

“THERE ARE CERTAIN THINGS THAT I JUST KNOW THAT I HAVE TO DO BECAUSE WE ARE BROTHERS”: A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF YOUNG BLACK MEN’S ENGAGEMENT WITH POPULAR REPRESENTATIONS OF BROTHERHOOD

By

Sibongiseni Mkhize

Submitted in partial fulfilment for the degree:

Masters of Arts (Clinical Psychology)

In the

Department of Psychology

Faculty of Humanities

Rhodes University

December 2013

Supervisor: Dr L. Saville Young

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the following people for their contribution and their support:

- The men who participated in the study and shared their views openly
- My supervisor, Dr L. Saville Young for her guidance and patience
- My mother, Mazo for her continued prayers, support, love and encouragement in my studies
- My father Robert, my sister Nozipho and her husband Ngwane for all the support and prayers
- Members of the Mkhize and Zibani families that have been instrumental in my studies, you are greatly appreciated
- All my friends, Rev. P Mntambo, Ntwana and all the loved and special people who supported me
- And lastly, thank you my Lord Jesus for carrying me through and being my Hope and Strength.

Abstract

The present study analyses the discourses that young black South African men employed when they engaged with popular representations of brotherhood in the media. In particular the study explores how these particular young men view masculinity within brothering and what the implications of ‘doing brothering’ are as a result of this view. Drawing on discursive psychology, the study is located in a social constructionist theoretical framework and uses a qualitative methodological approach. The data used in the discourse analysis was gathered through focus group discussion of scenes from the television show *Generations*. The discourse analysis produced two major discourses in which there were different constructions of masculinity each influencing the way in which brothering was done. The first discourse constructed a ‘dutiful man’ who performs his brotherly obligations separately from his emotions, this discourse is in line with discourses of hegemonic masculinity where men are expected to fulfil obligations and are not expected to be emotional. Resisting this discourse at times, some participants in this study did occasionally construct men as having rich emotional lives such that the *quality* of interaction with brothers is constructed as more important, in terms of building intimate fraternal relationships, than the *amount* of interaction with them. The second major discourse constructs the ‘ideal man’ in two different ways: as the ‘good man’ and the ‘unscrupulous man’. The ‘good man’, like the ‘dutiful man’ performs the obligations society has placed on him, but does not receive the social esteem that is given to the ‘unscrupulous man’, who is successful and financially powerful. Although both these types of men are spoken of as possessing masculinity, the ‘good man’ is constructed as holding onto a type of masculinity that does not have a place in contemporary society. The findings suggest that brothering informs the way in which men take up certain masculine positions. The study contributes to our understanding of the construction of gender identity within familial relationships, specifically the adult brother-brother relationship.

Contents

<u>Acknowledgements</u>	i
<u>Abstract</u>	ii
<u>Chapter 1: Introduction</u>	1
<u>1.1 Context of the study</u>	2
<u>1.2 Aims of the study</u>	3
<u>1.3 Format of the thesis</u>	4
<u>Chapter 2: Literature Review</u>	5
<u>2.1 Introduction</u>	5
<u>2.2 Sibling relationships in adolescence and early adulthood</u>	6
<u>2.2.1 Changes over time</u>	6
<u>2.2.2 Closeness and sibling functions</u>	8
<u>2.2.3 Closeness and gender</u>	11
<u>2.3 The fraternal dyad</u>	13
<u>2.4 Theoretical perspectives and brothering</u>	15
<u>2.5 Social constructionism and brothering</u>	17
<u>2.6 Understanding discourse</u>	18
<u>2.7 Brothering in context</u>	19
<u>2.8 Gendered identities and the fraternal dyad</u>	23
<u>2.9 South African masculinities</u>	25
<u>2.10 Media as a context for brothering</u>	25
<u>2.10.1 Representations and the media</u>	26
<u>2.10.2 The media's impact on audiences</u>	27
<u>2.10.3 Gendered identity and the media</u>	28
<u>2.11 Conclusion</u>	29
<u>Chapter 3: Research Methodology</u>	30
<u>3.1 Introduction</u>	30
<u>3.2 Qualitative paradigm</u>	30
<u>3.3 Discourse analysis</u>	31
<u>3.4 Discursive psychology</u>	32
<u>3.5 Research aims</u>	33
<u>3.6 Participant recruitment and sampling</u>	34
<u>3.7 Data collection of focus group</u>	36

<u>3.8 The analytic process</u>	40
<u>3.9 Validity and reliability</u>	41
<u>3.10 Ethical considerations</u>	42
<u>Chapter 4: Findings</u>	44
<u>4.1 Introduction</u>	44
<u>4.2 Interpretive repertoire: The dutiful man within brotherhood</u>	44
<u>4.2.1 Ideological dilemma</u>	51
<u>4.2.2 Subject positioning</u>	54
<u>4.3 Interpretive repertoire: The ‘ideal man’</u>	55
<u>4.3.1 Ideological dilemma</u>	63
<u>4.4 Summary: The ‘dutiful man’ and the ‘ideal man’</u>	66
<u>Chapter 5: Discussion</u>	68
<u>5.1 Introduction</u>	68
<u>5.2 Discussion</u>	68
<u>5.3 Personal reflexivity</u>	74
<u>5.4 Credibility of analytic claims</u>	76
<u>5.5 Limitations and strengths of the study</u>	78
<u>5.6 Implications of findings and recommendations for future research</u>	78
<u>References</u>	80
<u>Appendix A</u>	84
<u>Appendix B</u>	85
<u>Appendix C</u>	86
<u>Appendix D</u>	87
<u>Appendix E</u>	89

List of tables

Table 1.....36

Chapter 1: Introduction

The relationship between siblings comprises of a sister-sister dyad, brother-brother dyad and/or brother-sister dyad. Literature on the sibling relationship notes that the relationship is characterised by warmth, involvement in each other's lives and also conflict and rivalry (Scharf, Schulman & Avigad-Spitz, 2005). While some research has explored the relationship between siblings as it develops over time, others have focused on the type of interaction and the level of closeness or intimacy between sisters, brothers and/or brothers and sisters. Literature from research that has compared the level of intimacy and/or closeness between siblings has often reported that the relationship between the sister dyad is more intimate than that between the brother dyad (Floyd, 1997). Previous research on fraternity, according to Floyd (1997), emphasized the negative aspects of brothering while not giving attention to how this relationship has the potential to have emotional as well as instrumental benefits. The literature which exists on the brother-brother relationship shows that brothers *do* experience intimacy and that intimacy is expressed differently from the sister-sister relationship (Floyd, 1997).

Edwards, Hadfield, Lucey and Mauthner (2006) hold the view that defining what a sibling is can be understood through both biological and social means. The biological tie can be understood by the fact that siblings come from the same family thus sharing 50% of the same genes whilst the social tie is understood through the idea that the sibling relationship is socially constructed through sibling interaction (Edwards et al. 2006). This then means that when considering the relationship that exists between siblings, one cannot disregard the context within which this relationship occurs as this will influence the way the siblings behave with one another. Considering Floyd's (1997) stance that intimacy may be expressed differently in the brother dyad as well as Edwards et al. (2006) noting that the sibling relationship is socially constructed through the sibling interaction, it becomes important to

consider the role of the social context such as gender, culture, family in influencing the way in which brothering is performed. I refer to 'doing brother' or 'brothering', borrowing from West and Zimmerman's (1987) article on 'Doing gender', because it is in speaking about or doing activities with brothers that the meaning of these fraternal relationships comes into being.

1.1 Context of the study

Through avenues such as television, radio and print media, the media is engaged with representing popular images of brotherhood. These popular media representations of brotherhood can be seen in the Sonke Gender Justice's 'Brothers For Life' campaign which draws upon the concept of 'brotherhood' to target mainly men in South Africa. The campaign aims to address the risks which are associated with having more than one partner at the same time, sex and alcohol; gender based violence as well as promoting HIV testing. Through using commercial advertisement, the campaign then draws upon brotherhood as a way of conveying to men that the decisions they make are important and that these decisions will have an impact on their future and that of their dependents (Brothers For Life, 2009). As the media represents brotherhood in a certain way to its audience, it does not only represent reality but it also constructs meanings and how things should be (Macdonald, 2003). Social constructionism argues that meaning as well as realities are derived through negotiation and are shared between people (Burger & Luckman, as cited in Edwards et al. 2006). This means that cultural meanings and social structures including the media should also be considered when trying to understand the relationship between siblings.

Exploring the sibling relationship through social constructionism, starts from the point that categories and meanings around being a brother, older or younger are subject to being socially constructed and the extent to which one takes up these categories and meaning is not a given but it can vary (Edwards et al. 2006). From this perspective, the brother-brother

relationship is not one that occurs in a vacuum; rather I argue that the relationship between brothers is subjected to both dominant discourses as well as to the structures of the lived social practices of age, class, ethnicity, gender and the like. It then becomes important to consider the act of brothering alongside an exploration of men's gendered identities (Saville Young & Jackson, 2011). According to Morrell (1998) masculinity can be defined as a collective gender identity which is not a natural attribute but is however socially constructed and changes over time as it is generated through particular situations within relationships which also experience change. Within the South African context, according to Walker (2005), versions and expressions of masculinity have experienced destabilization and disturbances in the post-apartheid era with the introduction of democracy in the country. Thus according to Saville Young and Jackson (2011), the way in which men do brother is shaped by the way in which they understand their own masculinity within a particular culture; as well as within a particular class.

1.2 Aims of the study

This study analyses the discourses that particular young black South African men employ when they encounter popular media representations of brotherhood. In particular, the analysis examines how masculinity is constructed within these young men's discourses as they talk about brothers that feature in the popular South African soapie, *Generations*. The research draws on discursive psychology which according to Willig (2001, p.91) focuses on "how participants use discursive resources and with what effects". The focus of this study is thus on how young men speak about being a man within brother-brother relationships. The data was produced from two different focus group discussions. The data analysis thus looks at the different constructions masculinity within brothering. Also the research is concerned with the effects these constructions have on doing man and being a brother and how these young men take up and/or challenge these constructions.

1.3 Format of the thesis

After this introduction to the study, *chapter 2* discusses the existing literature reviewed around adult siblings, brothering, social constructionism, masculinity and the media as a social context. *Chapter 3* describes the research methodology that the study used. It considers the qualitative paradigm and discusses discourse analysis and discursive psychology. Following this is a discussion on the research aims which is followed by a discussion on the sampling method, data collection and then the analytic process. The next chapter, *chapter 4*, presents the researcher's analysis of the data with elaboration of the discourses that were identified. *Chapter 5* is the conclusion of the thesis and it provides a summary of the findings as well as the reflexive process. This chapter also provides a discussion of the limitations and strengths of the study as well as the implications of the study and recommendations for future research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The definition of a brother is linked to one's understanding of what constitutes a sibling. The concept of a sibling can be understood by considering the genetic similarity that exists between siblings such as whether one has a full, half or step-sibling. However, this way of understanding a sibling according to Edwards et al. (2006), does not consider the emotional and social factors within a sibling relationship as it only places emphasis on the biological factors. The relationship between siblings and how a sibling is defined is also influenced by ethnicity, cultural, religious as well as political context. From this perspective sibling relationships refer to the dynamic interactions that occur between social structures and subjectivity (Edwards et al., 2006). The relationship that exists between and/or among brothers consists of an interaction that takes place within the family and also within the wider community; it is a socially constructed relationship.

According to Burr (1996), what is regarded as the truth is created and sustained through a social process, through interactions with other people in our daily lives. These interactions provide us with the current understanding that is shared between people. From this social constructionist perspective, exploring the media representations of brotherhood becomes important as the media is one of the social contexts which plays a role in influencing the way in which brothering is done. Exploring brothering within the media context also means exploring men's gendered identities that influence the way in which men do brothering. Masculinity according to Morrell (1998) is not a natural attribute but rather is socially constructed. The media provides a platform for the 'truths' about what it means to be a man within brotherhood within particular contexts.

This research is interested in the brother-brother dyad and specifically, in how media representations of brotherhood are taken up by particular men. This chapter will discuss

literature that is relevant to the research topic by means of a literature review. Firstly the literature will start by discussing sibling relationships in adolescence and early adulthood as this is the age group the study seeks to explore. In this discussion of sibling relationships, the literature explores the changes that occur over time as siblings develop as well as how closeness between siblings affects the functions of the sibling relationship and how gender influences closeness. As the main area of research of this study is the brother-brother dyad, the literature will then move to discuss the fraternal dyad and its dynamics. Thirdly, as there are different theoretical perspectives that can be used to understand the dynamics of the relationship between brothers the literature then briefly explores some of these. As already briefly noted, the study employs a social constructionist perspective and this will be discussed further in relation to discourse and brothering in context. The media, as one of the contexts which constructs brothering, is discussed before concluding. An understanding of representation theory (Fursich, 2010) as well as audience theory (Pitout, 2009) will be briefly given as this will assist in understanding how men's constructions of brothering may interact with the media as a context.

2.2 Sibling relationships in adolescence and early adulthood

2.2.1 Changes over time

According to Van Volkom, Machiz and Reich (2011) what makes the study of sibling relationships important is the finding that when linking the development of sibling relationships in childhood and adulthood, siblings have been shown to have an impact on each other's lives. Quantitative research on the sibling relationship has focused on the bond between siblings as having different characteristics as the relationship develops from childhood, adolescence and finally into adulthood (Floyd, 1995). For example in a study by Scharf, Schulman and Avigad Spitz (2005), 116 Israeli participants who were emerging adults and adolescents completed questionnaires and were also interviewed about their

relationship with a sibling. The participants included men and women. The research was concerned with exploring the development of sibling relationships. According to Scharf et al (2005), siblings play an important role in each other's social world during childhood. The relationship is characterised by strong emotional ties with siblings taking up different roles within their relationships such as playmates and care takers. As the siblings become older, the nature of the sibling relationship changes becoming more egalitarian and more symmetrical (Scharf et al, 2005). Van Volkom et al (2011) also note this type of egalitarian relationship which siblings have in adulthood while in childhood the older sibling is seen as possessing more power or having authority over the younger sibling.

During adolescence the relationship between siblings takes on a new meaning as the dynamics of the relationship change. As adolescents develop an identity of their own and as they develop an emotionally separate self from their parents and start to have a greater interest in their world, friends as well as romantic partners, there is less interest in their siblings and in doing activities together (Scharf, et al, 2005). Although the sibling relationship involves less interaction and thus less quarrelling as siblings move into adolescence, Scharf et al (2005) note that there is evidence that intimacy and caring between siblings may increase over this time. As siblings develop into adulthood, their relationship also sees the occurrence of more transformation as young people begin to separate from their families as they pursue their careers and begin to establish intimate relationships of their own (Scharf, et al, 2005). At this age, the interaction between siblings is no longer one that is facilitated by the parents; it becomes more voluntary and the relationship becomes transformed into meeting the developmental changes that is occurring during this particular stage of young adulthood (Scharf, et al, 2005). According to Scharf et al (2005) the changes that occur as the relationship becomes more voluntary, reflects the social and economic characteristics of the culture in which these participants are from. For instance, the economic

characteristics which the siblings are from could require them to seek employment which may see the siblings working most of the time. As a result of this, opportunities to interact with one's sibling become limited and require the siblings to voluntarily make an effort to doing things such as spending time with their siblings. Conger and Little (2010) also make reference to employment and its patterns as one of the factors which will have an impact on the sibling relationship as obtaining employment is one of the pathways into adulthood. They note that in addition to employment dictating availability to the sibling, the type or nature of the work can affect the sibling's relationship. For example one sibling may be more successful in their work than the other. However family and cultural obligations may see siblings assisting one another, even financially (Conger & Little, 2010). What the above makes reference to is the idea that the nature of the sibling relationship is one that is dynamic as it is something that occurs within specific contexts and these contexts then have an impact on the type of relationship that occurs between siblings.

2.2.2 Closeness and sibling functions

Rittenour, Myers and Brann (2007) consider commitment in sibling relationships and how this is influenced by factors such as emotional closeness. These authors define commitment as a "psychological attachment through which an individual intends to continue in a relationship indefinitely" (Rittenour et al, 2007, p. 169) and commitment is according to these authors an important part of any successful close relationship. Rittenour et al (2007) note that as siblings become older their relationship, as was mentioned above, becomes more voluntary and thus their commitment to the sibling relationship and their emotional closeness will impact on whether siblings maintain a relationship with one another.

Bank and Kahn (1997) state that the sibling relationship is characterised by different forms of identification with the other sibling as the relationship develops. They differentiate between close identification, partial identification and distant identification (Bank & Kahn, 1997).

These forms of identification are indicative of a feeling one sibling experiences internally and not a bond that is observable. While some identifications transform into another some are stable and endure a lifetime. According to Bank and Kahn (1997, p. 84), with close identification each sibling “feels great similarity and little difference with a sibling.” Close identification can further be distinguished into three kinds and that is twinning, which according to the authors creates a fused relationship; merging, that sees the relationship involving the sibling not being able to develop self-confidence and not being sure of their personal identity, and lastly the idealizing type of twinning is characterised by the other sibling being the hero and having their traits imitated by the other (Bank & Kahn, 1997). This theory by Bank and Kahn (1997) when explored from a social constructionist perspective suggests that individuals will construct their identity in relation to their siblings. For example siblings will note traits that make them similar and traits that make them different from their sibling and from this construct themselves in certain way. Partial identification is described by Bank and Kahn (1997) as the identification that develops when a sibling feels that only some of the other sibling’s personality traits are similar to some of their own aspects. This perception can come as a result of observable things such as similar choices made or physical appearances that are the same. The perception can also arise from less obvious characteristics such as spending time with the other sibling and doing activities together. This type of identification is, according to Bank and Kahn (1997), a way of reducing uncertainty about the parts one is not sure of in one’s own personality. Lastly, the distant identification is one in which both siblings “feels great difference and little similarity” with the other sibling (Bank & Kahn, 1997, p. 85). Bank and Kahn (1997) note that these types of siblings are most likely to be unable to resolve their own conflicts and will require the assistance of their parents because of the perceived differences. Their relationship will be characterised to a certain degree by resentment of the other. However this theory by Bank and Kahn (1997) can be

criticised for its assumption that the relationship between and/or among siblings fall into a specific category at a particular time and this neglects the dynamic nature of the sibling relationship.

In their research on the sibling relationship in young adulthood, Weaver, Coleman and Ganong (2003) explored the relationship between sibling pair type and the performance of sibling functions among young adults in college. In this study Weaver et al. (2003) used a sample of 224 students who were between the ages of 18 and 24 with 83,9% of them being European American, 7,6% African American, 5,8% were Asian American and the remaining percent being Hispanic. The authors used the *Sibling Relations Questionnaire* which measures “the extent to which functions are performed by the respondents and his or her sibling” (Weaver et al. 2003, p. 252). Weaver et al. (2003) define sibling functions or the roles siblings may fulfil as being identity formation, mutual regulation, defending and/or protecting the other sibling, influencing daily life through everyday interactions as well as the teaching of skills and abilities. Identity formation can be described as the way in which siblings influence each other’s identity through identification and differentiation. The former involves seeing aspects of themselves by viewing their sibling’s experiences leading to development of their own possibilities, and the latter is when siblings compare themselves to the other sibling and they view aspects about them that they do not want for themselves (Weaver, et al 2003). Mutual regulation on the other hand is described by Weaver et al (2003) as being the component of the sibling relationship that allows individuals to try new roles and behaviour and receive feedback on that behaviour before enacting it in front of other people who are not part of the family. With the function of defending or protecting the other sibling, this relates to when siblings not only protect the other from other people or danger but also when there is a need to provide care for the sibling when there is no one else available to do so (Weaver, et al 2003).

With reference to this research study, exploring sibling functions is relevant to this study as the participants in this research are exposed to sibling functions explored by the media with specific reference to brothering. An example of one of the sibling functions that the participants of this study are requested to observe in the media is an older brother performing the role of taking care of his younger brother in the absence of their parents. Weaver et al. (2003) notes that the performance of sibling functions is influenced by closeness between the siblings and sisters are more likely to provide or perform these sibling functions. This statement infers that unlike the relationship between sisters, the relationship between brothers is characterised by less performance of sibling functions.

2.2.3 Closeness and gender

In their research of gender and friendship, Bank and Hansford (2000) explored why men's same-sex friendships tend to be less intimate and less supportive than those of women's same-sex friendships. In their study, they tested six explanations that they thought could possibly explain previously documented findings of there being less intimacy and support in men's same-sex friendships. These included lack of parental models for friendship, emotional restraint, homophobia, masculine self-identity, competitive strivings and role conflicts (Bank & Hansford, 2000). Emotional restraint is described by Bank and Hansford (2000) as coming from the argument that men have learned to express their emotions less than women because although it may endanger their health and well-being it is perceived as consolidating their power. The lack of parental models for friendships stems from the notion that parental behaviours play an important role in signalling whether it is appropriate to have intimate and supportive same-sex friendships. High levels of homophobia are said to influence same-sex male friendships resulting in them being less supportive. Bank and Hansford (2000, p.65) define homophobia as the "fear of homosexuals and/or the fear of being perceived as a homosexual" and they suggest that this has more influence on men than it does on women.

This research points to the significance of gender identity in intimate relationships. The literature on masculine self-identity and its influence on same-sex male friendships is according to Bank and Hansford (2000) confusing as there is both negative and positive correlations with variables such as self-disclosure. This confusion according to the authors may be due to there being different ways of measuring masculinity as well as friendship. Nonetheless there is data that notes a consistency with the suggestion that the masculine self-identity is less likely to promote support and intimacy in same-sex male friendships (Bank & Hansford, 2000). Competitive strivings' influence on the presence of support and intimacy is more evident amongst males that are in same-sex friendships (Bank & Hansford, 2000). The above mentioned variables according to Bank and Hansford (2000) bring to attention the role that the socialisation process plays in the upbringing of boys and girls and the messages that are sent about friendships, intimacy and support. Role conflict, which is a situational condition that occurs when one's expectation of one role such as work, conflicts with another role expectation such as friendship (Bank & Hansford, 2000). According to the authors; with men traditionally being expected to be the breadwinners for their families, men are thus more likely to experience their careers as having a negative impact on their friendships (Bank & Hansford, 2000). In this study the participants (male and females) answered questionnaires and they found masculine self-identity was more influential in there being less intimacy between men in same-sex friendships whilst having parents with same-sex close friendships influenced the level of support in male same-sex friendships.

Weaver et al. (2003) notes that closeness between siblings is a reflection of the sharing of confidences, listening to each other's problems as well as helping each other. Based on the arguments above on same sex friendships, one might assume that brothers and sisters relate differently from another when it comes to closeness, with brothers sharing less intimately and therefore not being as close as sisters. Having a sister has been said to lead to a more positive

relationship as brothers are more likely to compete when it comes to achieving in, for example, their academics and occupations (Van Volkom, 2006). Floyd (1995) concurs that gender affects the closeness of siblings as well as the type of interaction between siblings. Van Volkom (2006) explains closeness as including trust, concern for the other sibling as well as enjoying the sibling relationship. Van Volkom (2006) further notes that the greatest level of closeness is between the sister-sister dyad and that brothers are least close especially if it is a brother-brother relationship. This would then suggest that the performance of sibling functions in the brother-brother dyad would be affected. Whereas there has been more research suggesting that female siblings report more closeness than male siblings, and this also being true for female friendships, Floyd (1995) notes that men develop closeness in *different ways* than females. So whereas women's closeness is linked to self-disclosure males' closeness develops through the sharing of activities and interests.

Matthews, Delaney and Adamek (1989) noted that not all brother-brother dyads can be described in the same way with regards to the kinship between the brothers. Further Matthews et al (1989) state that due to the role that gender role socialisation plays, men and women may use different vocabularies to express their feelings. Brothers will thus express their emotions differently to each other; however, this expression does not mean that the experience of the intimacy between them is not present. As a result the closeness between a brother-dyad may be manifesting itself differently from that of the sister-dyad. Kelly and Hutson-Comeaux (1997) argue that it is important to consider the context in which the brother-brother and/or the sister-sister dyad occurs because emotional expression may be influenced by learned gender behaviours.

2.3 The fraternal dyad

Having discussed the development of the sibling relationship and how certain factors such as closeness and gender play a role in the way siblings interact with one another, the brother-

brother relationship will now be explored. For the purposes of this study it is important to then explore research that has been done on the brother-brother relationship and more specifically their expression of closeness and other emotions such as love and conflict. Floyd (1997) conducted a study that sought to examine the nature of closeness, liking and love among 59 brother-brother dyads using brothers who were both full biological brothers and also non-twin adult brothers. The men in the study were between the ages of 16 and 33 years old. For the purposes of this research “five dimensions of relational development were measured and used in stepwise regressions to determine what predicted closeness, liking and love in these fraternal dyads” (Floyd, 1997, p. 196). Participants completed questionnaires that sought to answer the research question. Like this study by Floyd (1997), this research is interested in the brother-brother relationship and how masculinity is constructed within fraternal relationships.

Floyd (1997) describes brotherhood as being paradoxical in that it is a union between two siblings which can at times be a source of rivalry and competition. Besides there being a sibling bond between brothers, it is also a union of two males and is thus influenced by masculine gender roles and also sociocultural ideas that are against male-male intimacy which may serve to keep brothers apart (Floyd, 1997). According to Floyd (1997), this above mentioned description of brotherhood is not the complete picture as there is a degree of closeness and interpersonal solidarity between brothers with also a presence of significant emotional and instrumental support. Floyd (1997) attributes the distorted view of the brother-brother dyad within scholarly information to research conducted on fraternity emphasizing the negative aspects of brothering without giving attention to how this relationship has the potential to provide emotional and instrumental support. There is literature on the brother-brother relationship which shows that brothers do experience intimacy and do have close relationships with one another (Floyd, 1996; Matthews et al, 1989). Closeness according to

Floyd (1997) can be described as being a relationship that has regular interaction, diversity in interaction as well as the ability of those in the relationship to influence one another. Thus whereas the sister dyad determines closeness as a result of verbal self-disclosure, the brother dyad experience closeness in their relationship through more instrumental qualities, for example interdependence or commitment to being able to count on one another (Floyd, 1997). Another explanation for the apparent difference in closeness between the brother dyad and the sister-dyad is the difference in the measured attributes of intimacy. That is, research tends to focus on attributes of intimacy, such as verbal self-disclosure, without paying attention to male forms of intimacy such as spending time together or dependability.

2.4 Theoretical perspectives and brothering

There are several theoretical perspectives that explore the relationship between siblings and how one might come to understand the nature of the sibling bond. Due to the scope of this specific study it is not feasible to explore all theoretical perspectives. The attachment approach, social learning approach and the family systems approach are briefly described in order to understand the sibling bond. These theoretical perspectives were selected because they moved away from focusing solely on the individual and instead explored the individual in relation to other people and their context. For the purposes of this study the brother-brother relationship is explored through a social constructionist framework. A detailed discussion of this theoretical perspective is therefore presented.

Sibling relationships have been explored from the perspective of the attachment theory. Bank (1992) notes that a sibling bond does not necessarily mean there is a conscious positive emotion and that it can be associated with different types of emotions and ways of relating to the other sibling. Bank (1992, p.145) gives examples of a sibling bond that “can be warm and clinging, or fearful and ambivalent, or violently negative, or marked by chronic yearning and disappointment.” The attachment theory aims to explain the developmental changes and more

specifically the individual differences in social relationships. According to this theoretical perspective a child's relationship with a primary caregiver will have long-term implications for the type of qualities of their relationships with their siblings. Whiteman McHale and Soli (2011, p. 125) state that "emotionally secure caregiver-child relationships are thought to lead to close relationships with others, whereas insecure relationships may lead to conflictual, distant, or otherwise less satisfying relationships, including with siblings." Siblings can be used as attachment figures in both infancy and adulthood; this attachment may be facilitated by several factors such as the other attachment figures being inaccessible, the trust and shared experiences which developed between the siblings (Tancredy & Fraley, 2006).

Social learning theories state that an individual comes to acquire behaviours including cognitive behaviours, for example, beliefs, by either reinforcement or by observing the behaviour of others. According to Whiteman et al. (2011) research on sibling relationships from a social learning perspective has focused on the role which parents play in modelling effective conflict resolution strategies in their own marriage and/or rewarding their children when they have get along. However siblings also have their own role to play in reinforcing each other's behaviours and they also learn through observation and imitation of each other's behaviours (Whiteman et al. 2011).

The family systems approach focuses on the larger context in which the sibling relationship occurs and in this sense probably shares some tenets with a social constructionist view on sibling relationships. According to Whiteman et al. (2011, p. 133) "families are seen as hierarchically organised into interdependent, reciprocally influential subsystems that "hierarchy" ranges from individuals to dyads (sibling relationships, marital relationships, parent-child relationships), triads (e.g. parent-child triad) and beyond to ultimately encompass the whole family system, including grandparents, aunts, and uncles."

This study chooses to understand the relationship between brothers through social constructionism perceiving the context in which the relationship occurs as important. A social constructionist perspective on brothers gives attention to the dynamic interactions that will occur between social contexts and what is subjectively experienced. A social constructionist perspective argues that the social and cultural context gives meaning to how siblings interact. From this perspective the way in which the fraternal relationship is constructed within a given context (including through the media) is taken up in different ways by South African men informing brothering. The meaning of being a brother can thus be explored through the use of a social constructionist framework.

2.5 Social constructionism and brothering

Social constructionists argue that meaning, as well as realities, are derived through negotiation and are shared between people (Berger & Luckman, 1967 as cited in Edwards et al. 2006). The social world is then regarded as being of utmost importance with social history, current cultural and social practices and “importantly, the patterning of everyday conversations and social interactions lying at the heart of what it means to be a person and how we make sense of our lived experience, as individuals and as members of groups” (Edwards et al. 2006, p.9). Social constructionists view social reality as something that is not static and cannot be given a definite description but rather it is something that is dynamic and continuously shifting throughout the history of relationships. According to Edwards et al. (2006) our identities are bound together with the identities of others and through meanings as well as ways of understanding which are available to us at the time. It can thus be said that identity (being a brother), the way of relating with others (brothering), the knowledge people have and the way in which they conceptualise themselves and their relationships with others come to exist from social processes and the interactions that occur within a particular social environment (Edwards et al. 2006).

Within the social constructionist framework people are viewed as being both “competent agents who build the social world in communication with each other and create social meaning through interaction” and also as being “subject to the influence of powerful underlying social structures and forces” (Edwards et al. 2006, p.9). People interact and build different meanings and understandings of their social world from their specific social and geographical locations and from other characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, class and so on. With this in mind and considering the relationship of the brother-brother dyad, the media, as a social context, provides the audience with constructions of the relationship between brothers. These constructions are taken up in various ways by individuals; some may resist these constructions, others may reinforce them, some may adapt them in the way they construct their own personal fraternal dyad.

2.6 Understanding discourse

Social constructionism also focuses on the part that language and discourses play in the construction of reality. Discourses are socially shared meanings that make up day to day living within any specific context. Discourses play an important role in maintaining, negotiating, and forming individual identities and in constructing individuals’ interaction within a group (Beyer, du Preez & Eskell-Blokland, 2007). With the current research in mind, the participants who are a part of a brother-brother dyad are exposed to specific representations of brotherhood that are presented in the media and these are then discussed. The participants use language and discourses from their social context and also interact with media representations (which also offer particular discourses) to construct social meanings of brotherhood.

This study is concerned with exploring the discourses young men employ when presented with specific media representation of brotherhood. Potter and Wetherell (1992, p.7) note that the term discourse can be used in many different ways and they define discourse as being “all

forms of spoken interaction, formal, and informal and written texts of all kinds”. For McCloskey (2008, p.24) discourse is defined as a “belief, practice or knowledge that constructs reality and provides a shared way of understanding the world.” Discourse is constructed through everyday language. It plays out through different ideologies that place limitations on what can be said, done and written by defining what knowledge and truth are constituted of. When considering the relationship between brothers and how they interact with one another, one can assume that there are certain ideologies that may influence how the brother-brother relationship plays out.

2.7 Brothering in context

Exploring the sibling relationship through social constructionism starts from the point that categories and meanings around being a brother, older or younger are subject to being socially constructed and the extent to which one takes up the categories and the meaning they give can vary (Edwards et al., 2006). From this perspective, the brother-brother relationship is not one that occurs in a vacuum; rather, a social constructionist perspective argues that the relationship between brothers is subjected to both dominant discourses as well as to the structures of the lived social practices of age, class, ethnicity, gender and the like. It is these features of social life that shape the way men understand and experience both who is considered to be a brother and the way in which one enacts being a brother within the family they are a part of (Edwards et al., 2006). In addition to the influences which men receive from their family in understanding brotherhood, Edwards et al. (2006), notes that the cultural and power relationships that are reflected and recreated by the wider social context also serve to mediate the constructions of brotherhood and how to be a brother. For example Edwards et al (2006) notes that in the fraternal relationship one brother may have more power than the other brother. Furthermore what power appears to be is socially constructed by the wider context. Further one cannot assume that one brother possesses more power over the other as a

result of being the older brother, as other factors such as financial power may dictate in that specific relationship who is more powerful if financial position is hegemonic in that specific social context. The concept of social context interacts closely with the notion of culture. In understanding what culture is, Berns (2007, p.73), defines culture as something that “involves learned behaviour, including knowledge, beliefs, art, morals, law, customs, and traditions, that is characteristics of the social environment in which an individual is from”. Berns (2007) notes that these cultural characteristics are communicated in the social context and they influence an individual’s behaviour. The media can be seen as a powerful way of constructing what is culturally appropriate. This is one of the reasons why the media is consulted by this research when attempting to understand the relationship between brothers and how it is represented. By paying attention to culture as a feature of the social context, Nuckolls (1993) states that one needs to understand different cultures and their effects on sibling relationships.

The anthropological literature, in particular, points to how within different social contexts brothering may appear different. Studies which have focused on brothers in South Asia have found that brothers live together in the parental household even after being married as this is part of the culture’s ideal (Seymour, 1993). In a study Derne (1993) conducted interviews with North Indian Hindu men who lived in joint family households. The aim was to explore how North Indian Hindu men place emphasis on hierarchy and how the adult brothers are expected to live in harmony in joint households and how these influence or shape the relationship between brothers. In this study Derne (1993) interviewed 49 Hindu men and 80% of these men lived in joint family households with one or more married couples. In the interviews the men were asked open ended questions about the advantages and disadvantages of living in joint family households and about their relationships with their parents, wives and brothers. The study revealed that the cultural ideal of having harmonious ties between

brothers influences the men to build fulfilling relations with one another. The relationship between Hindu brothers is influenced by hierarchical ways of relating to one another due to hierarchy being one of the values that the Hindu culture emphasises. The men, according to Derne (1993), each felt that they needed to act according to predetermined roles as a way of contributing to social order as a whole, and this cultural ideal was possessed by the men who were interviewed as their own. This is evident in the men's own talk with each other as they reconstitute the ideal in their own interactions (Derne, 1993). Nevertheless, alongside this hierarchy the Hindu men in this study also experienced equality in their relationship with their brothers as this comes from their culture of emphasising the importance of harmonious brother-brother relationships. This is seen through the brothers being obedient and respectful. This desire to have an equal relationship with their brother comes from the individuals' own desire for freedom to, for instance, make their own decision. With regards to the relationship between the brothers, the study found that these Hindu brothers often live as near-equals under their joint family home. This is done through such things as shared leisure activities and they perceive themselves as working together under their father who alone is the one leading the family (Derne, 1993). According to Derne (1993) equality is valued between the Hindu brothers, which is contradictory to the obedience which the younger brothers, according to their culture, should show towards the older brother and it is this contradiction that causes tension. Although there is this tension between hierarchy and equality in the way these Hindu brothers relate to one another, there is also a focus on the importance that brothers compromise as well as cooperate as this can assist in preserving the brother-brother relationship which is valued by these men.

What Derne's (1993) study indicates, is that one of the things which should be considered when exploring brother-brother relationships is the context in which brothering takes place as the context influences the nature of the relationship (Saville Young & Jackson, 2011). When

considering the South African context, Ziehl (2005) found that in rural black households, the households are connected to each other through the male bond as brothers often live in close proximity to one another. Each lineage has its own head who usually is the senior male and the lineage forms a cooperative group which has joint rights over livestock as well as land. With regards to matters of mutual concern, members of the lineage consult with one another, they are also expected to respect one another as well as meet on special occasions such as funerals and weddings. Each member of the lineage is “also expected to accept the rulings of the lineage segment head (headman) in matters of dispute” (Ziehl, 2005, p.48). This means that the relationship between the brothers influences the way in which the whole family interacts. As a result, according to this Zulu culture, it becomes important that the relationship between brothers be characterised by mutual respect and that their relationship be one that sees the brothers communicating which ensures that their family remains cohesive in their interactions.

Nkosi and Daniels (2007) conducted a study where they sought to find what the family strengths among South African families were with a specific interest in the post-apartheid era. According to Nkosi and Daniels (2007) there are various attributes which contribute to the unique family structures in South Africa and some of these attributes can be seen as strengths. Within the South African social context there is a value which is shared that comes from the word *ubuntu* (in the Zulu language) and *botho* (in the Sotho language) and these words are ancient, meaning “humanity to others” (Nkosi & Daniels, 2007, p.19). At the core of ubuntu/botho is “the principle of unity of humanity and emphasizes the importance of constantly referring to the principles of empathy, sharing and cooperation in an effort to resolve common problems” (Nkosi & Daniels, 2007, p. 19). The individual comes to view themselves and their role in the wider social context or society only in relation to the community as a whole of which they are a part. This provides families or individuals within

the family with the culture of sharing which also provides them with the possibility of receiving support for the times when there is a need to provide the other with support in which ever form possible.

What these above mentioned studies show is that the way in which brothering occurs between brothers is influenced by their culture and the given family structure. Thus the way in which men will relate to each other within the brother-brother relationship will be influenced by not only what their sociocultural context stipulates but also by how they react to these constructions which are at play.

2.8 Gendered identities and the fraternal dyad

As was discussed above, the brother-brother relationship does not occur in a vacuum; it is influenced by social constructions of gender. It therefore is important to consider the act of brothering alongside an exploration of men's gendered identities (Saville Young & Jackson, 2011). According to Morrell (1998) masculinity can be defined as a collective gender identity which is not a natural attribute but is socially constructed and changes over time as it is generated through particular situations within relationships which also experience change. Other factors which make up part of the form masculinity takes include culture and class, and, this according to Morrell (1998), means that within a society there are many different masculinities with each of them having their own shape and set of characteristic features. According to Morrell (1998, p.609) "subordinate and subversive masculinities exist among marginal, or dominated groups and these may be oppositional to the dominant masculinity." Further, Morrell notes that it is challenging and also not helpful to attempt to understand and label a man as to which masculinity type they belong to. This stems from the idea that not only is masculinity socially constructed but what is seen as masculine changes over time and therefore masculinity is not fixed.

As a way of conceptualising the existing masculinities, it is essential to conceptually arrange the different masculinities so as to make sense of the power aspect of masculinity and this notion brings in the idea of hegemonic masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity is seen as a particular form of masculinity that is dominant within a society and exercises power over the non-hegemonic masculinities. Morrell (1998) further notes that it is not about the number of masculinities but rather about relations of cultural dominance. The hegemonic masculinity positions itself in relation to the other values expressed by the subordinate masculinities. For example in a certain context financial power, good morals, having a large number of children may all be requirements for the masculinities within that social context. However within the same context, financial power may be the most valued masculinity and it may thus be positioned in a more dominant position in the hierarchy. This then translates into prescribed cultural values of what it means to be a man (Wetherell & Edley, 1999). This means that a particular way of being masculine is more powerful and culturally accepted and those who hold and claim it as their own are in a position of power and privilege. Further Connell (2000) notes that the notion of hegemonic masculinity illustrates that it is not simply the idea that one is a male that becomes domineering, and also associated with power but that it is certain ways of being or 'doing man' that becomes the cultural prescriptions that ensures that one man is according to the social context more powerful than the other. Saville Young and Jackson (2011, p.10) note that reference to 'doing brother' is made "because it is in speaking about or doing activities with brothers that the meaning of these fraternal relationships comes into being". The authors also note that the use of fraternity as something which is being performed "such as the act of 'doing brother' emphasises that brotherhood is never complete but always being re-produced and renegotiated" (Saville Young & Jackson, 2011, p.10). Thus it can be said that a particular way of 'doing man' will maintain, reinforce or subjugate particular ways of 'doing brother'.

2.9 South African masculinities

Within the South African context, according to Walker (2005), versions and expressions of masculinity have experienced destabilization and disturbances in the post-apartheid era with the introduction of democracy in the country. With the country experiencing both political and social change, this has seen an increased emphasis on gender equality, and alongside this there has been “continued poverty, unemployment, violence and a high incidence of HIV/AIDS” (Walker, 2005, p.228). This has provided a context in which many South African men have had to renegotiate their masculinities (Saville Young & Jackson, 2011). Morrell (1998) also notes that within the South African context another factor which may influence the way in which masculinity is constructed is one’s geographical location within the country as certain locations may have a different hegemonic masculinities. As a result when a man migrates to another location within the country they are then introduced to another or new ways of ‘doing man’ and thus they may take up a different gendered identity. In this study the men in the video as well as the young men who participate in the study have moved from their homes to seek employment and/or to receive an education. These men may be in the process of renegotiating their masculinities as they have moved to another city. With the social constructionist perspective noting the importance of context when doing brother, the renegotiation of one’s masculinity in a different context may influence the way they do brothering.

2.10 Media as a context for brothering

Through avenues such as television, radio and print media, the media is engaged with representing popular images of brotherhood. These popular representations can be seen, for example in the Sonke Gender Justice’s ‘Brothers For Life’ campaign which draws upon the concept of ‘brotherhood’ to target mainly men in South Africa (Brothers For Life, 2009). The campaign aims to address the risks which are associated with having more than one partner at the same time, sex and alcohol; gender based violence as well as promoting HIV testing. The

campaign draws upon brotherhood as a way of conveying to men that the decisions they make are important and that these decisions will have an impact on their future and that of their dependents (Brothers For Life, 2009). Another illustration of popular representations of brotherhood can be seen in the South African television series, 'Generations'. The series has two brothers' story lines which run parallel to each other. The first story line is of two young men who are brothers, namely Zamani and Ajax and the second story line has two middle aged men, Kenneth and Paul, who are also brothers. For this study, these are the representations of brotherhood that are employed. What these representations do when they interact with the audiences is influenced also by how the audiences interpret them in relation to their own social contexts.

2.10.1 Representations and the media

For the purposes of this research, media is defined as being a medium of communication which operates as a forum normalising the social construction of reality (Fursich, 2010). Although the media collectively consists of television, radio and newspapers or other print media, this study focuses mainly on the media through television. Media has over the years been seen to reflect reality; this has been seen as being especially true within the informal genres of media such as film (Macdonald, 2003). However, within critical studies of the media, there is a stance that media cannot only, and does not, reflect what is happening in the real world. According to Macdonald (2003), media analysts favour the concept of representation which stems from media representation theory. Representation theory states that the media does not only represent reality, but it also constructs ideas of how things should be and the meanings which are attached to how things are understood by its audience (Macdonald, 2003). That is, representations are created by media which are the "central signifying practices for producing shared meaning. The representations are constitutive of culture, meaning and knowledge about ourselves and the world around us" (Fursich, 2010,

p.115). According to Fursich (2010), contemporary media can be seen as operating in such a way that it has become a forum for the social construction of reality, such that it is one of the agents which serve to construct, contest or even maintain certain discourses within the public process. Media representation theory can be said to develop a social constructionist view of the media. For example when considering the 'Brother's For Life' campaign, the relationship between brothers is portrayed as one that is characterised by standing in solidarity to work together against anything that may threaten not only the brothers but also threaten those they care about. In this campaign the relationship that exists between brothers is also one that is used to portray the way men are to behave and if they behave in the way that is presented to them, they prove or show themselves to be a brother and a 'real man'.

2.10.2 The media's impact on audiences

The question regarding the media has been about the influence media has on the audiences' thinking. In the past the dominant discourse was that the media plays a huge role in influencing the development of social attitudes and beliefs of its audiences (Philo, 2008). However, audience theory, and the active audience paradigm challenges this idea that audiences are passive and thus have no resistance against the media (Pitout, 2009). The notion of an active audience refers to how audiences interact with and responds to what it is that they are seeing, hearing and/or reading before they make a judgement. According to Pitout (2009, p.391), although audiences are not passive in their interaction with media representations, the media does however set the agenda, that is, active engagement "takes place within the boundaries and parameters set by the media". Philo (2008) states that because the audience is actively engaging with media representations, it can then decide whether to accept or reject that which the media presents to it depending on particular members of the audience and their own sociocultural factors such as culture, gender, class and the like. In their representation of the relationship that exists between brothers, the media

also makes reference to the role factors such as culture and social class in the social context play in influencing brothering. The representations by the media of the brother dyad of black men may be a depiction of what the media views as reality and/or that which the media is attempting to construct as what the relationship ought to be like. Thus the media may be attempting to shift the way that men relate to another as brothers and/or how this relationship may be used to influence and bring social change. However this representation of brothering and how it is used is then engaged with by men and through their engagement with this representation of brothering they either accept it as being true or reject the representation. The discourses that are used by these men will either reinforce, resist or subjugate the media's representation of brothering and this will also be influenced by their own social construction of the brother dyad and also by the social context that they are from. According to Fursich (2010) the media is an important agent in the way that the public processes understanding by either constructing, contesting or maintaining the current discourse about social interaction.

2.10.3 Gendered identity and the media

I have argued above that gender impacts on the ways in which men do brothering. Hegemonic ways of 'doing man' or of being masculine constructs intimacy differently from feminine ways of expression thereby influencing the way men 'do brothering'. In his discussion of the media's representation of gender, Hermes (2011) notes that gender is that which is viewed as appropriate and/or inappropriate ways of being a man or a woman. These are then referred to as masculinity and femininity respectively. These are significant as they indicate the way in which society is structured with regards to its power relations (Hermes, 2011). According to Hermes (2011), it is important to note how the media represents masculinity as the media presents to the audience some of the dominant constructions of masculinity and these form part of the dominant ideology that prescribes what is deemed

proper behaviour for a man. “The media, in their capacity of informing us about the world and as entertainers, show us an immense range of possibilities and practices of ‘doing gender’” (Hermes, 2011, p.194). However these ranges of possibilities do not have an equal value and it is not possible to show all of them.

Over the years the representation of masculinity in the media has seen some changes, for example although the male suit is still presented, men are also showing their bodies more. Hermes (2011) notes that in popular television drama, the average male actor spends time in the gym so as to acquire toned muscles so that he may have the strong body image. Masculinity, irrespective of the genre or the storyline will always be concerned with hierarchical difference and “power is the key ingredient for successful masculinity” (Hermes, 2011, p. 195).

2.11 Conclusion

This literature review has argued that the sibling relationship is one that is not only defined by the sharing of either one or both parents and/or the sharing of 50% of genes but it is also socially constructed. Conceptualising sibling relationships as socially constructed means that the way in which brothers relate to one another and the way they define themselves as brothers is influenced by dominant family narratives as well as by the discourses characteristic of the social world in which they live, discourses that constructs gender identities in particular. I have argued that the media also plays a role in representing popular images of brotherhood which the audiences then actively engage with by either taking up the representations or challenging them. As was noted above, in its representation of masculinity, the media is much concerned with hierarchy regardless of the genre and/or the storyline. This means that the changing social context in which men ‘do brother’ needs to be considered when forming a conceptualisation of the brother-brother dyad.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology that was used for this study. Discourse analysis, which is one of the many types of methods that fall within a qualitative research design, was used for the study. Thus this chapter will give an overview of this type of method which will also include a discussion of discursive psychology as a type of discourse analysis. Furthermore the chapter discusses the research aims, sampling and data collection for this particular study as well as the ethics, reliability and validity of the study.

3.2 Qualitative paradigm

Qualitative research is, in its own right, a field of enquiry that is according to Denzin and Lincoln (as cited in Henwood, 1996, p.25), “surrounded by a complex, and interconnected family of terms, concepts and assumptions.” Thus it could be said that qualitative research has been informed by a variety of intellectual traditions. Qualitative research argues that it is important to gain understanding through exploring the meaning of experience, actions and events. This importance comes about because the above mentioned are interpreted through the eyes of particular participants, researchers and cultures and these interpretations are done in such a way that they are sensitive to the behaviour as well as the meaning of that particular context where these would typically occur. Qualitative research can be labelled as being “interpretive, contextual and naturalistic” (Henwood, 1996, p.25).

There are several perspectives and methods of qualitative research within the social sciences. Silverman (2005) notes that the constructionist model in qualitative research prioritises the interaction which occurs over meaning which results in this model focusing on what people’s actions are while not specifically making references to what is being thought or felt by people. As was mentioned in the literature review chapter, the study uses social constructionism as a theoretical framework. Social constructionism, as was discussed in the

literature review, says that meaning as well as realities are derived through negotiation and shared between people (Edwards et al, 2006). Social reality is viewed by social constructionist as being dynamic and is continuously shifting in the history of relationships. Therefore, a social constructionist methodology is interested in the meanings and realities constructed within particular social contexts and what these meanings and realities do, i.e. what implications they have for action.

3.3 Discourse analysis

McCloskey (2008, p.24) defines discourse as a “belief, practise or knowledge that constructs reality and provides a shared way of understanding the world.” Discourse is constructed through everyday language playing out through different ideologies which place limitations on what can be said, done and written. In this way discourse is seen as a way of constructing social relationships and themselves as well as how people experience these relationships and themselves. There are different approaches to discourse analysis for example Foucauldian Discourse Analysis and Discursive Psychology. According to Willig (2001), although these two approaches share many features they are also different in their approach to discourse analysis. Foucauldian Discourse Analysis was influenced by the work of Michael Foucault and the post-structuralist writers whose work explored the “the role of language in the constitution of social and psychological life” (Willig, 2001, p. 91). For this approach to discourse analysis, there is a premise that knowledge does not only reflect reality and that what is deemed to be the truth is “a discursive construction and different regimes of knowledge determine what is true and false” (Phillips & Jorgensen, 2002, p. 13). This research employs discursive psychology as an approach to discourse analysis. What is evident is that the two versions of discourse analysis focus on different kinds of questions. Discursive psychology becomes the choice of method of analysis for this study because it

asks “how (do) participants use language in order to negotiate and manage social interactions so as to achieve interpersonal objectives?” (Willig, 2001, p. 91).

3.4 Discursive psychology

Discursive psychology is originally inspired by conversation analysis and ethnomethodology and it is mainly concerned with studying what is done with language thus emphasizing the performative qualities of discourse (Willig, 2001). Potter and Wetherell (1992) argue that people will use their language to do something. Phillips and Jorgensen (2002) take it further by stating that discursive psychology is also a social constructionist approach and thus has the premise that language is not only used to ‘talk’ but it is also able to shape identities, social relations and the understandings of the world. It is important to note that what is said is oriented to action and its meaning depends on the use to which it has been put. Therefore, the use of language is bound by its context, and this is important to acknowledge when using discursive psychology. Willig (2001, p.91) notes that the focus of analysis in discursive psychology is on how discursive resources are used and their effects, “in other words, discursive psychologists pay attention to the action orientation of talk”.

When talking, people use a “repertoire of terms which have been provided for them by history” thus there will be a range of constructions about an object or event and the speaker chooses from these options (Edley, 2001, p. 189). However these options of constructions are not equal as some become more available than others, some are easier to say. Certain ways of understanding what reality is become more culturally dominant and are then taken for granted as true descriptions of the world (Edley, 2001). There are three key concepts in discursive psychology and these include interpretive repertoires, ideological dilemmas and subject positions. Potter and Wetherell (1992, p.138) note that “the interpretive repertoire is basically a lexicon or register of terms and metaphors drawn upon to characterize and evaluate actions and events.” Interpretive repertoires are separate ways or different ways of talking or

constructing a specific object or event. Edley (2001, p.198) notes that “the main point of interpretive repertoires is that they are relatively coherent ways of talking about objects or events in the world.” The second key concept is ideological dilemmas which were initially aiming to question the idea that “ideologies were integrated and coherent set of ideas that served to represent the domination of the ruling sections of society as natural or inevitable” (Edley, 2001, p. 202). Ideologies consist of the beliefs, practices, as well as the values from a specific culture or society. The dilemma is that the ideologies are about the same value, belief or practice but they are however contrary to one another (Edley, 2001). According to Edley (2001, p. 203) ideological dilemmas are “characterized by inconsistency, fragmentation and contradiction”. The third key concept is subject positions, which is seen as the concept that connects “the notions of discourses and interpretive repertoires to the social construction of particular selves. Subject positions can be defined quite simply as ‘locations’ within a conversation” (Edley, 2001, p. 210). Subject positions are the identities which one places themselves and/or others in through conversation. Keeping note of how dynamic social constructions are, it is important to note that subject position may change in the discourses that are used in the conversation and/or between conversations. However Edley (2001, p. 210) states that this does not “imply that identity simply follows in the wake of discourses. We must remember that people are also the masters of language, the creators of text.”

3.5 Research aims

This study aims to analyse the discourses that particular young black South African men employ when they encounter popular media representations of brotherhood. In particular, the analysis will examine how masculinity is constructed within these young men’s discourses about brotherhood. How do these young men construct masculinity within brothering and what implications does this have for how they ‘do brothering’? The research draws on discursive psychology which according to Willig (2001, p.91) focuses on “how participants

use discursive resources and with what effects”. Thus discursive psychology concerns itself with the action orientation of talk and how the speakers talk about issues which are of particular interest and of stake to them (Willig, 2001). This means then that it becomes important for the research to pay attention to the interpretive repertoires used by the speakers. Interpretive repertoires are used to construct alternative and sometimes conflicting versions of events and these contradictions in the way interpretive repertoires are used according to Willig (2001, p.96) demonstrate that the discursive resources “contain contrary themes that can be pitted against each other within rhetorical contexts”. The focus of this study is the way in which the young men speak about being a man within fraternal relationships. Thus the analysis will look at the different constructions of masculinity and how these constructions are taken up or challenged by the young men in their talk about brothering. What will also be explored by the analysis is the effect that these constructions of masculinity have on ‘doing brother’.

3.6 Participant recruitment and sampling

The sample consisted of a sample of convenience as all the participants were enrolled with the university where the author is also a student, in their first, second and/or third year of study. In order to have students that fit into specific criteria that were of relevance to the study, the study also made use of purposive sampling. This type of sampling selects participants on the basis of the researcher’s judgement and this is done through identifying certain characteristics that are of interest to the research (Litosseliti, 2003). The participants of this particular research were male and had at least one biological brother. The participants were all black and South African and between the ages of 20 and 23 years. This study employed a focus group in order to collect the data and Johnson and Turner (2003) advise that focus groups need to be homogeneous, therefore it was important that purposive sampling was used to ensure this homogeneity. Furthermore, the use of purposive sample is

chosen for the focus group because each participant needs to understand the research topic so as to be able to provide efficient information and have an opinion. The sample comprised of 8 males and there were 4 participants in each focus group. As mentioned above, focus groups involve a discussion and the implication of this is the dynamic production of knowledge through interaction. This further allows the meanings and answers given by the participants to be socially constructed. The participants needed to be black South African males as the result of the brother relationships depicted in *Generations* being men who were also black and South African. The research also specifically chose black participants as it was interested in the interpretive repertoires employed within a homogenous group that are likely to identify with the characters on the television series. Familiarity with the show *Generations* was not a prerequisite for the participants' participation in the study. However the participants that were part of the study were all familiar with the show and with the characters that were the focal point of the discussion. This does not mean that all the participants necessarily identified with the characters on the television series merely because they are black men. In other words, it is important to be cautious of an uncritical assumption of (racialised) subjective processes of identification with regards to cultural consumption and media representations. The researcher approached the student Registrar at Rhodes University to request permission to ask black male students who have at least one brother to voluntarily participate in the study. The recruitment was done through a university mailing list (Appendix A). Among the participants 3 of the men were part of a set of twins. The researcher did not intentionally seek twins to be part of the study and the extent to which this impacted on the findings will be discussed in the final chapter of this thesis. Below is a table of the demographics of the participants that participated in the study.

Table 1: Table of Demographics

*Names are pseudonyms that were chosen by the participants

Participant's name	Age (years)	Number of brothers	Part of twinship? Twin also part of study?
Lizwe	21	6	Yes. Twin brother also in study
Sibusiso	21	6	Yes. Twin brother also in study
Khaphela	22	2	No.
Dumisani	23	1	Yes. Twin brother not in study
Quinton	21	3	No
Ben10	21	1	No
Drake	23	2	No
Antonnio	20	2	No

3.7 Data collection of focus group

The study made use of a focus group as its method for data collection. Focus groups can be defined as a group of individuals who have been selected to take part in an informal discussion on a specific topic (Vaughn, Schumm & Sinagub, 1996). What distinguishes a focus group from other qualitative interview procedures is its use of a group discussion. Thus it can be said that the goal of a focus group is to discuss a chosen topic in an informal manner such that it allows there to be a range of opinions as well as a complete and revealing understanding of the issue being discussed. What is important to remember when conducting

a focus group is that the goal is not that there be consensus around the discussed topic, in fact the discussion should encourage people to express their different opinions (Vaughn, Schumm and Sinagub, 1996). The focus group discussion allows for there to be a social interaction which further makes way for a variety of responses from the participants thus responses may be challenged, developed or even undermined providing for a generation of data that is rich (Litosseliti, 2003). Willig (2001) further notes that the statements produced in the discussion can be challenged, extended, developed or qualified in ways that will allow the generation of richer data for the researcher. This does not only compliment the study's use of social constructionism as a theoretical approach but it also compliments the study's use of discourse analysis which is concerned with how meaning is constructed among people through the use of language. This method of data collection was also motivated by the research aiming to find the interpretive repertoires that the young men employ when speaking of brothering as well as the masculine constructions and what effects these constructions have on the way in which being a brother is spoken about.

According to Vaughn et al (1996), the time allocated for the focus group discussion should be between 1 and 3 hours as this will allow an in-depth discussion and it is also important that each of the participants is notified before the discussion of how long the discussion will be. As was mentioned above each of the participants had a minimum of one brother and they were young men and this was done as part of the researcher's intention that the participants would thus have experience that would assist them in being able to provide an opinion. Two focus group discussions were facilitated by the researcher and each of these discussions included 4 participants. In each of the focus groups, the participants knew each other from previous social gatherings. This was good as it assisted the participants to be comfortable around each other and this allowed them to engage with the discussion not only because they could relate to the topic but also because they had previously engaged in discussions with

each other. The allocated time for each of the focus group for the study was 2 hours; however one of the focus group discussions lasted 2 hours and 30 minutes whilst the other was 1 hour and 10 minutes.

The setting of the focus group discussion is according to Bloor et al (2001) important as it needs to be located in an accessible location and it needs to be one that facilitates an atmosphere that will allow the members to be relaxed and comfortable enough to be able to disclose information. Vaughn et al (1996) take it further by adding that the room chosen needs to be warm yet appear to be professional and it also needs to be of the right size such that it is not too small but also not too big allowing for the number of participants to be comfortable in the space. For this study, the venue for both the focus group discussions was the television/lounge room in the Rhodes Psychology Clinic and both the discussions were held on a Saturday and this assisted in the prevention of any kind of distraction. The researcher also provided the participants with snacks and juice so that they could eat and drink during the focus discussion and this further assisted them to be comfortable in the group setting.

The participants were shown 3 different clips from a popular South African soapie titled *Generations*. The storyline of this soapie is set on the backdrop of the media communication industry in the city of Johannesburg, South Africa. The storyline celebrates the dreams and aspirations of South Africans who are making a success of their lives under sometimes challenging circumstances. The show's storylines depict issues that occur between families, lovers and enemies and it has rivalry, betrayal and blackmail between siblings, friends and foes. *Generations* was chosen by the researcher to be part of the focus group discussion because of the plot having parallel brother-brother storylines which showed men from different generations living in the same social context. The show has two storylines of two pairs of brothers, Kenneth and Paul as well as Zamani and Ajax. These are black South

African men that are Pedi (Kenneth) and Zulu (Paul, Zamani and Ajax) speaking respectively. Kenneth is part of the upper socioeconomic class whilst Paul, Zamani and Ajax are a part of the middle socioeconomic class. These brothers come from different generations with Kenneth and Paul being between the ages of 40 to 50 years and Zamani and Ajax being between the ages of 20 and 29 years old. The three clips that were selected for the focus group showed different aspects of these men's brother-brother relationship. Each of these clips was approximately 3 minutes long. Questions that were related to the scenes being watched were asked to the participant by the facilitator. The facilitator prepared these questions in advance to guide the focus group discussion. These questions were driven by the specific research topic (Appendix B). Putter and Potter (2004) note that the questions need to be real in that the members of the focus group do not experience it as though it is an exam question and that there is an expected correct answer. Different literature about the questions asked seem to agree that the questions should be simple, unambiguous as well as open ended (Bloor et al, 2001; Putter & Potter, 2004; Vaughn et al, 1996). Initially when the focus groups started, the facilitator noted that the participants wanted to provide answers to questions that the facilitator would be pleased with. The facilitator then mentioned that they could provide whatever answer they felt was relevant to the topic and this assisted in there being less silence in between the discussion. The participants became forthcoming with their responses however this also resulted in them at times drifting away from the focus of the research, however the facilitator was able to steer them back. What was also noted during the discussion was that at times the participants would ask each other follow up questions. With the permission from the participants, the discussions were recorded using an audio recorder device and the recordings were then professionally transcribed.

3.8 The analytic process

Discourse analysis is concerned with the way people speak of things and the focus is not only on language but rather on what happens when people draw on their knowledge (Johnstone, 2008). The research uses Willig's (2001) procedural guidelines for analysing discourse. The procedure of analysis, following Willig (2001) included reading, coding, analysis and writing. The first step was for the transcripts to be read and re-read by the researcher, this happened continually throughout the process of coding and analysis. It was important that the text was first read without an attempt to analyse it, this allowed for a developing awareness of what a text was doing and how it managed to do this (Willig, 2001). After the reading of the transcripts, the second part of the procedure was coding which involved the selection of the material to be analysed. According to Willig (2001) coding of the transcripts relies on the research question, such that it becomes important that all the material that is relevant (that is material that relates specifically to brothers and the construction of masculinities) is highlighted and filed for analysis. Coding assisted in the selection of relevant sections of the texts that became part of the data. During this process of coding interpretive repertoires about brotherhood and masculinity that relate to the research question were highlighted for analysis. When searching for these repertoires, the analyst was looking for those repertoires that were common across the data from both the focus groups' transcripts.

The third part of the procedure was the analysis. Willig (2001, p.95) states that the "analysis of textual data is generated by paying close attention to the constructive and functional dimensions of discourse." This means that the context, variability as well as the construction of the discursive accounts needed to be attended to. In other words, while analysing the data, the researcher looked at how the text constructs brotherhood, how these constructions vary across contexts and with what consequences they were deployed (Willig, 2001). The

identified interpretive repertoires were then analysed and discussed individually. The ideological dilemmas were also analysed and discussed in relation to the interpretive repertoires that were identified. The subject positions of the participants were identified, these are positions that the participants have placed themselves and/or others in when discussing brotherhood and masculinity. The final part of the procedure was the writing up of the research study which includes the methodology section and the analysis and findings of this study.

3.9 Validity and reliability

The theoretical assumptions and the non-quantitative nature of discourse analysis results in the traditional concepts of reliability and validity being unworkable in this context (Potter, 1998). However, reliability and validity still remain important concepts and they are not so clearly separated from one another within discourse analysis (Potter, 1998). Potter (1998) proposes that there are three considerations that are relevant to validity and reliability and they include participants' understanding, coherence and reader's evaluation. According to Potter and Wetherell (1992) because the phenomena that discourse analysts are interested in have consequences for people's social lives, the interest is then in the participants' orientation or understandings. The quality of this research therefore needs to be judged against whether it captures participants' views of what they share about brotherhood and what they see as different. This emphasis acknowledges that participants have their own understanding and the focus is on how participants treat the discourses (Potter, 1998). Coherence builds on the notion that the work of discourse analysis is cumulative, thus it builds on insights from earlier work and needs to be coherent (Potter, 1998). "A set of analytic claims should give coherence to a body of discourse. Analysis should let us see how the discourse fits together and how discursive structure produces effects and functions" (Potter & Wetherell, 1992, p.170). The analysis could be regarded as not being trustworthy and complete should there be evidence of

loose ends, if the features of the discourse in the data do not fit the given explanation. Reader's evaluation is based on the notion that discourse analysis presents rich as well as extended materials in such a way that allows those who read the discourse study to evaluate the adequacy of the study (Potter, 1998). Potter and Wetherell (1992) also discuss fruitfulness as being another important concept of reliability and validity. Phillips and Jorgensen (2002) define the fruitfulness of an analysis as being its ability to give other and new explanations. Transparency of the report is also crucial as this is also part of the validity. Transparency includes the inclusion of representative examples of the data and even giving the reader the opportunity to evaluate the analytic process and be able to form their own impression (Phillips & Jorgensen, 2002). (See Appendix C & Appendix E)

With the social constructionist notion of knowledge being produced in social interaction and if, as mentioned previously, that knowledge is dynamic as it is continually being developed and negotiated, the researcher cannot thus claim to be neutral and/or objective. As a researcher you create worlds through the questions that are asked to the participants as well as those asked of the data and Burr (1996) explains this as being the process of researching a subject or event as having the implication of participating in the subject's and/or events' construction. This then brings forth the importance of the researcher engaging with personal reflexivity (Willig, 2001). This personal reflexivity is according to Tindall (2005, p.150), "about acknowledging who you are, your individuality as a researcher and how your personal interests and values influence the process of research from the initial idea to outcome." With this knowledge on personal reflexivity, the researcher, during the research process engaged with being reflexive and this will be discussed in chapter 5 of this study.

3.10 Ethical considerations

The ethics committee from the Rhodes University's Psychology department gave ethical clearance for the research and the dean of students at the university also granted permission

for the research to be facilitated using students from the university. The participants received a brief overview of what the research was about and they then voluntarily agreed to participate in the study. Before the focus group started, the participants agreed and signed a consent form which said that they agree to participate in the study and that they give permission for the discussions to be recorded and professionally transcribed (See Appendix D). Another issue that was important was that whatever information was discussed during the focus group was not to be spoken about outside the focus group to people who were not participants. The participants agreed to this and were made aware that it was their responsibility to ensure confidentiality and not just of that of the researcher. For anonymity, the participants' names were changed in the data as this was agreed upon with the participants. The researcher also had in place procedures that would assist should a participant experience emotional distress during the focus group discussion. These included the researcher assisting the participant to reduce their distress by removing them from the discussion and debriefing the participant and then further referring them to the Rhodes University Student Counselling Centre. The researcher has the skills to debrief as she is currently part of the MA Clinical Psychology training and has experience from seeing clients for psychotherapy. In any event, none of the participants experienced distress during the data collection process.

Chapter 4: Findings

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter the findings of the discourse analysis are presented. The analysis was concerned with the constructions made in the participants' talk about brothering and with what these constructions do as they operate within a certain context. In particular the discourse analysis for this study was concerned with how young black men construct masculinity within their talk of brotherhood, as they engage with media representations of brothering.

The presentation of the findings will be structured as follows: First the interpretive repertoires that were identified in the analysis will be presented. Within the discussion of the interpretive repertoires, the ideological dilemmas and subject positions will be discussed. Throughout the presentation of the findings extracts from the focus groups will be drawn on so as to ground the findings in the data collected.

4.2 Interpretive repertoire: The dutiful man within brotherhood

The interpretive repertoire of the 'dutiful man' within brotherhood explores the different ways of speaking about why men will take care of their brother when they are in need. In their talk, the participants alluded to there being duties that brothers perform for one another and they constructed two different ways of talking about the 'dutiful man' within brotherhood. These ways of speaking about the 'dutiful man' followed after the participants watched *Generations* and engaged with a scene that showed Kenneth taking care of his brother's health needs after he had been diagnosed with cancer.

Extract 1

Sibusiso

Also I think we need to be very careful to not sort of, not try to place more obligations on him in terms of siblings. Like there is a certain amount of obligations that is expected. So I think in that particular scene we should go back to the catching scene. He is obligated to make sure his brother doesn't crack

his head as he falls to the ground and cuts himself. He is kind of obligated, but automatically that doesn't say very much about the fact that he truly does love him. I think at the same time like you usually, it is like when we were growing up and now of many instances whereby, if I have been legitimately angry with you for an example and you do fall sick, there are very big parts of me that just keeps going and I say okay fine like you will live, so I don't need to respond to it. And where you see someone like on the street looking really ill or someone falls over and you've got so much concern and you are actually really worried and I think it goes back to my humanist approach because sometimes when you find like people like on the street. I was with my friend once and I like went into a dramatic tizz and I nearly died inside because I was so worried about that person. But it doesn't really say very much more about the actual relationship at its core. It is just such an obligation that you are expected to have as brothers and I think that is what happens in this particular scene.

In the beginning of extract 1, Sibusiso starts off by saying that “*Also I think we need to be very careful to not sort of, not try to place more obligations on him in terms of siblings*”. In this statement, Sibusiso constructs the relationship between brothers as one that is subjected to a number of expectations from society related to what each brother needs to do for their brother regardless of their feelings towards their brother. Furthermore by speaking of there being a need to not place “*more obligations on him in terms of siblings*” the construction is that there is a number of obligations that continue being added to the ones that are already existing between brothers and that this addition of obligations by society may exceed that which can be handled by these men who are brothers.

In the above extract, Sibusiso refers to a particular scene from *Generations* in which Paul is caught by his brother Kenneth as he falls to the ground. In the above quotation the participant uses the word “*obligation*” to construct the brother-brother relationship: “*there is a certain amount of obligations that is expected*”. In constructing brothering this way, Sibusiso reinforces the idea that brothers have certain responsibilities towards each other that they need to perform due to social expectations. This constructs a certain type of man who

recognises this social duty and is willing to take this duty on over and above other things. Sibusiso also says in the extract “*He is kind of obligated, but automatically that doesn’t say very much about the fact that he truly does love him*” and he further states towards the end that “*But it doesn’t really say very much more about the actual relationship at its core*” suggesting that what we see in the brothers’ actions is not necessarily indicative of an emotional bond between the brothers, but rather an obligatory tie. Here Sibusiso constructs masculinity as an ability to leave aside one’s emotions and focus rather on one’s duty. The talk of a man that fulfils his duty despite what he wants or feels towards the situation or person further portrays brotherhood as a relationship whereby responsibilities to each other are performed not because there is affection but primarily due to there being an expectation. Masculinity within brotherhood is therefore constructed as requiring the fulfilment of family obligations and the severing of social roles from emotional feelings. In extract 2 below, Sibusiso further extends this interpretive repertoire by alluding to the context in which brothers are expected to fulfil their fraternal obligations.

Extract 2

Sibusiso *I don’t particularly think so, I think. I think uhm like historically, culturally in society there has always been that idea that says in terms of family there are certain things that you just have to do. Like I think it is, when twins died back in the day, when one twin died and the other one gets buried with him, even if they were alive, like you just knew you have to do it. Like you don’t particularly want to share your life with your twin brother but it is one of the things that you just have to do because society will cast a nasty eye on you if you don’t particularly want to but I don’t think that is necessarily a reflection on how you then feel and perceive a person. Like I know these for example, like there are certain things that I just know that I have to do because we are brothers but it doesn’t sort of have any real bearing on how I feel about him as a person or as my brother, it is just one of those societal norms I guess that says you’ve got obligations just meet them through, it doesn’t matter how you necessarily feel about them. That is why if you hear about those situations where people stop caring about their family, you become that rogue, that black sheep in*

the family, a lot is said about them, especially neighbours and extra family on the other side, they had a lot to say about that person. And they like to ostracize and they judge very hard really because they don't seem to be following family obligation but is not even about them caring, it is just about the obligation itself.

In the above extract 2 the participant speaks of the culture in society as being influential in what happens within the family context. This constructs a type of man that also performs the above mentioned duties towards his family not only because it is expected of him to do so by his family, but also because he acknowledges his culture and/or the society that he is a part of. Significantly, Sibusiso constructs this acknowledgement of culture and/or society as existing irrespective of how the man feels about the duty or of his emotions towards his brother. The participant also speaks about the consequences of not doing that which a brother is *obligated* to do by their family, culture and their society. The use of concepts such as “*black sheep in the family*” and “*ostracize and judged very hard*” by the participant portrays a man who does that which he is obligated to do out of fear of not being accepted by his family. The man is also constructed as wanting to portray an image or character that will be approved of by those around him. What is constructed here is a particular gender identity, specific to brothering in this instance that is very much performed for the social context. There is a clear prioritising of external forces (specifically social approval) rather than internal forces (feelings towards his brother) in determining a course of action. As a brother, this type of man as mentioned in the above extract fears being seen as the “black sheep” of the family and thus the relationship between brothers will be protected by the men in order for there to be no rejection not only from the brother but also from the family and even neighbours. The brother is portrayed as being dutiful not because he wants to do so or because he values his brother-brother relationship but because there is the potential that he will lose his social esteem.

When Sibusiso speaks about the expectations of the cultural context with respect to brothering, he talks of the expectations as having been present even in the past when he says “*like historically, culturally in society there has always been that idea*”. In speaking of the obligations as being “historical”, there is an introduction of a time frame regarding the influence of society on brothering and also the way in which brothering is done with regards to the expectations that society has placed on men. However in extract 1, Sibusiso states “*careful to not sort of, not try to place more obligations on him in terms of siblings*”. This talk of “not placing more” obligations on brothers, constructs another time frame in which brothering occurs, in the present tense. The talk of different time frames which is the past and the present constructs the nature of the brother-brother relationship as being dynamic as it sees there being more expectations being placed on the men over time. Thus the dutiful man may find himself having to do brothering differently over time with society’s influence also adding to its obligations on brotherhood. In extract 3, the participants further discuss the discourse of the dutiful man who disregards his emotions and follows instead his obligation.

Extract 3

Antonnio *I think he genuinely cares because also this is cancer. It is not like saying my foot is broken and I need to get to the hospital and so and so, for cancer is something really, really real for me. I think also when it is reality that someone might die and you actually realize this it puts all other motives aside. You know like this might be the last time I am seeing this person, so I need to act.*

Sibo *Does everybody agree with Antonnio?*

Drake *No I disagree. I think it is just an obligation. I think looking at ja, Kenneth’s character I think it is just one of those like, I don’t know if he doesn’t care or whether like who might be sick, what is going to happen to him that’s none of his business, as long as you know things are going right in his side. So he is just one of those ‘okay ja he is my brother’, so he is trying to buy maybe face like because he is here let me just say try to pretend that I care but deep inside he knows that he doesn’t even give a damn.*

- Quinton *Well I won't take it to that exactly ja but I think it has some level of obligation to it as well, just a bit because I do feel that their relationship is really, really rough and it is that on a normal basis they don't get along, just on a normal basis they are always fighting. So but at the same time I said you can't really take away the fact that they are brothers. So regardless of what happens, he is still my brother and I do still feel some level of, I think I don't know, I don't want to say accountable but it is like I do have a sense that I should take care of you at some point.*
- Ben10 *He is responsible.*
- Quinton *Ja responsible but I think most, the most, the big thing I think is the obligation to him, rather than really love, like love the driving thing to be.*

The above extract illustrates a discussion between the participants which was after watching the scene between Kenneth and Paul, with Paul disclosing to Kenneth that he has been diagnosed with cancer. The discussion that the participants in extract 3 were engaging in revolves around why Kenneth is taking care of his brother Paul during the time that he is ill. In the extract, Drake uses the words “*so he is trying to buy maybe face*” and “*pretend that I care*” which constructs a type of man who ensures that he is protected and puts first his own reputation when it involves his responsibilities of taking care of his brother. That is the performance of his duties is a shield so as to ensure, as was previously mentioned, that he remains favorable in society by “pretending” to care for his brother, taking care of his brother is an “obligation”. The man as was spoken of above is aware of how he is expected to fulfil his obligation towards his brother as his culture and his family expects this of him and failure to do so may result in him being “ostracized” and/or becoming “the black sheep of the family” and he thus performs his obligation not only to protect his image but also his position in his family and community.

What can be further noted about the construction of the man who performs his obligations as a result of prioritizing social approval rather than internal forces such as his feelings towards

his brother is the construction of a man as being able to separate his emotions from his obligations. In extract 3 Quinton makes a note of how Kenneth and Paul “*on a normal basis they don’t get along, just on a normal basis they are always fighting*” this is followed by stating that “*regardless of what happens, he is still my brother and I do still feel some level of...ja responsible*”. In the same extract Antonnio makes reference to putting “*all other motives aside*” and needing to act. In this talk the construction is one in which men are able to disregard their emotions and do what is expected or to perform their obligations not allowing their emotions to influence the performance of the obligation. However, in this construction of men possessing the ability to keep their emotions separate from their obligation, what is important to note is that the men are not constructed as not experiencing emotions in their relationship with their brothers. What is implied is that men *do* experience emotion in their brother-brother relationships but that this is not foregrounded or prioritized.

Even when speaking about the expression of affection between brothers, it is constructed as compassion which men are obligated to show towards their brother during the difficult times.

This is illustrated in extract 4 below where Antonnio describes how affection is shown from one brother to another.

Extract 4

Antonnio *But I won’t say more compassion during the hard times and during the good times it would be better though because it is easier to show compassion through the hard times, because there is something pushing you to. Whereas if things are all good it is actually way more difficult to show compassion because to take it into my context, if my brother is doing fine I am doing fine but most probably wouldn’t chat to him until I get a message saying hi things aren’t good, then I give some compassion. Whereas in good times I think that is when we actually really need to show the compassion to see some really true compassion. So what is the best way? Like even for example, well I just put it in actual context, if my brother is at the campus and things are fine, the best way I can show my compassion is just to go and pay him a visit during the week, without any motives. Just to see him and say; ‘hey things are bad now all of a sudden’,*

maybe show the compassion because during bad times you should actually be showing more compassion than actually just showing compassion.

In extract 4, affection is spoken of as showing compassion. Compassion is constructed as “being there” for one’s brother when they are going through difficult times as well as when they are not experiencing any difficulties in their life. However, according to the participant, showing compassion during the difficult times that your brother is going through is what is expected from brothers, it is a requirement. This further extends the construction of the ‘dutiful man’ who performs his brotherly duties as part of prioritising the social expectations of how he should relate with his brother. Showing compassion to your brother during the times when he is happy and is not going through any difficult challenges is constructed as being more affectionate. This is may be a way for one brother to show his brother that his happiness is celebrated and shared in by his brother even though he is not going to receive any tangible reward for doing so. This construction of compassion in a brother-brother dyad as “being there” for your brother and sharing in their happiness speaks to the presence of emotions between brothers although the ‘dutiful man’ within brotherhood is able to separate his emotions from his obligations.

4.2.1 Ideological dilemma

The ideological dilemma introduced in this section follows the discourse of the dutiful man who performs his obligations towards his brother as is expected or required by his family and the society he is a part of. This construction as was discussed above constructs a man who is able to separate his emotions towards his brother and/or the situation from the obligation that he needs to perform so as to please external forces. This ideological dilemma refers to the contradiction between beliefs regarding the performance of obligation which is what is required by society while at the same time valuing authenticity towards one brother which is

also constructed as an important social norm in the participants' talk. In extract 5, Dumisani speaks about how society responds to a man who does not perform his obligations towards his brother.

Extract 5

Dumisani

And like he says when lots of people, when someone becomes a black sheep when someone makes a decision to cut all ties with their family and when they no longer observe society's norms, that is when you get this, he doesn't love them, he is a bad person whatever. That is there are things that you do just because, just because. It is not really a reflection on how, like you can look at I only have one brother so it is kind of difficult. But like if you look at other relationship and the guy has more than one brother there can be the one brother who is so tight with, they go out they have the same friends, they play the same sport. Like the same thing is almost like when people are saying you are my best friend because we get along, we can sit we can have a conversation, we can watch movies together. We can do things together. And then other people are like, that is my brother like you know, the guy who come into the house and you just, you know you will be doing your thing and he will be doing his thing. He leaves, you eat supper together not because you particularly want to eat supper together, your mother says it is time to eat supper and let's eat supper. You go on holiday together not particularly because I want to go on holiday with you, the whole family is going on holiday. So it becomes a case of I observe. In that case I don't like you, you don't like me but I observe the rituals because my mother would kick my ass or whatever and that is it. Like if you want to determine the love someone have for another person you cannot judge it simply by what they do because those things they would do even if they didn't like that person.

In the above discussion about the 'dutiful man' who is responsible and performs his duty towards his brother out of obligation there are certain notions which are in contrast to one another, pointing to an ideological dilemma. At the beginning of extract 5, Dumisani notes that when one decides to "no longer observe society's norms, that is when you get this, he doesn't love them, he is a bad person whatever". In this statement, society is constructed as

placing importance on there being affection between brothers and this affection is constructed as being visible when brothers perform the expectations that society has set out for them. However, the ‘dutiful man’ performs his brotherly duties even when doing so does not align with his emotions towards his brother as he fears the consequences of not doing his duties, consequences that will be meted out within his social context. The contradiction is that whilst society regards a man not fulfilling obligations towards his brother as suggestive of no affection, the ‘dutiful man’ is able to separate his emotions and his obligations and he is therefore not being authentic in his relationship with his brother, a social norm that is also important to society. Another implication for the construction of the dutiful man is that in their relationships, brothers cannot be certain of how the other brother really feels towards them, even though they are taking care of their needs and engaging in the same activities as them. This can be seen in Dumisani’s talk in extract 5 when he says; *“that there are things that you do just because, just because. It is not really a reflection on how”* and when he also says; *“like if you want to determine the love someone has for another person you cannot judge it simply by what they do because those things they would do even if they didn’t like that person.”* This ideological dilemma is also spoken of in extract 4 as the participant talks about how brothers should check on each other even during the good times which implies the valuing of an authentic position. While at the same time there is an awareness of the degree in which brothering is also caught up in social expectations and this is seen when Antonio says *“because it is easier to show compassion through the hard times, because there is something pushing you to”*. Due to brothering involving social expectations it thus becomes difficult to find this authentic position that brothers do value. In their talk of the ‘dutiful man’ within brotherhood, the participants took up the position of resisting this dominant discourse. The discussion of this subject positioning is engaged with below.

4.2.2 Subject positioning

In extract 5 Dumisani speaks about “doing” things with one’s brother as well as doing things with one’s friend. Dumisani states that *“like the same thing is almost like when people are saying you are my best friend because we get along, we can sit we can have a conversation, we can watch movies together. We can do things together”*. In this quote Dumisani speaks of the things that he does with his friends and by this he is constructing the idea of intimacy as experienced through ‘doing’. However, when he speaks of doing things with his brother, the participant notes that the things one does with one’s brother is not because one would want to do them but because *“your mother says it is time to eat supper and let’s eat supper. You go on holiday together not particularly because I want to go on holiday with you; the whole family is going on holiday.”* And he further notes that when such things happens between brothers, it is will be because the brothers are respecting the expectations from their family out of fear that they will be punished should they not do as expected. In this talk of comparing the act of doing between male-male friendship and the brother-brother relationship, there is seemingly an attempt to value the quality of what is being done in relationships, or the intention behind what is being done, as being more important than just respecting one’s obligations. It can be said then that in the above extract, the participant resists the discourse of the ‘dutiful brother’ who honours his obligation by doing things with his brother as evidence of the presence of affection. In extract 4, the participant also adopts the position of resisting the role of the ‘dutiful man’. Antonnio adopts the position of valuing authenticity with regards to the brothering relationship. In extract 4, Antonnio states *“if my brother is at the campus and things are fine, the best way I can show my compassion is just to go and pay him a visit during the week, without any motives.”* In this statement, there is reference to having interest in one’s brother even when everything goes well. This points to there being a genuine intention of liking one’s brother and spending time with them as opposed to acting out of obligation.

4.3 Interpretive repertoire: The 'ideal man'

From their discussion of the type of men that are found in their social context and from watching the men in the scenes they viewed, the participants constructed an 'ideal masculinity'. Drawing on their focus group discussions, the analysis pointed to different constructions the 'ideal man' and also the effects of these different constructions on brothering.

The following extract is a discussion among the participants about the type of men that Paul and Kenneth are.

Extract 6

Lizwe *Well I think that both males in this particular instance don't necessarily have something that doesn't deem them to be masculine in any way. Like despite the fact that Paul is a moralist, despite the fact that Paul does right by to everyone and you know people respect him and stuff like that, he still is deemed as your epitome of moral fibre as a man of society, you know. So that is a person a lot of males should aspire to become. Kenneth on the other hand is unscrupulous in his ways and everything, like everything as Sibusiso has put it. He is dreadful, he is willing to step on dead people just to get far in life. That is actually what he is willing to do. But at the same time that is also another way in which certain people within society view males you know, as a man you need to take certain steps or certain measures to get far, to protect those you love, to be deemed a successful you know that is a measure of how you get far in life as a male, as a man in a corporate industry. So primarily based on that you can see that a lot of them hold similar traits of what it is to be a man within society; but at the same time those particular trades can clash and it is unacceptable you know. He is a bad person, Kenneth is a bad person, however he still, he would still be regarded as you know what, that is the man I want to become. If I want to be CEO of two companies and get far in life, that is the person I want to become if I want everyone to like me, at the same token. Ja they just, I think they both do have it.*

Sibusiso *I think there would be a vast difference of how society would have seen them, if I think individually Paul wants to be a man, masculine man I guess and he would still be okay but then he sort of contrast...*

Lizwe *Definitely.*

- Sibusiso *And you sort of judge a person like someone like Kenneth. Kenneth is the guy who is then trying to be the alpha male of the entire world, he wants to be the leader of the pack.*
- Dumisani *He is domineering and that is it.*
- Sibusiso *Like watching them from the outside, you would argue, people would feel that Kenneth is really rude, look at all the things that Kenneth has done to Paul. People would ultimately say Paul is a bitch because he has ultimately just let this man like run his life over in so many...*
- Lizwe *And as a man you have to stand your ground.*
- Sibusiso *And as a man, you go Kenneth you are dreadful, you are terrible but you are still a man because you are going to pick yourself up, you are going to keep doing things, you are going to keep on thinking you are strong.*

In the beginning of extract 6, Lizwe states that both the men Kenneth and Paul “*don't necessarily have something that doesn't deem them to be masculine in any way.*” This talk constructs masculinity as something that can be expressed in different ways and because of this, what is the ‘ideal man’ in society can be seen in the different ways that men ‘do masculinity’. In speaking of Paul as being a “*moralist*” and as the “*epitome of moral fibre*”, the participant constructs him as an honest man who does good and takes care to ensure that he does not do harm to other people. Kenneth in extract 6 is described as being “*unscrupulous*”, “*dreadful*” and he is spoken of as being the type of man who “*is willing to step on dead people to get far in life*”. This description is contrasted to that of the ‘moral man’, epitomised by Paul. The ‘unscrupulous man’, in direct contrast to the ‘dutiful man’ described in the previous section does not consider what society may think of him but does whatever will make him successful in life, even if this means he, unlike the ‘moral man’, is not seen as being honourable. In his attempt to “get far in life”, this man is spoken of as having a selfish motivation to succeed as he will go to any lengths, even if they may cause damage to other people, to get ahead. Furthermore, in extract 6, Sibusiso speaks of Kenneth

as “*trying to be the alpha male of the entire world, he wants to be the leader of the pack*”. In speaking of this man in this way, the “alpha male” is constructed as being the type of man who has achieved financial success and progress in his career and is ahead of other men even though he achieved this through means that society may not approve of. What is constructed in this talk, is a man who unlike the ‘dutiful man’ is prepared to go against what society is expecting of him in terms of his intimate relationships, as long as the goal is financial success, this is allowed and even rewarded. Further in the participants talk about the CEO, they state that there are certain things that a man will need to do in order to gain this position. Lizwe states that “*he is willing to step on dead people just to get far in life*” and he also says that “*as a man you need to take certain steps or certain measures to get far*”. This talk implies that to be a CEO of a company a man needs to do things that may cause harm to the next person. This differs from the ‘moral man’ who receives social approval from his society. However as will be seen also in extract 7, the ‘moral man’ is referred to as a ‘bitch’ and this a derogatory female term. This constructs the ‘moral man’ who has an honourable attitude as being somehow feminine and is seen as being lesser than the ‘unscrupulous man’s’ masculine stance who is also the ‘*alpha male*’ of society.

Extract 7 continues with the discussion of the type of men that Paul and Kenneth are and in this extract Khaphela speaks of Paul as still being an ‘ideal man’ who constructs a different kind of masculinity.

Extract 7

- Khaphela *I think Paul plays his role well in terms of being the...*
- Lizwe *The bitch!*
- Khaphela *No. Not necessary but just in terms of the moral fibre it casts. The moral fibre, the chivalry, the let me get away from everyone, let me just go and die by myself. I think, like I think, and I think in so far as that is concerned, Paul still plays his role. He is still the guy who will be morally upright and step himself out of the*

situations and be walked all over and be all humble and yes perhaps but not necessarily be the, not necessarily ascribe or like link very much to the masculine, the alpha male kind of definition of masculinity. But it is something that links up to another kind of definition of masculinity where you just, you are the good guy, you are the good guy who takes it all and walks away and I think in so far as that is concerned, he plays the role very well I think.

In extract 7, Khaphela continues the construction of the ‘ideal man’, drawing on a discourse of morality. This ‘ideal man’ is the moral fibre of society and does what is expected of him as a man. In the extract when Khaphela states “*let me get away from everyone, let me just go and die by myself*” he is referring to the storyline of *Generations* whereby after his diagnosis of cancer Paul decided to leave South Africa without telling anyone so that he would literally “die alone”. In speaking of Paul as wanting to ‘die alone’ constructs a masculinity of not relying on others when going through a difficulty even when there is an illness. This constructs a man who is able to ‘survive’ by himself and a man who continues to function without intimacy even when he faces something such as death. This man is constructed as having physical and psychological bravery when faced with his own death. Together with speaking of this man as being able to “*step himself out of the situations and be walked all over and be all humble*” emerges a construction of a man who is self-sacrificing, this is what distinguishes him as a man. This type of man is further spoken of as being a “good guy” and according to the participant this type of man may not be what society sees as the “alpha male”, however, he is still spoken of as being masculine and the type of man that other men in society should aspire to. However extract 7, Lizwe uses the term ‘*bitch*’ that was used to describe Paul by Sibusiso in extract 6. In this extract, the term is used again to construct the ‘honourable man’ as being lesser than the man that Kenneth the CEO of a company is.

Thus far in the discussion of the ideal man there are two different types of masculinities that have emerged: the ‘good man’ and the ‘unscrupulous man’. In extract 8 below, the good man is constructed further in terms of his ability to express his emotions and this echoes the

construction discussed under the discourse of the ‘dutiful man’ within fraternity, as men are constructed as having emotional lives which often need to be hidden.

Extract 8

Lizwe *Zamani on the other hand is more sensitive um and his, his sensitivity appeals to a lot of women, he likes romance, romantic comedies.*

Khaphela *He’s a good guy.*

Lizwe *He’s a good guy, he’s like a Paul, he’s got a strong sense of moral fibre, direction, you know and that a lot of people find appealing.*

In extract 8, Lizwe and Khaphela are speaking about Zamani who is the older brother of the other character, Ajax; these brothers are in the other story line of *Generations*. When describing Zamani, Lizwe begins by noting that Zamani is “sensitive” and that this sensitivity results in him “appealing to a lot of women”. In this talk about what type of man Zamani is, his masculinity is portrayed as being something which allows him and/or women to be able to relate to him and thus find him “appealing”. This talk of the “sensitive man” as appealing to women also constructs him as being romantically successful which is a type of masculinity that is socially valued in heterosexual relationships. This type of masculinity is centred on his ability to express emotion which is linked to his ability to form relations with women. Following Lizwe’s statement that Zamani is “sensitive” and that his “sensitivity appeals to women” in extract 8, Khaphela interjects by saying that Zamani is “a good guy” to which Lizwe agrees. Talking about the sensitive man who appeals to women as being a “good guy” adds to the already existing masculine characteristics of the “morally upright” man described in extract 6 and 7 when the participants spoke of Paul. Furthermore, Zamani is likened to Paul in extract 8 in terms of having “a sense of moral fibre” and he is also described as having “direction” and as being someone that most “people find appealing”.

This type of man is what society describes as being the ‘good man’, one that will not only do good that will benefit them, but will do good that will benefit others. Masculinity for these types of men is characterised by being sensitive to other people’s emotions which not only allows that man to appeal or draw favour from those around him, but it also allows this type of man to be self-sacrificing as his sensitivity to other people’s emotions and needs allows him to do what is good for others. In the discourse of the dutiful man in extract 5 this man is constructed as behaving in a way that his mother will approve of and in the same way in extract 8, when speaking of the good man, he is also spoken of as a man that women will find appealing. Thus the ideal good man and the dutiful man could be spoken of as the type of man that women would like other men in society to be like.

Given the different constructions of the ideal man in society and the different masculinities at play in these constructions, the interest would be on how these constructions of masculinity influences the way in which brothers interact with one another in their relationship. Below are extracts that speak to the effects of these constructions of masculinity on the brother-brother relationship.

In the extract below, Lizwe responds to the discussion about the relationship between the brothers Ajax and Zamani and brothers Kenneth and Paul, specifically regarding the type of men they are and how this influences the way they interact with one another as brothers.

Extract 9

In this extract Lizwe was responding to the discussion on the relationship between the brothers Ajax and Zamani and brothers Kenneth and Paul regarding the type of men they are and how this influences the way they interact with one another as brothers.

Lizwe *...with Kenneth and Paul, Kenneth actually regards Zamani to be, regards Paul as a subordinate, as a bitch, as Sibusiso has put it, and that’s it. Whereas and Paul fights it a lot because it’s a show show down type thing, it’s an arrogance thing, it’s a power*

struggle, because even though the age gap isn't too big, they're old now, they're grown ass men, so they both want to assert this type of authority.

Kenneth has previously been spoken of as wanting to be the “*leader of the pack*” in extract 6 and, as can be seen in extract 9, the participants note the effect of this type of masculinity on his relationship with his brother who he is spoken of as regarding Paul as his “*subordinate*”. Lizwe constructs a man who will treat his brother as lesser than him, placing himself in the leadership position, as someone who knows better. Further in speaking of Paul as a “*subordinate*”, as was mentioned briefly above, Lizwe uses a derogatory female term (“*bitch*”) to describe Paul in relation to his brother Kenneth. Speaking of Paul as being a “*bitch*” is also present in extract 6 and in extract 7 when compared to his brother Kenneth. In speaking of Paul in this way, men in fraternal relationships are likened to a degraded woman if they are of a lesser social position to the other. However Paul is spoken of as fighting the position that his brother has placed him in and this is further spoken of as a “*power struggle*” between the brothers. The construction of masculinity is one in which men are encouraged to be a part of a battle between each other as brothers, each seeking to establish his assertiveness, leading to a struggle of power. The “*fighting*” for power in their relationship as brothers also constructs a discourse of there being sibling rivalry at play in the brother-brother relationship. What is also spoken of in describing the two men is that both are “*grown ass men*” and in using the word “*grown*” there is the inference that at a certain age men are to be responsible to take care of themselves and society thus expects certain achievements from them in terms of their social and financial status. What is also portrayed in this extract is how although one brother might be younger than the other, this does not prevent him from wanting to prove that he is a man and has the authority and is able to decide for himself, even if the older brother sees him and prefers to treat him as his subordinate. This

construction of one brother being treated as a subordinate is also spoken of as being influenced by the other brother assuming the ‘big brother role’ and also wanting to be the leader in the relationship. This can be seen in extract 10 and in extract 11 below: in both the extracts the participants are speaking about Kenneth’s reaction to his brother’s diagnosis of cancer, with regards to how the situation should be handled.

Extract 10

Antonnio *For me it comes from a kind of ‘know it all’ point of view because I feel in the story he is the big brother. So in a sense he has been taking care of Paul and so in his mind I think there is a bit of under estimation on his side. So I don’t know how to explain but like the best way I can put it is, like it is kind of a ‘know it all’ kind of view that he knows exactly what he should do and Paul should basically listen to Kenneth in a sense. So it is a kind of commanding kind of brotherly love.*

Extract 11

Ben10 *but then Kenneth is like to ‘okay listen here, this is what’s going to happen, this is how things are going to work’, he is the chief commander. So he knows how he is running the ship in everything.*

In extract 11 Ben10 speaks of Kenneth as being the “*chief commander*” and in extract 10 Antonnio describes the type of affection shown by Kenneth as “*a kind of commanding kind of brotherly love*”. The use of “commander” and “commanding” constructs a brother who is “domineering” and who wants to be the “leader of the pack”. Interestingly, in the above extracts, this is a slightly more positive construction of Kenneth compared to earlier extracts and Paul is urged to “*listen to Kenneth*”. Further what can be seen from the constructions of the ‘*unscrupulous man*’ is that when faced with an emotional situation (his brother dying of cancer) he is able to maintain his leadership position and formulates a plan of action, he is logical and is still rational. This constructs a welcomed escape from the emotional

significance of receiving a cancer diagnosis and this provides other men with more reasons as to why this masculine position is appealing.

4.3.1 Ideological dilemma

In the constructions of the ‘ideal man’ within society, the ‘good man’ and the ‘unscrupulous man’, the ideological dilemma is introduced through the construction of the latter being rewarded in contemporary society, despite not being liked by the participants.

Extract 12

Lizwe *But I was saying like in terms of masculinity, in terms of society and masculinity, I could definitely feel that point that indeed with Kenneth and Paul, nobody wants to be the Paul, everybody wants to be the Kenneth because it is all about consumerism, it is all about the being strong...(interrupted).*

In extract 12 Lizwe speaks about Kenneth as being the type of man “*everybody wants to be*” and he specifically links this to “*consumerism*” and “*if I want to be CEO of two companies and get far in life, that is the person I want to become*” as Lizwe stated in extract 6. In discussing the ‘good man’ in extract 6, Paul was spoken of as being the man who is the moral fibre of society. This constructed a man who is respected in his community and as a result is the man that other men should aspire to become. However, the participants’ discourse constructs a society in which a man’s financial status and his achievements in his career are valued, as ‘consumables’. Thus in the post-apartheid time, success for a black man is constructed as not being a man of good morals but rather esteem is granted to the man who will work towards being financially successful no matter the cost, as this is the type of man who will be able to provide financially for his family as well as be able to live a life of luxury. In as much as there is an acknowledgement of the ‘good man’ having the ideal masculine traits that other men should also be possessing, the ‘unscrupulous man’ is glamourized by the participants. What is implicit in extract 6 and 12 is that the man who is considered to not be the moral fibre of society, the man who will justify his means of

achieving his goal even if the means damages the next person is considered to possess more desirable masculine traits. In these extracts it is implied that masculinity is not only about the traits or characteristics that a man has but also about what the man has achieved. Thus a man's achievements such as within his career and also in terms of wealth may result in his other masculine traits that make him a 'bad person' being overlooked in society.

4.3.2 Subject positions

One of the ways in which some of the participants negotiated the above discussed ideological dilemma of the 'good man' and the 'unscrupulous man's' and their social approval can be seen in extract 13 when Lizwe discussed his position.

Extract 13

Lizwe *I try to subscribe to the same moral fibre and the same moral stance that Khaphela over here is talking about, you know, that we are trying to be good people and stuff like that. But at the end of the day I am a realist as well, I know that in order to get far in life you going to have to trample on a couple of people's toes, you are going to have to be that douchebag and try and be the alpha male here and I am all about winning as well. So I would like to find myself as the hybrid who brings, who connects all these two aspects together. Alright but when there is a clash, I know which one I'm going to take. I will sacrifice and cut a bit of loose ends to get far in life, that is what it is all about, it is about winning and maybe it is something that has been instilled only by watching television and stuff, because I get frustrated with people like Paul, because I feel like they don't get far in life....*

In the above extract 13, Lizwe states that he attempts to take up the position of the 'good man' who will be socially accepted and who will be willing to sacrifice his own desires. However, as he continues in his talk, Lizwe notes that because he is a "realist" he will take up the masculine position of the 'unscrupulous man'. In using the word "realist" to speak of the type of man he is, Lizwe constructs himself as a type of man who is aware of the limitations that come with certain masculine positions as these may result in him not being a "winner" which is, according to Lizwe, what the contemporary society has now become

concerned with. Furthermore although Lizwe constructs a possibility of the ‘unscrupulous man’ and the ‘good man’ both being masculine constructions that both receive social esteem, he constructs himself as taking up the selfish motive to success “sacrificing and cutting a bit of loose ends” to achieve and be placed on the highest level of social hierarchy even if it means disregarding his social obligations to his brother and society. Also in speaking in this way, Lizwe adopts a subject position of the ‘realist man’ who is at heart is a ‘good man’ but due to him being aware of his social context that he lives in he becomes the ‘unscrupulous man’. This assists Lizwe to resolve the ideological dilemma while at the same time putting blame on the social context and in particular a consumerist society.

The extract below, extract 14, introduces another subject position which sees Lizwe putting another participant, Khapela, in the position of the good man.

Extract 14

Lizwe *Okay just to sum it up because I think one, two, three feel the exact way whereas Khapela over here is entirely different and I will tell you why it is, I can see Khapela relating to Paul. Firstly Khapela is a traditionalist right? He is a moralist, Khapelo is the exact same person as Paul. Not just the Khapela in Generations but the Khapela that I see here as well right, that is Khapela. For Khapela being a man even in our post-modern society, he still values those traditional like values about being a man, being true to yourself, being [inaudible], that is him, that is him alright. What we can say about that is that being a man for him entails being a good guy and that is all well and good, being a good guy, still people are gonna respect you, you know*

In this extract 14, there is a construction of masculine identity or subject position of one participant by the other. In this subject position there is an account of a man who maintains that being a man entails being the ‘good man’ who has good morals and has the “traditional” masculine characteristics that are going to see him being respected as a man in society. In this extract the word “traditionalist” is used to describe the good man in the context of “the post-

modern society”. This talk conjures up an image of an “old fashioned” man who is holding onto the times when being the man of good morals was still a socially esteemed masculinity even though currently there is a move towards the type of man that is successful and has achieved his success through means that will not receive approval from society. The ‘traditional man’ is constructed as not living in the present and possibly holding on to a type of masculinity that no longer has a place in society.

4.4 Summary: The ‘dutiful man’ and the ‘ideal man’

From analyzing the data from the focus groups, the dominant discourses that were identified constructed the ‘dutiful man’ within brothering as well as the ‘ideal man’. The ‘dutiful man’ within brothering was constructed by the participants as being the man who will perform his brotherly duties for and/or with his brother even when his feelings towards his brother and/or the situation do not call for it. Thus, this man is able to separate his emotions from his obligations. The effect of this construction is to call the authenticity of fraternal relationships in particular into question. How do men know if their brothers really like them when performance of his obligations is influenced by his social context and the fear of the possibility of being rejected should he not perform his brotherly obligations? Nevertheless, participants argue that although society sees brothers who interact with one another by doing activities together as evidence of the presence of intimacy, the participants speak of the *quality* of the doing as being indicative of the level of intimacy shared between the brothers. What can be thus noted from the analysis is how fraternal relationships were constructed as promoting an obligatory tie. This obligatory tie requires that masculinity cuts off from one’s emotions in their fraternal relationship. Further, in the young men’s talk, they pointed to the possibility of the fraternal relationship being a relationship in which emotional lives could be valued. This valuing of emotional lives would be possible if effort and intent was put into interactions, outside of social expectations.

In the talk of the 'ideal man', what was constructed and what came across in the participants discussion is that there are different types of masculine positions that men take up within brotherhood. In particular, the participants spoke of the 'good man', drawing on a moral discourse. The 'good man' is honest and honorable, like the dutiful man he does that which is socially expected of him, however, he does it because it is congruent with his internal sense of what is right. That is unlike the 'dutiful man', the 'good man's' actions are done from a position of authenticity. The other type of man that the participants spoke of was the 'unscrupulous man' who may not be respected for the way he has achieved his success and obtained his social status but he is the type of man that most men aspire to be within contemporary society, a society concerned with consumerism. The constructions of the 'dutiful man' and the 'unscrupulous man' portrayed men and masculinity as having the ability to separate the inner emotional life from the social or outer life of societal expectations. . Whilst the 'good man' was constructed as being the man that women would want all men to be like, his social status amongst other men finds him also being likened to women in society. When these types of men who adopt different masculine positions are part of a brother-brother relationship their interaction was characterized as being rivalrous, with a power struggle ensuing between them as both men attempted to assert their authority. The problem with these constructions of the 'ideal man' is that although the 'good man' is respected in his social context, he does not receive the social esteem received by his brother who ignores society's obligations and becomes successful. Furthermore the 'good man' is spoken of as holding onto a type of man that does not seem to have a place in contemporary society. This ideological dilemma was managed through the construction of the 'realistic man' who is at heart a 'good man' but he takes up the position of the 'unscrupulous man' as he is aware of his social context and its consumerist practices.

Chapter 5: Discussion

5.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the findings and brings these findings into conversation with some of the relevant literature reviewed in the first part of this thesis. Towards the end of this chapter I evaluate the study, discussing some of its limitations and strengths. Finally, this chapter will include a reflexivity section in which I reflect on my role in the findings that emerge.

5.2 Discussion

The aim of the study was to analyse the discourses that particular young black men employ when they encounter popular media representations of brotherhood. The study was particularly interested in examining how masculinity would be constructed in these particular young men's discourses. The question being: How do these young men construct masculinity within brothering and what are the implications for how they 'do brothering'?

In terms of the analysis of the data it was found that the dominant discourse was the construction of men as acting or behaving towards each other in their brother-brother relationships in ways that are influenced primarily by their social context. This discursive construction of brothering as being influenced primarily by its social context points to the extent to which the social and cultural contexts are recognised by these particular participants as giving meaning to the dynamic interaction between siblings. This is very much in line with social constructionism which argues that meaning as well as realities are derived through negotiation and shared between people (Berger & Luckman, 1967 as cited in Edwards et al, 2006). Furthermore the findings of this research suggesting that men construct brothering as following the prescriptions of their family providing a different finding from the literature reviewed. In the literature exploring the relationship between siblings as it changes over time,

a study by Scharf et al (2005) found that in adulthood the sibling relationship becomes more voluntary and is no longer facilitated by the parents. This type of man who engages in activities with his brother regardless of his emotions so as to please external forces produced a discourse of a 'dutiful man' within brotherhood who honours his obligations. The honouring of one's obligations to one's brother can also be explained by the role that culture plays in brothering. As was mentioned in the literature review that the notion of social context interacts closely with the notion of culture and thus culture cannot be ignored when considering the social context in which brothering occurs. The definition of culture by Bernes (2007) noted that culture involved learned behaviour that is characteristic of one's social environment. These characteristics of culture are communicated in the social context thus influencing one's behaviour. However, honouring brotherly obligations constructs men as being able to separate these obligations from their emotions. This does not mean that there is an absence of emotions but rather that emotions are not expressed due to the possibility of there being social rejection with the neglecting of what is culturally acceptable. From this research finding, this research suggests that the construction of brothering as obligatory may have a negative effect on the relationship between brothers to the extent that the authenticity of brothering practices is brought into question. As was suggested in the findings of this research, taking up the masculine position of the 'dutiful man' may influence the way in which men will 'do brother' in their relationships. In the literature on the role of gendered identities on the fraternal dyad, Connell (2000) noted that certain ways of being or doing man becomes social prescriptions. With this Saville Young and Jackson (2011) make reference to 'doing brother' which emphasises brotherhood as being a relationship that is never complete but rather it is always being reproduced and renegotiated. Thus it can be said that a particular way of 'doing man' will maintain, reinforce or subjugate particular ways of doing brother. The talk of men honouring their obligations constructs men as being able to separate these

obligations from their emotions, but this however does not mean that there is an absence of emotions but rather that emotions may not be expressed in fear of social rejection. From this it could be noted that the discourse of man being able to disregard his emotions is dominant and this suggests that in 'doing brothering' the authenticity of doing activities for and/together with one's brother is neglected. Furthermore men were constructed as having rich emotional lives. This was evident in the talk about engaging in activities with one's brother that the importance is not in the 'doing' of the activity but rather on the quality of that which is being done. Review of the literature on brothers also revealed that gender role socialization plays a role in the way that they express their emotions; the difference in their emotional expression does not mean that there is an absence of intimacy (Mathews, Delaney & Adamek, 1989).

The second discourse produced by the data is that of the ideal man in which it emerged that there are different masculinities that men take up and also that brothers may take up different masculine positions from one another. In this discourse there was a construction of the 'good man' who is honest and honourable while doing what is socially expected with a certain level of authenticity. The second type of man was the 'unscrupulous man' who although has achieved financial and social status success through means not socially acceptable he is still the type of man most men in the contemporary, consumerism focused society aspire to become. Whilst the 'unscrupulous man' keeps up with the contemporary society, the 'good man' was spoken of as holding on to the type of man that does not have a place in contemporary society. The talk of there being a different type of man in contemporary society speaks to the literature that notes that what is seen as being masculine changes overtime and thus masculinity is not fixed (Morrell, 1998). From the findings both the 'unscrupulous man' and the 'good man' were spoken of as being masculine however the 'unscrupulous man' was the type of man that most men would aspire to become. Thus there is a hegemonic

masculinity positioned by participants in a dominant and powerful position while having the other masculinity as a subordinate (Morrell, 1998). As a certain masculinity may be dominant over others means that such men possess more power within the broader social context in which brothering occurs. Thus the power struggle between masculinities may then be present within the brother-brother relationship as the way of 'doing man' influences the way in which men 'do brother'. This may result in there being a power struggle as each brother attempts to ascertain his authority within the relationship and this may result in sibling rivalry. The post-apartheid era in South Africa has experienced both political and social changes which can be seen in the increase of factors such as an emphasis on gender equality, continued unemployment, high poverty levels, and so on (Walker, 2005). This has seen South African men having to renegotiate their masculinities within a changing social context (Saville Young & Jackson, 2011). The need to renegotiate masculinities by South African men was evident in the current study as per what was seen in the young men's talk. With the current hegemonic masculinity being seen as the man who possesses financial power, black men are seen moving towards capitalism and wanting to reach the peak of the corporate ladder because this is what the post-modernist man is constructed as being in society. This, according to the findings of this study may mean that men are increasingly faced with ideological dilemmas and are prioritising their economic security over emotional intimacy with implications for all intimate relationships.

Sibling functions are defined in the literature as being the roles that siblings may fulfil for one another and their performance was said to be influenced by the nature of the closeness between siblings (Weaver, Coleman & Ganong, 2003). According to the literature as discussed in chapter 2 sisters are noted to have closer relationships compared to relationship between brothers (Weaver et al, 2003). The literature states that brothers are less likely to perform their sibling functions for one another. However, the current study found that

brothers are constructed as performing their duties for one another due to there being an obligation to do so from their social context and fear of social rejection should they not perform their brotherly duties. It was also found in this study that performance of the brotherly duties was constructed as not influenced by whether brothers do or do not have high levels of closeness because brothers were constructed as men who were able to separate their emotions from their obligations. Put differently men are construed as able to disregard their feelings towards their brother in order to perform their brotherly functions. This further constructed the relationship between brothers as one that finds brothers not being able to conclude that their brother cares about them from the performance of sibling functions as these are performed due to there being an expectation from one's family and the society they are a part of.

Van Volkom (2006) describes closeness in the sibling relationship as the presence of trust, concern for the other as well as enjoying the sibling relationship. Floyd (1995) notes that men develop closeness in different ways: through the sharing of activities as well as sharing interests, for example. The closeness that Floyd (1995) discusses develops through brothers sharing activities and interests. However, the current study notes that it is rather the quality of the 'doing' that brothers construct as correlating to the closeness or intimacy that is in the relationship.

The role of masculinity in the construction of brotherhood concurs with the views of Floyd (1997). Floyd discusses the relationship between brothers as being paradoxical and that at times it may be characterised with rivalry and competition. Floyd (1997) also notes that the relationship between brothers is one that is, amongst other things, influenced by masculine gender roles. Furthermore, brothering from the social constructionist framework notes that when interacting with one another brothers will build different meanings as well as understandings of their social world (Edwards, Hadfield, Lucey & Mauthner, 2006). Edwards

et al. (2006) also note that our identities and how they interact with the identities of others are influenced by our understandings and meanings based on the knowledge of the current time. Thus in their talk the participants' understanding and meaning of their brother's behaviour as an individual and towards them is influenced by their understanding of what it is to be a man during this current time. Also what is notable is that in their talk the participants resist these masculine identities and how these identities influence the fraternal relationship while at the same time adapting some to suit the fraternal dyad.

In addressing the research aims of the study, the research explored the discourses that the men in the study used in constructing brotherhood and the role of masculinity after they encountered popular media representations of brotherhood. As the study used social constructionism perspective which states the importance of considering the social context in which brothering occurs, the media was thus seen as one of the factors in the social context which plays a role in influencing the brother-brother relationship. The media representation theory which states that the media does not only represent reality, but it also constructs ideas of how things should be and the meanings which are attached to how things are understood by its audiences (Macdonald, 2003). According to Fursich (2010), contemporary media can be seen as operating in such a way that it has become a forum for the social construction of reality, such that it is one of the agents which serve to construct, contest or even maintain certain discourses within the public process. In their interaction with the media, audiences have been noted by the audience theory as not just being passive but rather as being active and interacting and responding to what is presented to them. Philo (2008) states that because the audience is actively engaging with media representations, it can then decide whether to accept or reject that which the media presents to it depending on particular members of the audience and their own sociocultural factors such as culture, gender, class and the like. The findings of the research suggest that the media representation of brotherhood which the men

in the study engaged with constructed brothering in a way that the men could engage with and in their engagement the men did indeed become an active audience. That is the men's interaction saw the men engaging with the different constructions of masculinity and although their talk accepted these masculine constructions they also negotiated them by for instance taking up the subject position of the 'realistic man' as a means of solving the ideological dilemma of masculinity. With regards to the media's representation of brotherhood, the men's discourses subjugated the representation with the discourse of the 'dutiful man' who performs activities alongside and/or for his brother due to there being obligations. Thus in their engagement with the popular media representations of brotherhood although they (the representations) were constructions of what brothering may look like in their social contexts, the men took the representations further by engaging with them and not only maintaining them but also subjugating some of them.

5.3 Personal reflexivity

As was discussed in chapter 3, personal reflexivity is important as the researcher cannot take up the position of a neutral or objective observer (Willig, 2001). It is important that researchers continue to acknowledge their own social context, beliefs, values and experiences and how these may have impacted or influenced their research.

My interest in the brother-brother dyad is informed by my observation of the interaction amongst the men that are part of my extended family, which are my father and his brothers as well as male cousins. In their interactions, I have over the years noted that there appears to be differences in the way that the brother-brother dyad from the younger generation interacts compared to the brother-brother dyad in the older generation. Through experience with these men in my family I also came to note that the interaction between myself and the men from the younger generation possesses differences with things such as self-disclosure and the

expression of affection when compared to the interactions among the men themselves. An awareness that I came across during the research with the men is the extent to which obligatory ties influences the way in which brothers interact with one another. As a result of this awareness I have begun to observe the relationship with members of my own family from a different perspective.

With being exposed to men from different cultures and communities, I also noticed that there are different ways of 'doing man' amongst these men. This coincided with me through my studies being introduced to theories of masculinity, femininity, social constructionism and community psychology. Through this experience I developed an interest in masculinity and how young men took up certain masculine positions while challenging others. The introduction of the *Brother's For Life* campaign in the media interested me as the campaign sought to change the way men think and do 'being a man' by using the way they speak of what a man is to construct a different kind of man. One of the aims of the campaign is to construct a man who takes care of himself, his health and protects those in his life including women and children. Furthermore this campaign drew on brotherhood as a foundation to have other men become a part of the campaign. Thus the research question for this study saw an interaction of interests for me. With the findings from this study, I still think the campaign is relevant. The campaign does however need to be cognisant of the role of masculinity as well as the social expectations that men in the country are faced with and as a result the campaign should look at gradually introducing this change of ways in which men 'do man'.

Upon the beginning of the study, I did not have firmly developed expectations, however I was concerned that the participants may not be able to relate to the media representations and have difficulty with answering the questions that were the guide for the focus group discussion. Another concern for me was my position as a woman who is also a stranger to them and how this would influence the participants' ability to be comfortable in discussing

their relationships with their brothers as well as discussing gender. To counter this factor I implemented safe guards such as performing ice-breaker activities to initially get the participants comfortable around each other and I included refreshments that the participants could eat during the focus group. At times during the focus group discussion it became difficult to control the discussion as participants would tend to drift away from the topic and taking up the position of the researcher and move towards ignoring my presence. This could be understood through the acknowledgement of there being masculine positions being at play. For example with reference to the discourse of the man who takes up the leadership position and becomes the commander in chief, this may have been what influenced the focus group process.

My interest in masculinity allowed me to be comfortable with what was being spoken and this assisted me in asking follow up questions that allowed the participants to engage more in the discussion. With this in mind it also became important for myself to continually reflect during the focus group discussion so as to not lead the discussion to the extent that the participants provided talk that they may think I wanted to hear. While analysing the text, I also had to be mindful of my role as the researcher and that I was coming into the analysis not as a neutral agent. Examples of what I as the researcher brought along in this research is my views on consumerism and how one's success can be achieved without defaulting into using methods that may cause harm to others. This may have affected how the discourse of the 'unscrupulous man' was explored during the focus group discussion as well as during the discourse analysis.

5.4 Credibility of analytic claims

In chapter 3 the analytic guidelines for using discourse analysis were discussed and it was noted that reliability and validity in discourse analysis are not clearly separated from one

another (Potter, 1998). This section will discuss these guidelines in relation to the current study.

Participants' understanding takes into account that participants have their own understandings or orientation and the focus is on how they treat the discourses (Potter, 1998). Throughout this research, effort was made to remain as close as possible to the data and to the words produced by the participants as a way of prioritising their understandings.

The coherence criterion builds on the notion that the work of discourse is cumulative; building on previous work and the analysis should show how the discourses fit together and what are the discursive effects and functions produced (Potter, 1998). The analytic claims of this study satisfy this criterion as it was able to add onto previous studies on the fraternal relationship and also brought new findings that added to the knowledge on how factors such as masculinity influence the brother-brother relationship.

The analysis of this study can be said to satisfy the criterion of trustworthiness as the explanations given in the discourse analysis do fit with the data. That is the study gave a discourse analysis that was relevant to the given extracts that were taken from the data. Fruitfulness as a criterion was also satisfied by the study as it provided different understandings of the relationship between brothers and how masculinity interacts with the brother-brother dyad. This represents fruitfulness as the research has added to the literature on the relationship between brothers. Transparency was also satisfied by the research as there is an inclusion of an example of the coding of the discourses that were found in the data during the analysis process (See Appendix C & E). In the following section of this study, the limitations and the strengths of the study will be discussed given the evaluation of the study that has been provided.

5.5 Limitations and strengths of the study

This section of the discussion will start by discussing the limitations of the study and then discuss the strengths of it. One of the limitations of the study was the inclusion of twin brothers in the study, more specifically that this pair of brothers participated in the same focus group. Of the vast amount of literature on the nature of the twinship relationship, what has been commonly noted is that this relationship is unusually intimate with a unique bond (Tancredy & Fraley, 2006). This may have influenced these participants' participation in the study as they may have a different experience of brothering when compared to the other non-twin participants. One other limitation of the study is that the study did not explore the participants' own positionality in relation to their siblings that informs their current constructs and meanings. The participants' actual relationship dynamics of their own brother-brother relationships, such as hierarchies of age, would have been useful to explore. .

One of the strengths of this study is that the methodology of the study facilitated the study's aim by allowing there to be the identification of the discourses that young men use to construct brotherhood. In evaluating the study's credibility it was found that the analytic claims that were made were able to satisfy the credibility criteria discussed.

5.6 Implications of findings and recommendations for future research

The study aimed at contributing to the already existing literature that explores the relationship between brothers and what it means to be a man in a brotherhood. One of the aims of social constructionist research is to produce new ways of thinking about the social world by examining our claims to knowledge (Burr, 1996). In this sense the study was able to achieve this aim by presenting an account of how men who are a part of a brother-brother dyad construct brothering and how they interact with media representations of brotherhood. Furthermore this study was able to identify the dominant discourses of masculinity from the men's talk and how these constructions of how to be a man influence the way in which

brothering is done. The study also showed how men were able to challenge the media's constructions of masculinity with there being an emphasis on the authenticity of the 'good man' thereby indicating the possibility for change in 'doing man'. These findings could be used in broader social contexts, to inform discussions around changing men's behavioural patterns in society such community engagement projects that seek to change men's behaviour patterns towards themselves and towards women and children. This can be used through campaigns such as the 'Brothers For Life' campaign and other initiatives that could engage with men from different communities using the social constructionist model to community engagement with the fundamentals of community psychology. For example with the knowledge of how masculinity influences relationships when engaging in discussions aimed at bringing about social change, those driving such programs can use this awareness in terms of how they interact with those involved. As it was not part of focus of this research, further research could explore sibling dynamics of the participants of such a study, that is in regards to having participants that are not only brothers but who are brothers from the same family participating in the same study together. For example further research could explore sibling dynamics between the brothers during the focus group discussion including the ambivalent performances of self 'doing man' in relation to the other/brother .

This study explored the discourses on brotherhood and masculinity that have been constructed through social interaction. As a result of this the study had a broader focus and was able to capture the mechanisms employed by young men in constructing the discourses around brothering and masculinity. Future research could explore conducting the same study with men from different age group to get a sense of the extent to which the masculinities that emerged in this study are specific to young adulthood and also well-educated young black men.

References

- Bank, J. B. & Hansford, S. L. (2000). Gender and friendship: Why are men's best same-sex friendships less intimate and supportive? *Personal Relationships*, 7, 63-78.
- Bank, S. (1992). Remembering and reinterpreting sibling bonds. In F. Boer & J. Dunn (Eds.). *Children's sibling relationships: Developmental and clinical issues* (pp. 139-152). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishing.
- Bank, S. P & Kahn, M. D. (1997). *The sibling bond*. New York: Basic Books.
- Berns, R. M. (2007). *Child, family, school, community: Socialization and support* (7th ed). Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Beyer, J., du Preez, E., & Eskell-Blokland, L. (2007). Social constructionism. In M. Visser (Ed.), *Contextualising community psychology in South Africa* (pp. 37-50). Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Bloor, M., Frankland, J., Thomas, M. & Robinson, K. (2001). *Introducing qualitative methods: Focus group in social research*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Brothers For Life. (2009). *About Brothers For Life*. Retrieved March 5, 2011, from http://www.brothersforlife.org/about_b41.html
- Burr, V. (1996). *An introduction to social constructionism*. London: Routledge.
- Conger, K. J & Little, W. M. (2010). Sibling relationships during the transition to adulthood. *Child Development Perspective*, 4(2), 87-94.
- Connell, R. W. (2000). *The men and the boys*. Australia: Allen and Unwin.
- Derne, S. (1993). Equality and hierarchy between adult brothers: Culture and sibling relations in North Indian joint families. In C. W. Nuckolls (Ed.). *Siblings identity and relationships: Sisters and brothers* (pp. 165-189). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Edley, N. (2001). Analysing masculinity: Interpretive repertoires, ideological dilemmas and subject positions. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. J. Yates (Ed). *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 189-228). London: SAGE Publications.
- Edwards, R., Hadfield, L., Lucey, H. & Mauthner, M. (2006). *Sibling identity and relationships: Sisters and brothers*. New York: Routledge.
- Floyd, K. (1995). Gender and closeness among friends and siblings. *The Journal of Psychology*, 129(2), 193-202.
- Floyd, K. (1996). Brotherly love I: The experience of closeness in the fraternal dyad. *Personal Relationships*, 3, 369-385.
- Floyd, K. (1997). Brotherly love II: A developmental perspective on liking, love, and closeness in the fraternal dyad. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 11(2), 196-209.

- Fursich, E. (2010). Media and the representation of others. *International Social Science Journal*, 113-130.
- Henwood, K. L. (1996). Qualitative inquiry: Perspectives, methods and psychology. In J.T.E. Richardson (Ed.). *Handbook of qualitative research methods for psychology and the social sciences*. Leicester: British Psychological Society.
- Hermes, J. (2011). Media representations of social structure: Gender. In E. Devereux (Ed). *Media studies: Key issues and debates* (pp. 191-210). London: SAGE Publications.
- Johnson, B. & Turner, L. A. (2003). Data collection strategies in mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.). *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioural research* (pp 297-320). London: SAGE Publications.
- Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). Australia: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kelly, J. R & Hutson-Comeaux, S. L (1999). Gender-emotion stereotypes are context specific. *Sex Roles*, 40(1), 105-120.
- Litosseliti, L. (2003). *Using focus groups in research*. London: Continuum.
- Matthews S. H., Delaney, P. J. & Adamek, M. E. (1989). Male kinship ties: Bonds between adult brothers. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 33(1), 58-69.
- Macdonald, M. (2003). *Exploring media discourses*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McCloskey, R. (2008). A guide to discourse analysis. *Nurse Researcher*, 16(1), 24-44.
- Morrell, R. (1998). Of boys and men: Masculinity and gender in Southern African studies. *Journal of Southern African studies*, 24(4), 605-626.
- Nkosi, B. & Daniels, P. (2007). Family strengths: South Africa. *Marriage and Family Review*, 41(1), 11-26.
- Nuckolls, C. W. (1993). An introduction to the cross-cultural study of sibling relations. In C. W. Nuckolls (Ed.). *Siblings in South Asia: Brothers and sisters in cultural context* (pp 19-41). London: The Guilford Press.
- Phillips, L. & Jorgensen, M. W. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Philo, G. (2008). Active audiences and the construction of public knowledge. *Journalism Studies*, 9(4), 535-544.
- Pitout, M. (2008). Media audience theory. In P. J. Fourie (Ed). *Media studies: Media content and media audiences* (Volume 3) (pp 391-340). Cape Town: Juta.
- Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. (1992). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage.

Potter, J. (1998). Discourse analysis and constructionist approaches: Theoretical background. In T. E. Richardson (Ed.). *Handbook of qualitative research methods for psychology and the social sciences* (pp 125-140). Leicester: BPS Books.

Putcher, C., & Potter, J. (2004). *Focus group practice*. London: SAGE Publications.

Rittenour, C. E., Myers, S. A. & Brann, M. (2007). Commitment and emotional closeness in the sibling relationship. *Southern Communication Journal*, 72(2), 169-183.

Saville Young, L. & Jackson, C. (2011). 'Bhuti': Meaning and masculinities in Xhosa brothering. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 21(2), 221-228.

Scharf, M., Schulman, A. & Avigad-Spitz, L. (2005). Sibling relationships in emerging adulthood and in adolescence. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 20(1), 64-90.

Seymour, S. (1993). Sociocultural contexts: Examining sibling roles in Asia. In C. W. Nuckolls (Ed.). *Siblings in South Asia: Brothers and sisters in cultural context* (pp. 45-69). New York: The Guilford Press.

Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE Publications.

Tancredy, C. M. & Fraley, R. C (2006). The nature of adult twin relationships: An attachment-theoretical perspective. *Journal of Personality*, 90(1), 78-93.

Tindall, C. (2005). Issues of evaluation. In P. Banister, E. Burman, I. Parker, M. Taylor & C. Tindall. *Qualitative methods in psychology: A research guide* (pp 142-159). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Van Volkom, M., Machiz, C & Reich, A. E. (2011). Sibling relationships in college years: Do gender, birth order and age spacing matter? *North American Journal of Psychology*, 13(1), 35-50.

Van Volkom, M. (2006). Sibling Relationships in middle and older adulthood: A review of the literature. *Marriage and Family Review*, 40(2/3), 151-170.

Vaughn, S., Schumm, J. S & Sinagub, J. (1996). *Focus group interviews in education and psychology*. London: SAGE Publications.

Walker, L., (2005). Men behaving differently: South African men since 1994. *Culture, Health and Sexuality*, 7(3), 225-238.

Weaver, S. E., Coleman, M. & Ganong, L. H. (2003). The sibling relationship in young adulthood: Sibling function and relationship perceptions as influenced by sibling pair composition. *Journal of Family Issues*, 24(2), 245-263.

West, C. & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 125-151.

Wetherell, M. & Edley, N. (1999). Negotiating hegemonic masculinity: Imaginary positions and psycho-discursive practises. *Feminism & Psychology*, 9(3), 335-356.

Whiteman, S. D., McHale, S. M. & Soli, A. (2011). Theoretical perspectives on sibling relationships. *Journal of Family Theory and Review*, 3, 124-139.

Willig, C. (2001). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology: Adventures in theory and method*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Ziehl, S. C. (2005). Families in South Africa. In B. N. Adams & J. Trost (Eds.). *Handbook of world families* (pp. 47-63). California: Sage.

Appendix A

Student list email

My name is Sibongiseni Mkhize and I'm currently studying towards my MA in Clinical Psychology at Rhodes University. As part of my qualification I am researching the relationships between brothers. In particular, the research is concerned with how young men who have a brother engage with the way in which the South African media represents brotherhood. This research has received ethical approval from the Department of Psychology.

I am currently looking for participants who would like to volunteer to take part in a focus group discussion which will involve a screening of scenes from a South African television show that depicts brotherhood. The participants need to be black young South African men between the ages of 18 and 24 who are currently registered students at Rhodes University and are either in their first, second and/or third year of the study. Those who participate will also need to have at least one brother.

This could be a great chance to not only meet new people but also engage in an open discussion around your relationship with your brother. And if you have an interest in psychology this would be a great opportunity to get experience in the field.

If you are interested please contact me on either of the following:

slvmkhize@gmail.com

s.mkhize@ru.ac.za

Thank you for your assistance

Sibongiseni Mkhize

Appendix B

Focus group guideline questions

1. How would you describe the relationship between Paul and Kenneth considering the current situation playing out in their relationship?
2. What kind of men are they (Paul and Kenneth) and how do you think the kind of men they are influences their relationship?
3. How would you describe the relationship between Zamani and Ajax? How do you think the type of men they are influences their relationship?
4. In what way does the presence of Samuel (the friend) influences the way in which Zamani and Ajax relate to one another?
5. How do you think Zamani reacts to the newspaper article and what do you think of his reaction?
6. How does the relationship between Paul and Kenneth compare to the relationship between Ajax and Zamani?
7. Consider your own relationship with your brother, how does it compare to the relationship between Paul and Kenneth and/or Zamani and Ajax?
8. What do you think of Generations' representation of the relationship between brothers? If you were to write a script for Generations that depicted brotherhood, briefly describe what the storyline would look like?

Appendix C

Example of coding during analysis

1. Interpretive repertoire

Why brothers show each other concern or do things for each other

- Obligation or “because they are brothers: focus group1 pg1, 3-7,12-13, focus group 2 pg5.

Does obligation mean caring? (ideological dilemma and subject position)

- Focus group 1 pg 7-8, 11
- Expression of intimacy or affection focus group 1 pg 8, focus group 2 pg 7-8

2. Interpretive repertoire

Describe what is being a “man”-the ideal man.

- “The winner” “the moralist” “unscrupulous man” “ideal guys and forced masculinity”
- Focus group 1 pg 15-19, 22, focus group 2 pg 1-2

Being the good man or the unscrupulous man- “social esteem” versus “holding on to the obligation and being the honourable man without social esteem” (ideological dilemma and subject positions)

- “Nobody wants to be the good guy” focus group 1, pg. 15, 18-19, 29, focus group 2 pg 6-8

Appendix D
CONSENT FORM
RHODES UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
**AGREEMENT BETWEEN STUDENT
RESEARCHER AND RESEARCH
PARTICIPANT**

I.....agree to participate in the research project of
on *'A discourse analysis of young black men's engagement with popular representations of
brotherhood'*

I understand that:

1. The researcher is a student conducting the research as part of the requirements for a Master's degree at Rhodes University. The researcher may be contacted on 0834339896 or s.mkhize@ru.ac.za. The research project has been approved by the relevant ethics committee(s), and is under the supervision of Dr L Saville Young in the Psychology Department at Rhodes University, who may be contacted on 046 603 8047 or l.young@ru.ac.za.
2. The researcher is interested in brotherhood and how it is represented in the media.
3. My participation will involve participation in a focus group discussion with other male participants and that I am volunteering to take part in the research.
4. I may be asked to answer questions of a personal nature, but I can choose not to answer any questions about aspects of my life which I am not willing to disclose.
5. I am invited to voice to the researcher any concerns I have about my participation in the study, or consequences I may experience as a result of my participation, and to have these addressed to my satisfaction. The Rhodes University Student Counselling Centre may be contacted for further support on 046 622 7070.
6. I am free to withdraw from the study at any time – however I commit myself to full

participation unless some unusual circumstances occur, or I have concerns about my participation which I did not originally anticipate.

7. The report on the project may contain information about my personal experiences, attitudes and behaviours, but that the report will be designed in such a way that it will not be possible to be identified by the general reader.

8. I also give consent that the recordings may be kept by the supervisor for a period of 5 years in a locked filing cabinet after which it will be destroyed.

9. I give permission for the data from the research to be used again in another study provided that I remain anonymous and that no information that may assist in my identity being recognised be kept confidential.

Signed on (Date):

Participant: _____ Researcher: _____

Appendix D

Extract from One of the Transcriptions

Lizwe Look I think when it comes to that, the issue of concern here in terms of where it actually stands on a wall, I am gonna disagree because ja we are going round in circles now. Sorry. I so disagree, I am not entirely sought by that argument, sorry I think Khaphela is also with me. Judging from your analysis right now, I don't think we are going to reach a point where we actually going to agree. So...

Sibo So I just picked up something that Sibusiso said, like having certain obligations because somebody is your brother, so are you saying that just, I don't know if everybody agrees but is it saying when somebody is your brother, let's say somebody is your brother, you are obligated to do certain things, like are there is certain expectations that you have to do certain things because that person is your brother. But at the same time does that not reflect on how you feel about them as of your brother?

Sibusiso I don't particularly think so, I think. I think. I think uhm like historically, culturally in society there has always been an idea that says in terms of family there is certain things that you just have to do. Like I think it is, when twins died back in the day, when one twin died and the other one gets buried with him, even if they were alive, like you just knew you have to do it. Like you don't particularly want to share your life with your twin brother but it is one of the things that you just have to do because society will cast a nasty eye on you if you don't particularly want to but I don't think that is necessarily a reflection on how you then feel and perceive a person. Like I know these for example,

like there are certain things that I just know that I have to do because we are brothers but it doesn't sort of have any real bearing on how I feel about him as a person or as my brother, it is just one of those societal norms I guess that says you've got obligations just meet them through, it doesn't matter how you necessarily feel about them. That is why if you hear about those situations where people stop caring about their family, you become that rogue, that black sheep in the family, a lot is said about them, especially neighbours and extra family on the other side, they had a lot to say about that person. And they like to ostracize and they judge very hard really because they don't seem to be following family obligation but is not even about them caring, it is just about the obligation itself.

Dumisani Ja, I agree with that because like he says just by viewing, like lots of people would say, like I recently attended an unveiling for my grandfather's tombstone and they were like because you know like, when some parents die, people just, the kids come there they take the money, they spend the money, they do whatever they want. They won't even bother. Some parents die, there is no tombstone, there is no nothing to remember them because the parents have spend, because the children spend all the inheritance and the minister there was commenting about how it was so lovely and everything that the children have done all this, they erected the tent and the nice tombstone and everything, the service they held right, and like he was saying that leaving aside how they genuinely felt about their parents, it is an obligation. If you didn't do that the neighbourhood would be like, look at that, look at him, look at him. And like he says when lots of people, when someone becomes a black sheep when someone makes a decision to cut all ties with their family and

when they no longer observe societies norms, that is when you get this, he doesn't love them, he is a bad person whatever. Like a father, like a brother, that would put any rage upon. That there are things that you do just because, just because. It is not really a reflection on how, like you can look at I only have one brother so it is kind of difficult. But like if you look at other relationship and the guy has more than one brother there can be the one brother who is so tight with, they go out they have the same friends, they play the same sport. Like the same thing is almost like when people are saying you are my best friend because we get along, we can sit, we can have a conversation, we can watch movies together. We can do things together. And then other people are like, that is my brother like you know, the guy who come into the house and you just, you know you will be doing your thing and he will be doing his thing. He leaves, you eat supper together not because you particularly want to eat supper together, your mother says it is time to eat supper and let's eat supper. You go on holiday together not particularly because I want to go on holiday with you, the whole family is going on holiday. So it becomes a case of I observe. In that case I don't like you, you don't like me but I observe the rituals because my mother would kick my ass or whatever and that is it. Like if you want to determine the love someone has for another person you cannot judge it simply by what they do because those things they would do even if they didn't like that person and that you can see, especially in an African context when you hear parents talk about other family members like, let's say extended, extended, extended family like as ezilalini and stuff like that and when they have to go down to ceremonies and stuff like that and do that stuff. They don't particularly want to go into the bundu's and

you know life, know how to what and do that stuff because they are coming even from Johannesburg, wherever they've got the nice cushy things but because that person is family, I have to do the trip, I have to come down, I have to do that and I have to do that with a smile on my face because this is how family treats family.

Sibusiso Families are perceived how to treat ourselves.

Dumisani Yes.

Sibo So can I also, can I ask you guys, does it seem as if also like the way a brother, brothers interact with? Is it also like kind of determined by the family or determined by society or like what do you think influences the way in which brothers...?

Lizwe I think it is influenced by a lot of things because obviously with males the norm of society about males aren't as open as females. Based on that our relationship aren't necessarily going to be as, you know, as intimate as they should be. But at the same token as well, I have six brothers, out of all the six I am closest to him, primarily because we grew up together, he was my only brother when we were growing up and stuff like that. And so we are the last borns and so based on that our relationship is slightly different to how other people would view a brother relationship as per say. So whilst on the same token there is some thought of expectation and there is something of norm where as males or as brothers you are expected to behave in a specific manner. The level of intimacy though, I think it is quite, it is fluent and fluctuant according to the nature of the relationships that brothers have. So ja, I think from what I have seen, I have seen a lot of families where brothers just walk in

and say okay what's up and then that is it. If they interact, they interact doing physical things maybe like playing a sport or cutting the grass or doing manual labour, chores or ja it is never really like okay do you want to hang out let's go drinking together. I rarely see like siblings, brothers in particular hanging out together in the same space of friends, like drinking and stuff like that. Regardless of the age, maybe it is different that we are twins, but as like in, I mean sorry Sibusiso and I can mission and just go and drink whenever we want to, we can mission go and have lunch or something like that. So we do have those type of things where we just catch up. I think also because we don't live in the same res now, that is also a great thing and we wanted that, so we can afford each other time to miss each other and so that is great, I think it is beautiful it is great. So I think I have answered the question.

Khaphela I think it is so hard to apply a standard because I mean if I look at my brothers and how brothers are two years apart but one is thirteen years older than me the other one is eleven years older than me and they are buddies, like all the way through. They both had different kinds of upbringing because they, I just laugh at them and say they grew up during apartheid you know because they were actually born in the late seventies back when my parents were like but now they aren't, so you know. And I think as compared to our neighbours who were like almost at the same age kind of brothers, who like live in the same space who hardly talk to each other who are not, my brothers are just similar. They had the same friends, they had the same group of big friends and they do things together. They live in different towns but generally we came to what not, travelling will be done together, big road trips will be done together, that is just how things work you know. You know and so, I mean

but then again my relationship with them is very different as well you know. It is very, it is almost like they could be my fathers because they are that old but they are my brothers so it is all the perks about them but none of the shouting because they can't claim you now.

Lizwe Like I almost have that same gap with one of my brothers, there is thirteen/fourteen year, like fourteen year gap between us and whereas in his setting whereas with Khaphela's setting there is that type of relationship whereby it is almost like a father/son relationship without the implications of having your brother yell at you or whatever the case may be. We don't have that type of situation. My brother tries to be my father and I think that is part of the reason why we don't get along as much. I just don't like that, for me you are my brother there is nothing else. If I want money from you I can ask you don't get it twisted, don't try and control my life just because you are fourteen years older than me. Yes you are married, yes you got kids and stuff like that, but aside from that no you are not the boss of me. So like sometimes there is such a huge generational gap between siblings, particularly brothers, there is that thing, there is that level whereby your older sibling will generally try and control your life whereas like I no, I am doing my own shit you know, you are not the boss of me I am sorry, I just. And that is why we don't necessarily get along as well as we should have.

Sibo If you are considering Kenneth and Paul there, all the things that you guys are talking about now, like the way in which brothers interact and the age and all of that stuff but what anything that you saw in this scene accumulating how they interact and how society and all that type of stuff, concern, there is not

much I mean but from that scene, you know is there anything you guys can think of that relates to what we are talking about right now?

Sibusiso Obligations, so like you saw that scene over there that he is obligated to care versus his brother but I mean, and it goes back to this point we were making and I think we made it well and we had a good debate, is the fact that the obligations cannot always be taken as a true reflexion of what your true feelings and sentiments towards a person are.

Lizwe Surely, I think that surely that the mere fact that beyond the fact that there is an obligation, the mere fact that you are willing to respect and adhere to that level of obligation, does indicate some aspect of not only just doing this. And not only just the fear of social censure if you don't adhere to those particular norms and obligations but it also then implicates you to have some level of concern, that extends beyond the obligation. I feel that way.

Khaphela Surely from when I want to be travelling from Grahamstown all the way back (inaudible).

Lizwe I would never do that to someone because (interrupted).

Sibusiso Yes it is obligation, yes it is still the way in which I was told to do things and I was turning to that, surely it is something genuine and as much as people are trying to move from Jo'burg to East London.