of work put forward by the second-wave feminist movement, the establishment of rape crisis centers for women, coupled with the mediatized portrait of sexual victimization (Greer, 2007; Carrabine et al., 2004; Ward, 1995; Daly and Chesney-Lind, 2004; Walklate, 2007; Naffine, 1997; Smart, 1989; Brownmiller, 1975; Munro, 2001; Grøvdal, 2012). Could this be an illustration of how naturalized this one specific perspective and approach is to the dynamics of rape victimization? Nonetheless, it does not indicate that the participants discard the notion of a male rape victim, whereby they refuse to acknowledge it, but it signifies that they needed some time to wrap their heads around the potential dynamics of male rape victimization. Furthermore, that there might be certain aspects of rape dynamics that is too socially outlawed or ‘frowned upon’ to discuss openly. In a sense, it seems, they needed to nullify their thought process and cultivated concepts of rape, and start from scratch when considering this rape dynamic. As indicated by the participants’ description of how they envisioned a rape victim as female, most spoke of male victims of rape in comparison to female victims of rape. When asked whether they could envision a male victim of rape, the participants typically agreed that they could. Yet that this dynamic is rather foreign, illuminated by Tiril:

‘I have never heard of a man being raped, it might not be as acceptable to publically say that ‘I’ve been raped’ when you’re a man’

Additionally, Lars: ‘When rape is debated in society it is in relation to women, it is something that is talked about in official debates and in media, even though it’s still a subject surrounded by taboo, at least some dimensions of female rape… so, even though rape isn’t a pleasant subject to discuss, it’s at least discussed, which is good… but for men who has been raped, it’s just not something that’s talked about, because it’s not considered as a problem, you know… definitely not to the same extent as female victims of rape’

It is interesting when Lars points out that rape is subjected to heated discussions in official debates and though media outlets, yet it is ‘still a subject surrounded by taboo’. What is it with sexual violence, particularly rape, that is so different from other forms of violence?
Notably, it is interesting that sexual violence is considered greatly sensitive and somewhat taboo, nonetheless, it is also more debated than any other form of violence, such as drug influenced fighting on a night out. This form violence typically among men occurs much more frequent than sexual violence, specifically rape, as if this form of violence is normalized and aligned with masculinity narratives (SSB, 2016). Subsequently, when victimhood is regarded and brought to the forefront through news media outlets or official debates it is routinely manifested as sexual and rape victimhood. As a result, one might argue, that the body of work put forward by the discourse of radical feminism has indeed influenced the raised awareness of sexual violence, this crucial social movement has contributed in determining the construction of sexual victimhood and whom might achieve a legitimate status (Grøvdal, 2012). By extension, it has indeed shaped the gendered availability of rape victimhood. One might recognize this influential discourse through the emergence, operationalization and organization of rape crisis centers whereby it is oftentimes a support system directed at women (Martin et al, 1993). It signals that sexual violence, specifically rape, is reserved for women, as an expression of male violence against female, consequently deteriorating the same issues described by Christie (1986a); whereby men do not have access to help nor the victim position, at least not in the same manner as for women. Furthermore, an expression of systematizing the availability of rape victimhood is recognizable in some international legal legislation, such as the notion that rape is solely legitimate when executed in a penetrative manner and with the use of a penis. Evident in, for instance, the legal definition of rape in the UK which states the following; ‘Intentionally penetrates the vagina, anus or mouth of another person with his penis’ (Sexual Offences Act 2003: 1a), which one could argue connotes with the radical feminism analysis. Even though the UK legal definition of rape is ‘designed to be fair and non-discriminatory’ (CPS, 2004), it clearly is nothing short of gender discriminating. Consequently, emphasizing that ‘rape is the social tradition of male domination and female exploitation’ (Ward, 1995: 22) Although, within Nordic countries, rape legislation resides as gender neutral, it is interesting to make a note of because one might presume that in an increasingly globalized society individuals are influenced by the ways in which gendered sexual violence and rape victimhood is conveyed in Western societies, indicated by the access to mediatized representations of rape. It follows, Lars notes that female rape is indeed discussed, even if it is sensitive and somewhat taboo, whereas male rape ‘is just not something that’s talked about because it is not considered as a problem’. One might argue that male rape is indeed not considered as a societal problem, ‘at least not the same extent as women’, which could be an outcome of the important work of
radical feminism, in the sense that rape is typically discussed and policed as something women might be subjected to. Supported by Silje’s narrative;

‘I think it’s more focus directed at women because those are the ones that report their victimization... like, it’s really rare that men do, so I don’t think when people hear that a person has been raped that they would think of the victim as a man’

Consequently, rape victimhood typically resides as an issue reserved for women and children, in this sense it serves as an added dimension of how its social and cultural constructed nature restricts the access and allowance for male rape. Furthermore, it might serve as a modest demonstration of how victimhood, situated within sexual victimization, rather traditionally, is constructed in a Norwegian context. Even though the participants do not arrange access to the how men themselves view this establishment, they do facilitate access to insight on the male entry into sexual victimhood categories, specifically rape. Clearly, it is not generalizable to Norwegian societal attitudes yet it might indicate one potential point of view and the rape victimhood position deficient availability for men.
5 Male rape victimization and masculinities

As indicated by the aim of this thesis, the second half of my main interests to explore further was how the understandings of male victimhood norms interact with the notions of masculinity, while utilizing specifically rape victimization as a reference point. Before analyzing how male victims of rape within masculinity discourses are perceived within my modest sample, I found it logical to question the participants understand the notion of masculinity in the attempt to understand their viewpoint and rationales. This enabled me to examine and compare the divergent dimensions of the perceived male rape dynamic the participants identify through the lens of societal expectations and constructions of the masculine male subject. As demonstrated in Chapter 3 Methodology, the interviews were conditioned in such a manner to explore and, hopefully instigate, gendered reflections of the constructions of male rape dynamics, yet most drew these conclusions beforehand and did so naturally. Additionally, it will draw upon the concepts and approaches introduced in Chapter 2 Theoretical Framework.

5.1 What is masculinity?

The essence of masculinity is oftentimes challenging to grasp and pinpoint with accuracy. Not to mention, express in a transparent manner. The essence of what one might define as masculine is highly intricate and abstract, thus, it is rarely reflected upon in daily life. Therefore, it is often taken for granted and regarded as a given. A given that male bodies are naturally equipped with a set of social and cultural fabricated masculine traits, as its loyal companion (Reeser, 2011). Seemingly, it is sometimes forgotten that masculinity is a social construct of a given historical and cultural context, influenced by societal norms and idealized men, often grounded in pop culture discourses, who readily embodies the essence of masculinity; consequently, it is manifested as a benchmark for other men to aspire to (Connell, 1995; Messerschmidt, 2000; Jon, 2014). By extension, it is manifested in the cultural scripts of the normative scripts of hegemonic masculinity, which is generally defined as ‘the set of ideas, values, representations and practices associated with ‘being male’’ (Jefferson, 2001: 38). Nevertheless, the manifestation of masculinity is often reflected upon
when something has gone ‘wrong’, when a man does not fit with the societal and cultural scripts of what ‘being masculine’ require. One might argue that there is a tendency to reflect upon the essence of masculinity either when one encounter people who are lacking in what one perceive as masculine or when this essence is heightened in such a manner that it is considered extreme and outside the norm. Subsequently, Reeser (2011) argues; masculinity becomes visible because of its absence or when exaggerated. For instance, in western societies, male bodybuilders and firefighters might serve as an illustration of the ultra-masculine perception where their physique or occupation truly embodies and showcases their masculine essence. Their masculinity is produced and reproduced, performed, daily. One can easily recognize their masculine identity through muscles and perceived physical strength or the firefighters’ courage and rationality in dangerous situations, thus appearing as a man able to successfully protect themselves and others. One might recognize the concept of cowboy masculinity, whereby individuals perform and conduct their masculine identity through different cultural idealizations and associations with a ‘masculine’ occupation (Jon, 2014). On the contrary though, encountering a man full-on bawling in the streets it likely to trigger thoughts of unmanliness. These considerations are evident in the participants’ reflections is this tendency to presume that masculinity is as an organic and innate component of the male body. Furthermore, the difficulties with pinpointing exactly what and how the performative nature of gender roles play a part in the social and cultural scripts. As a result, some spoke of gender roles and the embodiment of masculinity with ambivalence. Illustrated by Lars:

‘Masculinity is something... it is a societal thing where gender roles are, which is a bit... well it is a bit difficult to... masculinity is like the male part of being human’

And Silje:

‘Masculinity is one of those words that are really hard to grasp, you know...and explain, it is just something a man is’

Much like the general reflections of victimhood, the participants also adopted several narratives and spoke of the manifestation of masculinity with ambiguity. Once again illuminating the difficulties with establishing a clear-cut interpretation of these phenomena, much due to the complexities and subjectivities it embodies. Both Silje and Lars preceded to circle in on some defining features of masculinity as the conversation progressed, as if they
had to thoroughly channel their thoughts to such a notion before being able to assemble their thoughts on the subject in question. The more they talked about it, the easier it seemed for them to formulate a point of view. Lars, for instance, eventually wound up with a pretty precise description where masculinity, in his narrative, is embodying ‘toughness, assertiveness, loyalty and courage’. Decidedly, it is complementarity to the traditional traits presented in scholarships (Jefferson, 2001; Reeser, 2011; Messerschmidt, 2000; Wedgewood, 2009). Whereas, for instance, Ida consistently rejected the notion of masculinity and the construction of gender roles (Butler, 1990) altogether:

‘I don’t think that masculinity is something that actually exists, it’s the same as when someone says you’re a girly girl, it is just too hard to define, or attach a label to... because it doesn’t exist. I think that it is something that our society constructs to like categorize a behavior or a presence, you know...’

Nevertheless, the participants typically reflected and attached ‘labels’, similarly to Lars narrative, to what they understood as masculinity. Typically, when they spoke of masculinity it was repeatedly affiliated with what they narrated as a ‘masculine man’, occasionally utilizing a mediatized lens of pop culture representations in their perception. Illustrated by Tiril;

‘There are these stereotypes of the ultimate masculine man, for instance like public figures such as Johnny Depp. He would to many be a man with a high degree of masculinity... because of his masculine aura’

When asked what she meant by ‘masculine aura’ she said that ‘it is his confident attitude and body language’, additionally, ‘being tall, authoritarian and having a robust physique’. Akin to Jon (2014) concept of cowboy masculinity, whereby the perception of masculinity is influenced and inspired by heroic figures produced in different cultural wrappings often through mass media and social media outlets. Although Jon (2014) primarily depict the concept of cowboy masculinity through the lens of men’s perception of their own masculinity as a self-regulating process in the light of heroic figure influences, one might presume that others too, adopt and recognize the immense influence of public figures and popular culture. Consequently, cultivating their perception of masculinity and what constitutes a masculine man, much like in Tiril’s narrative. Interestingly, several participants spoke of a masculine
aura or a masculine presence often as someone who is *mentally sturdy, strong-willed and confident*. Something unspoken the man just is, that he exudes. Despite these rather traditional aspects of what is regarded as masculine, a few participants also emphasized the changing norms of masculinities towards a softer manifestation. Much like the implications of Jon (2014), Ervø and Johansson (2003) and Reuterstrand (2004) where, in Nordic counties, the contemporary understandings of masculinities, suggest that men are to a greater extent involved in the compassionate aspects of life such as childcare within the family structure, whereby the hard aspects of masculinities are blended with softer aspects. Thus, in somewhat opposition to the classical understandings of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1995). Illustrated by Anniken:

‘If you’re like a man’s man, I think that you would have to be compassionate and caring too…and like humble. It shows that you’re comfortable with yourself and your masculinity’

However, Anniken explains, one should exhibit these softer traits when it is ‘appropriate’ such as ‘when you’re with your family’. One might interpret then that men are expected to govern and perform this ‘softer side’ of their masculine identity when in social settings that are perceived as harmless, whereby the pressure of performing his masculinity in such a manner to gain respect from other men and display toughness are restricted (Messerschmidt, 1993). Thus, performing several masculine identities dependent on the social situation the man engages in.

Having recognized this, it appears that the participants singled out a few key elements associated with a masculine man, some of which has been outlined above. Additionally, they frequently spoke of emotional control as a masculine trait, which a masculine man readily internalizes. The ability to refrain from showing too much feelings or even thoughts, and elevate himself to an individual in complete emotional control. Nora’s narrative serves well in illustration:

‘I think that men describe things in few words, and quite briefly... they’re not expected to like elaborate and talk about, or show their feelings like women’

Additionally, Ida: ‘Men doesn’t talk about stuff like that, in fear of being perceived as like a sensitive little boy’
And, Lars: ‘Men don’t show their feelings as much as women... I don’t think he would be considered very masculine if he did’.

Illustrated by these narrative extractions, masculine understandings are often constricted to the idea that ‘boys don’t cry’; whereby emotive displays of ‘weakness’ such as crying reciprocate the defining features of femininity, thus embodying what masculinity is not (Lorentzen, 2011; Sparks, 1996; Hollander, 2001). When considering the emerging themes of this sample, it is transparent that the participants’ narratives attach several components to the concept of masculinity and the construction of a ‘masculine man’ through what some participants classified as a masculine aura. These include, yet not limited to, assertiveness, toughness and emotional control. Along with physical traits such as tall, physical strength and being muscular. Significantly, the participants also recognize that there indeed is a softening of masculine norms, which might signify a diversion from hegemonic masculinity, much like predicted within the Nordic cultural norms (Jon, 2014; Ervø and Johansson, 2003; Reuterstrand, 2004)

5.2 A masculine rape victim?

Dunn (2012) argues that men are conflicted when attempting to reconcile being a victim with the notion of being masculine, as if these conditions are colliding. Victimhood connotes femininity, clearly signified by deep-rooted societal norms and the extensive work conducted in the academic sphere, additionally, portrayed in official discourses whereby victimhood is generally reserved for women and children. In order to be perceived as a legitimate victim, who readily receives and internalizes compassion and sympathy, one must, at the very least, be viewed as a person in need of protection, or rather, someone who when victimized undoubtedly did not stand a chance against their attacker. Naturally, the ways in which one becomes recognized and legitimimized as a victim is highly complex and consists of a host of diverse aspects too profound to respectfully and thoroughly discuss in this thesis.

Nevertheless, as suggested by Carrabine et al (2004) and Greer (2006) in the hierarchy of victimization, the deserving victims generally amount to women and children, whereas the undeserving victims are frequently reserved for men. In short, men, rather masculinity, does not embody the necessary ‘qualifications’ to be regarded as victims, especially so within the
sphere of sexual victimization, thereby creating conflicting and polarizing encounters. Masculinity and rape victimhood are in its very essence conflicting, consequently, rendering the masculine victim as a paradox. Kristine expand on this thought:

‘I think that many men feel that our society puts a lot of pressure on them to be like strong and in control, and that kind of influences them to not show that they’re a victim or that they’ve been affected by being raped... because they don’t want to show that they have been exploited or be associated with that’

One might interpret Kristine’s narrative as societal pressure to conform to traditional masculine norms, such as being strong and in control, prohibit men in expressing themselves as victims of rape, and significantly, rendering the position of male rape unavailable. The societal norms have such an enormous impact on the ways in which men perform their gendered conduct and the avenues in which they view their masculine identity in relation to sexual victimization. Kristine also highlights one of the key masculine traits identified in this sample, that of emotional control, when she says ‘...show that they (haven’t) been affected by being raped’. This cultural image of men, and what being a ‘real man’ entails, clearly illustrate that men are not expected to speak openly of complex and sensitive issues and feelings (Burcar, 2014). They are expected to signify emotional strength and when confronted with hardship, maintain as the stable pillar or the retaliator, in their community. Furthermore, the construction of a victim constitutes a binary condition, firstly being acknowledged by society and acknowledge oneself as a victim, secondly, by assimilating the role of a victim one is habitually regarded as passive, helpless and weak (Jon, 2017). In addition, the role of a victim also includes the duty to exhibit such characteristics (Ericsson, 1993: 76). In Kristine’s narrative, one can easily identify the difficulties men encounter by being ‘associated with that (of a rape victim)’. Consequently, Jon (2017) and Burcar (2014) suggest that men might experience a loss of masculine identity. Illustrated by Nora:

‘Men are supposed to be strong and like tough, masculine of you will... so when he doesn’t properly defend himself, it clearly effects how he perceive his own masculinity and generally as a man’

Nevertheless, the ways in which the man experiences loss of masculine identity is determined by an array of various aspects, such as the conduct of the attacker and the responses of the
family, the community and society (Sivakumaran, 2007). Nora’s narrative lends itself well in illuminating Burcar (2014) argument that men are expected to use violence, not become the victims which suggest notions aligned with being feminine and contradict the ways in which the image of a ‘real man’ and how ideal victims are framed. One might interpret that when she says, ‘when he doesn’t properly defend himself’ she pinpoints the expectation of men as active subjects whereby men are supposed to be able to successfully do something about their current situation; in this case rape victimization. They are not expected to passively conform to the requirements of victimhood. Furthermore, it suggests that men aspiring to the normative masculine norm should be able to properly defend themselves by whatever means, it doesn’t matter if one must use violence as long as one are able to keep the masculine identity intact. One can link this back to the expectation of successfully retaliate35 against their attacker (Bäcklin et al. 2013). Moreover, men are from a criminological, societal and mediatized perceptive regularly associated with violence, therefore when one challenges these sets of ideas, it upsets our notions and seems to threaten the general discourse (Holstein and Miller, 1990). It follows, both Nora and Kristine illuminate the understanding that men cannot both successfully conform to the notion of normative masculinity or the idealized manifestations of victimhood. Internalizing and portraying the position of a victim, and all that this entails, hinder a fruitful performance of masculinity due to its association with feminine traits. Consequently, it begs the question; if a man cannot both fully be regarded as masculine and sexually victimized, must a man be feminized in order to be sanctioned as a victim of rape?

5.2.1 Feminization of male victims

Houge (2015: 173) argues that ‘male victims of sexual violence are subjected to a symbolic feminization process and/or possibly homosexualizing process’. Supported by Sivakumaran’s (2007: 271) reasoning of this feminization process whereby ‘the intention of rape may be to ‘lower’ the social status of the male survivor by ‘reducing’ him to a ‘feminized male’36. Although these scholars conducted their research on male rape in war times, one might recognize some of these feminization processes in peace time as well, additionally, through the general societal lens of rape victims conditioned as female. It follows, the participants quite readily listed distinctive features they narrated as a male rape victim;

35 The expectation of retaliation will be further discussed in 5.4.3 The principle of resistance
36 See 5.3.1. The male on male rape stereotype
Ida: ‘Attractive, young, weak and unable to defend themselves’
Lars: ‘Pretty feminine features such as being like, a bit passive... and small’
Anniken: ‘I think he’s a bit flimsy, and defenseless... modest’
Fredrik: ‘Sensitive, naive and young’
Nora: ‘I don’t have any clear thoughts on the subject, so maybe the same features as with female victims?... he might be like young, attractive and not necessarily as physically strong’

One might argue that the participants indeed feminizes the male victim by attributing features associated with a female victim, and consequently feminine traits. Considering that ‘the only way others can judge their essential nature as men is through their behavior and appearance’ (Messerschmidt, 1993: 84), it is not difficult to imagine that the participants view male rape victims, based on these features, as a rather feminized male. Consequently illuminating the unmanliness and what masculinity is not, whereby, masculinity is fundamentally measured ‘in relationship to what is unmanly’ (Lorentzen, 2011: 114, Houge, 2015). Once more, suggesting that male victims fundamentally counteract the idealized and feminized understandings of victimhood (Houge, 2015). One might interpret that, due to the symbolic contradiction of masculinity and rape victimhood, the participants had to place the victim within either the masculine norm or within the notion of victimhood. Why does a man have to have his ‘masculine aura’ reduced, rather fractured, to be regarded as a rape victim? The male victim is still expected to embody fragments of what is considered aligned with a masculine identity, evident in the manners the participants differentiate aspects such as accountability of a female versus a male victim. For instance, the participants were keen to emphasizes that men are expected, rather, presumed to stop the sexual attack before it even happened, whereas women are expected to take preliminary caution through preventative measures. Voiced by Silje:

‘I think that men, surely, are expected to be able to stop the attacker during the rape, more so than women. Whereas women are expected to stop the act before it happens trough like preventative measures such as being cautious of their surroundings and the way they behave’

Additionally, Anniken said:
'I think that men generally have a better vantage point to successfully stop the abuse, unless he was under the influence of alcohol or drugs, than women... and not to like let himself be assaulted too easily'

Both Silje and Anniken believes, rather expects, that the man will resist their victimization presumably though violence. This general view of men can be traced back to the masculine norms, the man is supposed to fight back, be aggressive and in control of the situation and like Anniken says 'not let himself be assaulted too easily', consequently establishing his masculinity in order to gain respect from others (Messerschmidt, 1993; Connell, 1995; Jon, 2014). One can interpret, in light of Anniken’s narrative, that men indeed are accountable when victimized; the man must have put up a good fight if someone successfully assaulted him. Anniken presents it as if the man has a choice in is victimization, thus completely discarding the complexities of rape as well as the individual reactions to such a trauma, which considerations can be identified in the extensive research conducted on female rape victims (Horvarth and Brown, 2013). The deep-seated presumption that men are reacting individuals is clearly recognizable in masculine traditions (Messerschmidt, 1993; Connell, 1995). The cultural expectations of women also create a gendered paradox, women are too expected to react to their victimization, by taking accountability of what happened and report their victimization (Lamb, 1999; Stefansen and Smette, 2006). Similar to the other participants, Anniken narrative suggest an exception; being under the influence. The involvement of drugs or alcohol emerged as crucial perception of male victims, it was narrated and negotiated as an explanation of how the man ‘let himself be sexually victimized’. Emphasizing the necessity of loss of autonomy in male rape; as long as the traditional avenues of practicing their masculine identity and autonomy is restricted, such as being institutionalized or under the influence of substances, the participants were more understanding of the dynamics surrounding male rape. One can easily draw similarities to the perception of female victims of rape, more specifically the link between substance use and accountability (Rozee and Koss, 2001). Nevertheless, the position of a rape victim is generally available to women, regardless of substance use, whereas it appears that the participants in this sample attached this as a crucial component in their understanding of male rape victimization. Moreover, suggestion that masculinity is often defined by strength, and coupling this with the male body’s larger size as a defining feature of a man (Reeser, 2011).

---

37 Will be further examined in 5.4.3 The principle of resistance
38 Will be further discussed in 5.4.2 Establishing male victim credibility – negotiating the dimensions
Illustrated by Lars, ‘...regardless, it would be easier for a man to stop the abuse than for a woman mainly because of a man’s physical strength’. Showcasing, perhaps, that men are expected to take action during their victimization, and successfully remove themselves from the situation or at least overthrow their attacker, thus restrict their potential sexual victimization. Nevertheless, when men are unsuccessful in doing so, the participants position the man in a rather feminized condition, harmonized with the constructions of sexualized victimhood, consequently having to abdicate, at least to some degree, their masculine identity. In light of this, narratives of masculinities coupled with feminizing the construction of a victim has contributed in the fabrication of a legitimate victim and made the prospect of men being recognized as victims, to the same extent as women, unavailable (Laugerud, 2007).

5.3 Situational and relational dimensions of male rape dynamics

As outlined in chapter 3 Methodology, the interviews were intentionally conditioned in such a manner to instigate gendered reflections of the dynamics of male rape victimization. This in the prospect of shedding light on some relatively unexplored phenomena; how men subjected to rape victimization are perceived by society, and examining the thought dimensions situated within dynamics of male rape interact with notions of victimhood and masculinity norms. Though recognizing that it will be implausible to generalize. It became evident that it was necessary to use the traditional roles in rape as a counterweight, one might presume that this came about due to the unorthodox twist in rape victimization examined in this thesis. The participants organically produced this differentencing by comparing and contrasting both female versus male victim, and male versus female perpetrator – it seemed as though it was a necessity for them. Especially so when they spoke of the offender.

5.3.1 The male on male rape stereotype

Nevertheless, they mainly spoke of male rape victimization as their focal point, while utilizing their knowledge of the position of female victim and male offender to illustrate their narratives of female on male rape. It follows then, Ida expands:

39 See 4.3 Male rape: a restricted category within the conceptualization of rape victimhood?
'If I was told that a man had been raped, I would definitely think that the rape happened in prison and that he was raped by another man... we just don’t hear about other settings than in those. Obviously, it must happen elsewhere as well, but that would be the first thought'

Supported by Silje:

‘It would’ve been in like a gang environment or prison or something... as like a form of humiliation, punishment and a power demonstration’

Ida and Silje’s narratives epitomize the stereotypy of adult male rape victimization, whereby the occurrence of male rape is often associated with male on male institutional sexual abuse in prisons (O’Sullivan, 2013; King, 1992). The embodiment of sexual assaults in prison has, indeed, been central to broader portrayal of incarceration, subsequently, generating the oversensitivity that Fleisher and Krienert describe as ‘the myth of prison rape’ (2009: 56-7). Although statistically as few as 10%, indicated by an American National Survey, of inmates had been subjected to sexual assaults; thus, illuminating the overestimation of male rape within prison (Beck and Johnson, 2012). When Ida says that ‘we just don’t hear about anything other than in those settings’, one might interpret that she refers to the mass media coverage, although limited, which includes pop cultural representation of male sexual abuse through film adaptations. Whereby incarcerated men are subjected to the threat of being someone’s ‘property’, subsequently feminizing and emasculating the man, through ‘degrading’ means such as sexual assaults and male prostitution (Kaye, under publication; Mariner, 2001). Furthermore, reinforcing the perception that male victims ought to abdicate parts of their masculine identity to be regarded as somewhat legitimate in a victimized position. Additionally, a conditional element in the public male rape recognition is that of incarceration or restriction, at least to some extent, of personal, sexual and masculine autonomy, in this sense their position of victim and masculine identity is somewhat fractured. One is not fully ‘man’, nor fully a rape victim. By extension, when examining Silje’s narrative, she sheds light on the perception of male rape as a form of punishment and power demonstration, the notion that rape and sexual assaults, perhaps, is also significant in attempting to deduct masculine identities. Furthermore, that this cultural logic equips male

---

rape with the ability of ‘feminizing’ male subjects in such a manner to identify gender non-conforming persons as convenient objects for a specific form of gendered humiliation through male on male sexual violence (Emmer et al. 2011; Jenness and Fenstermaker, 2016). One might interpret her narrative as harmonious with the general presumption of the dynamics of male on male rape, rape is not necessarily governed by sexual lust, rather it is more likely to be dominance oriented. Subsequently, manifesting the ultimate way of humiliating and degrading the male subject, whereby the male is socially disavowed rather than redeemed by the feminization; hence rendering his status as the laughing stock (Kaye, 2017: under publication). Interestingly, one might recognize their narratives as an expression of Bourdieu’s (1972) concept doxa, it is taken for granted that the occurrence of male rape is habitually intertwined with male on male institutional settings or within the confinements of subcultural norms, therefore their cultivated thoughts on male rape is expressed in institutional settings. It is known that prison rape is one of the few legitimate setting for male rape, therefore it is not considered a taboo, unlike other settings highlighted in this sample such as female on male rape within the domestic sphere. Nevertheless, Ida says ‘obviously, it must happen elsewhere as well, but that would be the first thought’, therefore one might interpret that her narrative also incorporates the perception that male rape might indeed expand beyond institutional settings which was also expresses as the conversation progressed for quite a few of the participants. Illustrating the fluctuation and ambivalence of narratives. In terms of rhetoric, she it is notable that she seems quite determined that it ‘must happen elsewhere’.

5.3.2 The role of sexuality

It follows, the participants typically altered between several narratives, and conventional and unconventional mechanism of male rape and the gendered relation to the perpetrator. Generally, when considering male on male rape, the participants identified the relational aspect of the victim and offender as ‘could be anyone’. Interestingly though, a few differed the victims’ sexuality and the impact this signifies. Illustrated by Tiril:

‘I think that if a man rapes another, then the perpetrator must be really aware of what he’s doing and the ways this would impact his victim. Oftentimes, when you’re raped by another

---

41 5.3.3 Female on male rape a plausible dynamic?
man there’s a different type of sex... like it would be so violating, if you’re heterosexual you wouldn’t want to have a penis up your ass or in your mouth’

One might interpret that Tiril narrative encapsulates the victims perceived sexual and physical integrity within heterosexual male on male rape. She emphasizes that when a straight man is raped by another it ‘must be so violating’, due to the sexual identity of the victim. As though the impact of the rape in this relation is catastrophic, comparatively to gay rape, because within homosexual scripts it is the orderly manner of having sex. Subsequently, it might indicate that the victimized heterosexual man’s integrity is profoundly affected and fractured when the offender is the same sex. So, if a homosexual man was raped by a woman, would he experience the same violation of sexual integrity? Wouldn’t gay men experience a violation of personal and physical integrity when raped by another man, because he is ‘used to it’? Furthermore, does it indicate that the issues with sexual and physical integrity of heterosexual female on male rape is left impenetrable? By extension, Tiril speaks from a heterosexual perspective, whereas, Anniken adopts a homosexual perspective;

‘I think that when a gay man is raped it would be like a young guy who is exploring his sexuality, and because we’re brought up in a heterosexual world, if you can call it that, the man doesn’t really know the ropes of gay sex yet... it’s not something that is being taught in sexual education, therefore he might be taken advantage of’

It is interesting to observe the rhetoric means of narrating the victims’ sexuality, in Anniken’s homosexual discursive one can recognize the feminized innocence and inexperience that one might associate with (legitimate) rape victimization (Greer, 2007, Houge, 2015; Mariner, 2001). Nonetheless, she also indicates victim culpability due to the suggestion that gay men must police oneself in order to not be ‘taken advantage of’, similarly to the expectations of female rape victims42. One might interpret it as ‘he didn’t know better’, because he had not been taught ‘the robes of gay sex’ due to his exploration of own sexuality. Comparatively, these two narratives stand in stark contrast; heterosexual men raped by other men is such a ‘violation’ associated with much shame due to the loss of physical, masculine and personal integrity, yet it is seemingly compassion worthy. Whereas gay men have themselves to blame, it is almost expected that gay men would encounter sexual assaults on their journey of

42 See 4.2.1 Accountability.
exploring own sexual identity. Yet, Anniken also seemingly accuses the ‘heterosexual world’ of inequalities; how is gay men supposed to protect themselves when they are left to navigate the field of what constitutes gay consensual sex and non-consensual sex? Moreover, heterosexual practices in western societies is rather normative, it is almost a given (Meeks, 2006: 65-66)

5.3.3 Female on male rape a plausible dynamic?

Having considered this, male on male rape is typically what the participants imagined when asked to reflect on male rape victimization and the dynamics of victim and perpetrator. Nevertheless, when asked to reflect upon whether they could imagine female on male rape, and in which settings this could occur, the narratives were oftentimes ambivalent. A few spoke of female on male rape as no different to male on male, and that either is likely. Illustrated by Ida: ‘it could happen anywhere, at any time. Like with male on male or male on female, it could just as well happen on in the streets as in your own bed’. However, the participants typically found it hard to grasp the concept of a woman raping a man. Moments after Ida made her claim outlined above, she said ‘but I must admit it is quite hard to imagine a woman raping a man, because a woman wouldn’t be able to force herself upon a man in the same way a man would’. Relating her narrative back to the assumption that due to the likeliness of men being physically larger than women, the man surely should be able to stop their sexual victimization. Ida further elaborates her reasoning and one possible avenue the woman then could seek in order to successfully rape a man ‘this is why I think that the man must be younger, because he might be an easier target to overthrow, and that he is more likely to be susceptible to manipulation’. Furthermore, Nora weighs in by saying that ‘the only way I see it happening is if the man was under the influence of drugs or in a like domestic partnership or something’. When asked why she thought of domestic partnership as a setting, she relied that ‘he might feel that he had to do it, to please her because they’re in a relationship and as a man there are attitudes of like how a man should sexually please his woman, although I’m not really supportive of that attitude because like you would never say that to a woman today, so it wouldn’t be fair to expect that of men either’. The notion that men must be, to a certain extent, inhabited in order to be raped is evident in this sample, illustrated by the thought that there must be drugs involved, he must be younger or feel a moral pressure to conform to his ‘duties’ as a man. Consequently, not defining the sexual
encounter as rape$^{43}$. Nevertheless, several of the participants where not as easily convinced that female on male rape is plausible, if so in what way? In light of this, one can draw on Fredrik narrative:

‘Of course, it is possible, but in which settings would that occur? How would that happen? It seems a bit unlikely and unnatural for a woman to do that, because its like much more accepted in our society that women could be raped by men, whereas when you turn it around... I think it would be difficult to believe that this actually happened, like really that happened? And then one would automatically think, how’

Initially, it appears this notion was completely foreign to Fredrik, he often, much like several other participants, questioned how and in what ways it could be plausible. Both from an offender perspective and victim perspective. How would a woman overthrow a man physically? He must be drugged, or subordinated in some way. How would you provide physical proof in a courtroom or to police officers when you file a report$^{44}$? These, along with a handful of other reflections, were brought to the forefront. It was quite interesting to observe the ambivalent ways in which they narrated a potential female on male rape, and how they gradually, it seemed, were able to grasp such a concept. The more they thought of such a scenario, the easier it seemed to envision the dynamics. Could it be that female on male rape victimization is not singularly taboo, but also, or entirely, a phenomenon not thought of as a potential scenario in our cultural scripts, hence reflected as doxa? Restrained by the fixed societal perception of male on female rape, and to some extent male on male rape, steadily produced and reproduced by mass media outlets and official discourses. On the basis of my observations throughout the interviews, I often questioned whether the participants had ever thought of such scenario, not because they refused to acknowledge it as real or valid, but because of its invisibility in our society. How could they have an educated opinion on something they never thought of as an existing rape dynamic? This might illustrate the necessity of exploring female on male rape and further research on male rape, much due to the under-reporting and presumed dark figures so distinctive for rape victimization. If we do not know the extent and dynamics of male rape, in its entirety, how are we able to recognize and aid the secluded male victims?

$^{43}$ The avenues the participants predicted male victims would seek when establishing, rather the lack of, their assault will be further discussed in 5.4.2 Establishing male victim credibility – negotiating the dimensions

$^{44}$ Reflections of how the participants thought male rape victims would be met by the police will be further discussed in 5.4.4 Societal perceptions of the male rape victims encounter with law enforcement
It follows, when the participants envisioned female on male rape, they oftentimes subscribed certain assumptions of both the relational aspect between victim and perpetrator, and the situational aspect. It became evident that **substance use, relationship based on high levels of trust** and **age variation** whereby the women was older and the man younger, were frontrunners in this sample. This notion that the woman is older and the man younger might serve well as the presumed dynamic when a woman was to rape a man, evident in the unique media coverage of female on male rape; teacher/student relations (Howell et al. 2011). Nevertheless, the victimized boy is often underage, therefore it is not considered as adult female on male rape. Additionally, Kristine described the situational aspects where the rape is most likely to occur as ‘not the typical rape where you’re ambushed in a dark alley, more like when you’re unconsciously drunk at a house party’. By extension, it became transparent that within this sample the participants imagined female on male rape more likely to occur in the private sphere, whereby there was a high level of trust therefore also complex power relation, and that the male victim is much more likely to know the perpetrator if the perpetrator was a woman versus a man.

5.4 The outcome of the thought male rape dynamics and the ways in which its dimensions influence the dynamics

5.4.1 Negotiating the perceived fractured masculine identity

It follows, another theme that emerged during the interviews was that of how the man’s masculinity had been affected by the rape. Typically, the participants echoed each other on this topic, where they assumed that the man would indeed feel loss of masculinity when sexually victimized. As previously discussed, the concept of a woman rape a man, due to its polarizing and complex nature, resulted oftentimes in the perceived fracture of masculinity. Once again, relating back to the responsibility a masculine man must take on when victimized, how and why they ‘let themselves be victimized’ in the first place. Fredrik’s narrative serves well in illumination of how the masculine essence was compromised when sexually victimized by a woman:

‘I think he would have thought how did I let this happen to me? If I would’ve been raped by a woman I think I would’ve felt a great deal of shame, both physically and mentally’
Emilie: ‘Would you care to elaborate on that?’

Fredrik: ‘Physically I probably would’ve felt like how she could overpowered me as a man, and mentally it would boil down to that I’m a man and she’s a woman, and how my friends and the general society would regard me after this happened... I think I would’ve been met with understanding, but also speculation and disbelief of how this happened. Regardless, I think they would’ve viewed me as less masculine’

It is interesting to observe how Fredrik narrates that ‘it boil(s) down to that I’m a man and she’s a woman’, as this statements implication is self-explanatory and obvious. Clearly, because ‘I’m a man and she’s a woman’, it would affect the ways in which society views the man when sexually victimized. This statement is rich with doxa (Bourdieu, 1972), the thought that it is completely natural for Fredrik to think that men are rendered less masculine, less of a man, when violated by a woman, this is a given. Significantly, the gendered role of a woman does not conform with the position of a sexual perpetrator either (Denov, 2004; Lawson, 1993). Evident in the deeply rooted perception of what society view as feminine characteristics, such as nurturing, caring and non-aggressive, ‘challenges the powerful stereotypes about motherhood that is deeply cherished by our society’ (Denov, 2004: 19). Additionally, Fredrik address the principle of resistance; the expectation, regarded in this context as a given, of being able to fight their attacker off, notably when the attacker is female and presumably physically smaller than the man45. The challenges with identifying oneself as a victim is transparent (Stefansen and Smette, 2006). When doing so it indicate that the victim fulfills the societal expectations of a victims, consequently displaying behavior and emotions consistent with helplessness and passivity, clearly in profound opposition with masculine norms (Lamb, 1999; Messerschmidt, 1993; Dunn, 2012; Lorentzen, 2011). One might interpret Fredrik’s narrative as the unwillingness of acknowledging oneself, as a male subject, as subjected to sexual violence, especially so when the perpetrator is female; did it even happen? Interestingly, Durfee (2011: 329) study on female on male assault indicate that ‘although the man claims that his partner is an abuser, he is not a powerless victim in need of protection’, consequently men recognize that they have been subject to a crime, but discards the connotation of a traditional victim through what

---

45 The principle of resistance will be further examined in 5.4.3
Durfee coins as ‘victimized masculinity’. Furthermore, men in this study spoke about being victimized without displaying themselves as weak; ‘… through this ‘new official discourse’ men are reconstructing victimization, claiming victimization in a way that is consistent with hegemonic masculinity, which emphasizes strength, power and control’ (Durfee, 2011: 311). As a result, men modify the traditional notion of the passive victim, when reproducing masculine values coupled with the empowerment of a victim, to emerge as masculine and competent victims.

5.4.2 Establishing male victim credibility – negotiating the dimensions

As indicated on various occasions thus far, the participants also assumed concern with male rape victims’ credibility could be a determining aspect in how they are perceived – much like there is disputes of credibility for the whole of rape victimization discourses (Hackett et al. 2008; Anderson, 2007; Jordan, 2004; Borgida and White, 1978). Specifically, for male victims of rape, the participants emphasized the aspect of male sexuality. The idea that men are perceived as sexual beings, to a much greater extent than women, where in which men readily seize and conquer any given opportunity for sex, additionally that men are hormonally and biologically governed (Jon, 2017; Gonsiorek, Bera and LeTourneau, 1994). Female rape seems to be regarded as a violation of the woman’s sexual integrity (Phillips, 2000) whereas, men are often regarded as having a lessened sexual integrity, how does this lack of sexual integrity affect the perceived credibility of male victims? Does it render the male victim unfathomable and unaffected? The perceived lack of sexual integrity was conveyed as significant in determining the culpability of the male victim. Silje talks about this assumption that men are habitually sexually governed:

‘I definitely think that there is a societal pressure of ‘being a man’ and like have sex, even if he doesn’t necessarily want to in that moment. But I think that many think that men don’t say no to sex... also that his friends probably would be like ‘well, at least you got some’’

And Nora:

‘I think in female on male rape it might be easier for the woman to deny having raped him, because she would think, firstly who would believe that a woman could rape a man, and
secondly she might like deter him from speaking about it because of the stigma... might even defend her crime by saying to him that he needs to man up and accept it, because men always want to have sex’

In light of Silje’s narrative one might interpret that men habitually are perceived as wanting and are eager for sexual encounters once the opportunity presents itself. *The societal pressure of ‘being a man’,* signify that men are supposed to accept and seize these opportunities, perhaps even be grateful; evident in how Silje narrates the peer group responses of the victimized man ‘well, at least you got some’. Why would a man say no to sex if it is in his nature to never turn down a sexual experience? Clearly then, when male victims on rare occasions does come forward, one might presume there would be issues with his credibility. The traditional avenues for recognition as a rape victim is plainly renounced when it comes to male victims, particularly when victimized by a woman in a heterosexual relation. Due to their perceived lack of sexual integrity, they are thought of as craving sex *‘even if he does not necessarily want to in that moment’*. Surely, the threshold for receiving societal and mediatized compassion and support is, in this sense, considerably higher for men than for women. As a result, one might argue, this perception reinforces the conventional hierarchy of victimization whereby one can identify the cultural power of the idealized victim; men on the bottom, women and children at the top (Carrabine et al, 2004; Greer, 2007). Furthermore, when translating Becker (1967) notion of a hierarchy of credibility, which signifies the means of capturing social inequalities and the moral hierarchy of undeserving and deserving individuals, into the realm of sexualized victimhood constructions one can acknowledge the legitimization processes of rape victims. By extension, one might argue that male victims of rape are ‘undeserving’ of ‘being regarded as the most credible’ due to the moral structure that embodies the position of sexual victimization, coupled with the polarization with masculine norms, which is recognizable in the extensive representation and production of female rape victims in news media outlets (Becker, 1967: 103; Greer, 2007). It follows, when taking a closer examination of Nora’s narrative one might identify the difficulties of marrying masculinity and victimhood, the implausibility surrounding male rape, specifically female on male. As outlined in *Internalizing institutional male on male rape stereotypy*. Subsequently, the participants predicted that men are more likely to speak of their victimization as a regrettable sexual encounter, as opposed to defining their experience as rape or sexual assault with regards to female on male rape. Illustrated by Kristine:
'It might be a bit more difficult to believe him, because we often think that men are down with whatever sexually... so if men were subjected to what women would define as rape, I think they might call it something else, like a regrettable sexual encounter or something... that’s the frame of mind that our society often has’

And Lars:

‘I think it’s more likely that men views being raped by a woman as like a regrettable sexual encounter, something they thought wasn’t quite ok, but they wouldn’t define it as sexual assault or rape’

5.4.3 The principle of resistance

It follows, when asked whether they thought that male victims of rape were more frequently blamed for their victimization, they all echoed each other and agreed that this was intertwined with culpability and the principle of resistance. As illuminated by Nora:

‘Men are supposed to be strong and tough – masculine... so when you’re aren’t able to sufficiently fight back it could make or break your credibility as a victim, because it is so ingrained in the idea of what it means to be a man... even though I wouldn’t support such a view’

Interestingly, this was one of the few rape attitudes that they all agreed on, and considered to some extent true. Typically, there were some variation, consistent with the ambivalent nature of this sample, nonetheless, the expectation that men are supposed to fight harder than women due to their perceived physical strength. As a result, they ought to have been able to fend off their attacker sufficiently. However, when failing to do so, much like suggested by the research conducted by Davis et al (2010), they are likely to be judged more harshly than their female counterparts. Furthermore, Nora’s narrative clearly supports the notion of resistance as integral in the process of deciding the credibility of the victim (Rumney and Henley, 2006). She even says, ‘it could make or break your credibility as a victim’ due to the close relationship with conventional masculine norms. In terms of rhetoric this is a rather powerful statement, not only are men presumed to put up a good fight with their attacker, but
they are also expected to do so sufficiently. Significantly, it seemingly implies that it is not enough that men solely attempt to resist their victimization, rather, it is such an established interpretation that men would be able to act and liberate themselves from such a situation with fearless determination, consequently not conforming to the passivity recognized in the victimized position. Therefore, oftentimes female rape is produced as more credible when involving resistance, as this indeed is an imperative component of any rape victimization, yet it seems than there is no such redemption for the male victims’ credibility, at least not in female on male rape (Rumney and Henley, 2006). By extension, one might recognize Nora’s unwillingness to approve of such a view. She is keen to emphasize that she does not identify with this portrait of male victims, interestingly, it might indicate that the actual societal expectation, because she clearly seems to speak from a societal point of view as opposed to her own, of the principle of resistance is considered taboo. It is not morally appropriate to say because it signifies that one might not feel compassion for these men lacking in resistance.

5.4.4 Societal perceptions of the male rape victims encounter with law enforcement

In the light of this, I posed a scenario regarding the police forces’ ability to police rape victims: if a man reported being raped by a female perpetrator, what do you think the police force’s initial reaction was in relation to this? Although it seemed that the participants attempted to maintain rather natural to the gendered aspect of how rape victims are policed, I found that the participants typically thought the police officer would portray negative attitudes towards the male rape victims. Interestingly, they oftentimes differentiated between how the police communicated with the male victim and the ways in which they thought they internally processed this intelligence, based on the traditional biases surrounding rape victimization and gender roles. Illustrated by Lars:

‘I think that the police would take him seriously, to some extent, but that the police officer who receives the case personally would think it was a joke... that a man had been raped, especially by a woman... because it is so rare, it doesn’t happen... and I think that the officer’s thoughts would be a bit different because it doesn’t quite fit with the traditional rape cases...like he wouldn’t be met with as much understanding and compassion as a female (rape victim)’
And Ida:

‘I think that men would be met with more like skepticism by the police, and have a harder time believing him. Obviously, I hope that he would be taken just as seriously as women, although I have my doubts... I do think if it was a male officer that they would probably have a negative attitude towards him and think like how did he get into this situation?’

Despite of my small sample, this is an interesting finding as it indeed can be a key reason for why rape victims do not report their victimization. Lars reasoned this by claiming that ‘if men would just like voice their victimization, there wouldn’t be as much dark figures in male rape’. Another theme that emerged from this study was that female on male rape is outside the social norms therefore ‘they won’t be as willing to straight away accept it, as they would with a woman’ and take the male rape victim seriously. Yet, when asked to imagine the same scenario, now with a female victim of a male perpetrator, they typically agreed that ‘they (police) are going to believe her quicker, but stigma is still attached regardless’.

Furthermore, I found that although they would be more willing to accept her victimization because its prevalence is significantly greater than for males, different questions would be asked by the police force, such as her alcohol consumption and what she was wearing. In light of this, much like the literature surrounding policing rape victims (Hohl and Stanko, 2015), the perceived disbelief communicated by police officers carry great significance when exploring both the divergent perceptions of rape victims and the under-reporting of male rape victims. Men may consider rape victimization as incompatible with their sense of masculine identity, specifically, the under-reporting of male rape could read as a combination of shame, fear, guilt and stigma (Stanko and Hobdell, 1993). Additionally, Abdullah-Khan (2008) study showcases that, although law enforcement is obliged by legal actions to limit their own prejudices, this is seemingly rather difficult. This study concluded that ‘it is difficult for officers to see how an adult male can let himself get into a situation where he can get raped and be unable to physically protect himself’ (Abdullah-Khan, 2008: 171). This wariness of the police force’s ability to police rape victims respectfully may indeed be a great barrier, and lend itself as a major factor for the victims’ withdrawal from the process altogether (Stanko, 1985).

It follows, once again, it is recognizable that this sample partake in a sense of negotiation of what constitutes as legitimate male rape victimization. The participants discussed the ways in
which the dimensions outlined in 5.3 Situational and relational dimensions of male rape dynamics nourish its perceived dynamics, consequently they emphasize that, particularly female on male rape dynamics are troublesome in terms of comprehension. This was dependent on various elements such as how the raped man’s sense of masculinity has been effected, rather fractured, in terms of not living up to the normative masculine standards and how the masculine essence is fractured when raped by a woman due to the social constructions of gender roles. Whereby women are perceived as physically smaller than men and not necessarily inhabiting components harmonized with a rapist. Moreover, the participants emphasized the notion of culpability in terms of perceived male sexual integrity and the principle of resistance. Men are oftentimes viewed as having a fragmented sexual integrity, consequently the participants thought men are more likely to define their victimization as a regrettable sexual encounter as opposed to rape as they thought it would be challenging for the man to be perceived as credible. Furthermore, that the principle of resistance, rather the lack of, is integral in determining the culpability of the man; men are expected to sufficiently fend off their (female) attacker thereby not being subjected to rape altogether.
6 Conclusion

It has been the objective of this thesis to explore and access societal perceptions of how the perceived dynamics of male rape interact with notions of victimhood and norms of masculinity. Additionally, to disclose the gendered dimensions of male rape dynamics, and illustrate how criminological academic contributions, alongside the modest empirical sample, might aid in the comprehension of these phenomena. Subsequently, it has facilitated contextual access to defining features and structural dimensions within the dynamics of male rape.

A characteristic trait of this thesis is how the participants oftentimes seemed to ambivalently negotiate the conditions for what constitutes as male rape, through the overarching male rape dynamics further sorted into specific dimensions, and then the perceived consequences of these dimensions. Male rape is indeed perceived as a potential rape dynamic, but only when placed within certain dimensions and ascribed conditions. They negotiate the interacted transferability of male rape dynamics into idealizations of rape victimhood and masculinity, and the ways in which these polarizing idealizations intersect. One defining feature of this interaction is evident in the fractured status when attempting to align these idealizations. On the one hand, there are some dimensions of male rape dynamics that somewhat align with both normative masculinity and idealized victimhood. On the other hand, there are dimensions which contradict these notions, consequently rendering the male rape victims’ status fractured. In this sense, the outcome of these constructions suggest that male rape victims do not fully live up to the idealization of a victim and still maintain the normative masculine identity. This is evident in how the participants subscribed, for instance, feminized characteristic when describing a male rape victim. Furthermore, the outcome of the negotiations of the specific exemptions when considering male rape dynamic as legitimate indicate that there are some determining dimensions such as; the perpetrators gender, victims age, whether the victimized man was under the influence of drugs, situational and relational contexts. As well as, the consequences of the dimensions within specifically female on male rape mounted to; principle of resistance, sexual integrity and how they presumed the male victim would governed this fractured masculine identity.
By extension, the media-influenced negotiations of what the participants constituted as a rape victim indicate that some defining features connotes with Christie (1986a) analysis, whereby they assigned characteristics such as defenseless, vulnerable and young. Nonetheless, they also drafted a contemporary understanding of the idealized rape victim whereby they assigned the notion of culpability, which Jacobsen and Skilbrei (2010) coins as ‘reproachable victims’. The participants typically acknowledged that women, and to a lesser extent men, could be subjected to sexual violence and rape, consequently being acknowledged as legitimate victims. Yet they also emphasized the notion of being, to some extent, accountable or at least having contributed in their victimization. For female victims this was refined to being morally obliged to prevent their victimization through ‘preventative measures’ and, when victimized, report their victimization to law enforcement in order to aid in preventing rape as a whole. Whereas men were expected to take action and successfully prevent being sexually victimized altogether, which one can draw parallels to the understandings of normative masculinity (Messerschmidt, 1993; Connell, 1995; Jon, 2015). However, when failing to do so, men were positioned in a rather feminized condition corresponding with the feminized constructions of rape victimhood, consequently having, to some extent, renounce their masculine identity. Moreover, the participants thought of the occurrence of male rape as habitually intertwined with male on male institutional settings, more specially prison settings, suggesting that this is regarded as a legitimate setting. Interestingly it reinforces the perception that male rape is regarded as legitimate when incarcerated or otherwise restricted in terms of personal and masculine autonomy. Additionally, that male rape is dominance governed, and perceived as the utmost manner of humiliating and impair the male subject whereby men oftentimes are socially disowned rather than restored by the feminization (Kaye, under publication). Similarly, the empirical indication of this thesis, when considering female on male rape, suggest that men must, to some extent, be impaired to be raped, through means of drugs, being young or experiencing the moral pressure of conforming to his ‘duties’ as man. However, the participants typically found it more challenging to recognize the plausibility of female on male rape, it was not considered as a potential scenario in our cultural scripts. This was expressed through, for instance, how they presumed men would be greeted by law enforcement; disbelief. Furthermore, the participants emphasized that men would encounter challenges with being perceived as credible. Conditioning this to cultural understandings of male sexuality and the principle of resistance. Whereby, men would, due to the polarization of normative masculinity and moral structure that embodies rape victimhood,
not be regarded as the most credible. Thus, the participants predicted that, according to this sample, men would be more likely to define their victimization as a regrettable sexual encounter as opposed to rape. Men would be judged more harshly than their female counterparts due to the expectance of sufficiently resisting the attack, therefore one participant claimed that it could ‘make or break your credibility as a victim’. Consequently, rendering the masculine male rape victim a paradox, much due to the difficulties with fully conforming to both the idealized understandings of victimhood and normative masculinity. Significantly, it indicates that both statuses, rape victim and masculine man, are fractured in some sense if they intersect.

It is also important to make a note of the applicability of traditional understandings of normative masculinity and the ideal victim, which has been the theoretical anchor of this thesis, when applied in a Norwegian context. The findings presented indicate added dimensions, and alterations, to transcend these influential concepts into Norwegian cultural scripts. For instance, Christie’s (1986a) notion of ideal victim has been subscribed added dimensions in terms of how idealized victimhood consists of the defining features from his analysis, but also the notion of ‘reproachable victims’. Whereby a legitimate victim is, on the one hand passive and compliant with the established feminine connotations of victimhood, on the other hand they are morally presumed as actively taking responsibility for their victimization subsequently aiding in the prevention of rape. In terms of Messerschmidt’s (1993) interpretation of hegemonic masculinity, it is evident that much like the implications of Jon (2014), Ervø and Johansen (2003) and Reuterstrand (2004), contemporary understanding of normative masculinity has the added dimension of incorporating softer and more compassionate segments in life. Ultimately, the empirical findings in this thesis suggest that, within Norwegian cultural scripts, men are too expected to inhabit compassionate and humble traits as this ‘shows that you’re comfortable with yourself and your masculinity’. Significantly though, the participants negotiated this as something a man should include in is masculine identity when appropriate, while still remaining rather consistent with established normative masculine norms such as being assertive, confident and strong-willed.

The negotiated dynamics presented in this thesis illustrate the challenging task it truly is to identify the determining dimensions within male rape dynamics and its legitimacy; there are certain dimensions more recognized than others for a host of various reasons. Although, it is not this thesis main objective to determine how male victims of rape obtain, or has restricted,
access in victimhood, one might presume that the dimensions presented influence this achievement as indicated in 4.3 Male rape: a restricted category within the conceptualization of rape victimhood? Subsequently, it is of importance to highlight the complexities and subjectivities that is so recognizable when conceptualizing rape victimization, especially when attempting to align normative masculine identities with ideal victimhood, evident in their polarizing nature. Having considered this, the phenomena of male rape dynamics warrant further attention and research. Although, the intention of this thesis is not to generalize, nor is it able to, the perceptions illustrated does put forward several interesting questions as to the dynamics of male rape which still resides as a relatively unexplored field. Even though this thesis does not arrange insight into how men themselves view this dynamic and its interaction with notions of victimhood and norms of masculinity, it does facilitate insight into a rather neglected rape dynamic through societal perceptions. Hopefully then, this thesis and its findings might serve as a modest contribution to expanding the knowledge on one of the most heatedly discussed topics in present social and official discourses; rape victimization.
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ØNSKER DU Å DELTA I ET SPENNENDE FORSKINGSPROJEKT?

_Hva tenker du om menn som voldtektofre og kjønnsroller i voldtektssituasjoner?_

Mitt navn er Emilie og jeg er masterstudent i Kriminologi UiO. Dette forskingsprosjektet har som formål å tydeliggjøre sosiale holdninger til menn som voldtektofre, kjønnsroller i voldtektssituasjoner og hvordan samfunnet forstår dette fenomenet. Studien vil mer spesifikt forsøke å belyse dette fenomenet gjennom individuelle intervjuer basert på tanker og holdninger til offer - overgriper relasjon, egenskaper i voldtekt situasjoner, relasjoner og kjønnsroller. Jeg ønsker å komme i kontakt med høyskoleutdannede menn og kvinner mellom 18-35.

Som deltaker i dette forskningsprosjektet vil du bli spurtt å stille opp til:

_Ett intervju på 40-60 min_

Sentrale temaer i intervjuet er:

- Dine tanker og holdninger om voldtektofre, iberegnet ofre og overgriper
- Dine tanker og holdninger om maskulinitet og feminitet
- Kjønnsroller knyttet til voldtektofre

Her har du muligheten til å bli bedre kjent med deg selv, samtidig som du bidrar til forsking som kan supplere kunnskapsgrunnlaget om voldtektofre. Minner om at alle personopplysninger vil bli behandlet konfidensielt og anonymisert. Hvis dette er av interesse, eller du ønsker å vite mer om prosjektet mitt, vennligst kontakt meg på:

_e.s.fjeldvang@student.jus.uio.no_
Appendix C: Participant information sheet

Informasjonsskriv om deltakelse i forskingsprosjekt

Sosiale holdninger til mannlig voldtektsøfre, kjønnsroller og egenskaper i voldteks situasjoner og relasjoner.

Bakgrunn og formål:

Hva betyr deltakelse i dette prosjektet?

Hva skjer med informasjonen om deg?

Dersom du har noen videre spørsmål knyttet til studien, ta kontakt med meg Emilie Skjolden Fjeldvåg på e.s.fjeldvang@student.jus.uio.no. Dersom det skulle oppstå problemer, spørsmål eller usikkerheter kan også min veileder ved Universitetet i Oslo kontaktes: professor May-Len Skilbrei på m.l.skilbrei@jus.uio.no

Studien er meldt til Personvernombudet for forskning, Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste AS (NSD).
11 Appendix D: Consent form

Samtykke til deltakelse i studien: Sosiale holdinger mannlig voldtektsøfrre, kjønnsroller og egenskaper i voldtektsituasjoner og relasjoner.

Jeg har mottatt informasjon om studien, og vet at min deltakelse er frivillig. Jeg er innforstått med hvordan mitt bidrag blir oppbevart, anonymisert og tatt i bruk. Jeg er med dette villig til å delta.

(Signert av prosjektdeltaker, dato)
12 Appendix E: Blank interview guide

(Typical introduction)

- Til å begynne med er jeg interessert i din mening om et offer generelt, og da spesielt et ideelt offer, når du ser for deg et ideelt offer, hvilke karakteristiske trekk tenker du at personen innehar?

- Hvis du skal se for deg et voldtektoffer, ser du for deg en mann eller dame da?

- Når du seg for deg et kvinnelig offer, hvordan ville du beskrevet henne?

- Hvis du kan se for deg et mannlig offer, hvordan ville du beskrevet han?

- Noen foretrekker å omtale seg selv som overlevende fremfor offer av en kriminell handling, hva tenker du om det?

- Hvordan vil du definere voldtekt?

- Hva er maskulinitet for deg?
• Tenker du at det finnes en ideal type maskulin mann i dagens samfunn, for eksempel i forhold til sosiale faktorer som: etnisk bakgrunn, religiositet, sosio-økonomisk bakgrunn osv?

• Hva tenker du hvis jeg forteller deg at en mann har blitt voldtatt. Er dette overraskende? (hvorfor?)

• Kan du se for deg i hvilke settinger menn være utsatt for voldtekt? (omgivelser, relasjoner m.m)

• Hva tenker du hvis jeg forteller deg at en mann har blitt voldtatt av en kvinne. (hvorfor?)

• Kan du se for deg i hvilke settinger menn kan være utsatt for voldtekt utført av kvinner? (omgivelser, relasjoner m.m)

• Hva tenker du hvis det er en mann som har blitt voldtatt av en annen mann?

• Hva tenker du samfunnet ser på som feminitet?

• Scenario: et kvinnelig voldtektoffer anmelder voldteken til politiet, hvordan tror du politibetjenten reagerer?

• Samme scenario, men da et mannlig voldtektoffer, hvordan tror du politibetjenten reagerer?

• Hva tenker du er gjerningspersonens motivasjon for voldtekt?

• Tenker du voldtekts motivasjon er det samme for kvinner og menn?

• I hvilke settinger er det mest sannsynlig at en kvinne voldtar?
• Kvinnelige voldtektsofre har i større grad tilbud om støtte som er tilrettelagt av staten og diverse organisasjoner enn hva som er fokusert til mannlige voldtektsofre, hva tenker du om det?

• Neste tema nå vil være rundt påstander hentet fra annen forsking og litteratur som kan gjenspeile ‘vanlige’ tanker rundt voldtekt. Det er ingen riktig og gale svar, jeg er bare interessert i å høre hva du tenker om disse utsagnene.. ‘menn er i mindre grad påvirket av voldtekt enn det kvinner er’

• ‘Menn kan ikke bli tvunget til å ha sex mot sin vilje’

• ‘Menn som forgriper seg seksuelt på andre menn er homofile’.

• ‘Tilstedeværelsen av opphisselse, ereksjon eller ejakulasjon innebærer samtykke på vegne av den personen som blir angrepet’

• ‘Mannlige ofre for voldtekt blir beskyldt oftere enn kvinnelige ofre fordi de ikke klarte å motsette seg handlingen og dermed ikke klarte å oppføre seg som "ekte menn"

• ‘Kvinner er ikke i stand til å være seksuelt aggressive’

• ‘Seksuelle overgrep av kvinner kan virke mindre traumatiserende for menn enn seksuelle overgrep av menn fordi det er mindre sannsynlig at det involverer fysisk vold.’

• Hvor gammel er du?
• Hvilket kjønn identifiserer du deg med?
• Hva er ditt utdanningsnivå?
13 Appendix F: Legal definition of rape

The legal definition of rape in Norway states the following (Norwegian Penal Code):

§192. Any person who

a) engages in sexual activity by means of violence or threats, or

b) engages in sexual activity with any person who is unconscious or incapable for any other reason of resisting the act, or

c) by means of violence or threats compels any person to engage in sexual activity with another person, or to carry out similar acts with himself or herself
