

**DISCOURSES AROUND ABORTION
IN A LOW-INCOME COMMUNITY IN THE WESTERN CAPE.**

A thesis in fulfilment of the
requirements of

MASTERS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE

of

RHODES UNIVERSITY

by

TANYA-ANN BOWES

August 2009

Supervisor: Professor Catriona Macleod

Declaration

I, Tanya-Ann Bowes, hereby declare that unless specifically indicated to the contrary, this thesis is the result of my own work. Furthermore, I declare that the material contained in the thesis has not been submitted to this or any other university in partial fulfilment or fulfilment of the requirements for another degree.

.....

Tanya-Ann Bowes

Student No: 800S0676

August 2009

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to sincerely thank my husband Philip for his continuous support. I would also like to thank Linda Walters for her time and effort in assisting with the translation. To Wendy Freeman, thank you for your administrative help. To my mom, Dianne Sundberg, thank you for your insight and comment. Without the community of Dorpie this research would never have been possible. Lastly, I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Catriona Macleod for her expertise, encouragement and for including me in her larger study funded by the National Research Foundation. It has been a privilege to be your student.

ABSTRACT

Since the introduction of the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act in 1996, research concerning abortion has primarily focused on public health issues or on the personal experience of women. The cultural and social context within which women experience a termination of pregnancy and in which services are offered has received less attention. The purpose of this study was to analyse public discourses around abortion in a low-income community in the Western Cape. Focus groups were used to gather data from three women's and three men's groups. The findings suggest that the agenda of pro-life discourses in this community is not always to defend the life of the fetus. Rather these discourses serve to protect, preserve and maintain the power of the traditional nuclear family, headed by the husband, over women's reproduction and sexuality. Religious and moral arguments serve to disguise the gender issues at stake. However, instances also occurred where TOP was supported if the husband participated in the decision-making process. Therefore, his presence normalised abortion. Thus, the prevailing public discourses around abortion in this community either support or negate abortion in order to further the agenda of patriarchy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
1.1.	Introduction: rationale for the study	1
1.2.	Context: The introduction of the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act	4
1.3.	The research	7
1.4.	Notes on terminology	8
1.5.	Outline of chapters	10
1.6.	Conclusion	12
2.	Theoretical Framework	13
2.1.	Introduction	13
2.2.	From realism to social constructionism	13
2.3.	Conceptualising discourse	15
2.4.	Power	18
2.4.1.	The way in which the discourse is used	19
2.4.2.	The context in which the discourse occurs and positioning theory	21
2.4.3.	Disciplinary power	23
2.5.	Conclusion	25
3.	Literature Review	27
3.1.	Introduction	27
3.2.	Critique of attitude research	28
3.2.1.	The relationship between attitude and behaviour	30
3.2.2.	The occurrence of contradictions within the same text	32
3.2.3.	The depoliticising of social problems by attributing them to individual processes	33
3.2.4.	The element of reductionism in attitude research	33
3.2.5.	The lack of consideration for the multiplicity of the people's construction of TOP	34
3.2.6.	The means used to categorise or conceptualise TOP	35

3.3.	Social issues in relation to abortion and the man co-responsible for the pregnancy	37
3.3.1.	Religion and abortion	37
3.3.2.	The traditional nuclear family and morality	39
3.3.3.	Public/private split	40
3.3.4.	Patriarchy within the family	42
3.3.5.	Mothering	44
3.3.6.	Fetal rights vs reproductive rights	47
3.3.6.1.	Conservative position	48
3.3.6.2.	Moderate view	50
3.3.6.3.	Liberal view	50
3.3.7.	Pro-life women-centred approach	52
3.3.8.	Men in relation to abortion	53
3.4.	Conclusion	57
4.	The Methodology informing This Study	60
4.1.	Introduction	60
4.2.	Research aims	60
4.3.	Sampling and focus groups	61
4.4.	Data collection	66
4.4.1.	Research procedure	71
4.5.	Data analysis	74
4.5.1.	Parker's criteria	75
4.5.1.1.	A discourse is located within a text	75
4.5.1.2.	A discourse is about objects	76
4.5.1.3.	A discourse contains subjects	77
4.5.1.4.	A discourse is a coherent system of meanings	78
4.5.1.5.	A discourse refers to other discourses	78
4.5.1.6.	A discourse reflects on its own way of speaking	79
4.5.1.7.	A discourse is historically located	79
4.5.1.8.	Discourses support institutions	80

4.5.1.9.	Discourses reproduce power relations	80
4.5.1.10	Discourses have ideological effects	81
4.6.	Ethical considerations	82
4.7.	Reflexivity	85
4.8.	Conclusion	87
5.	Three discourses relating to religion and the family	89
5.1.	Introduction	89
5.2.	Anti-abortion God's will discourse	90
5.3.	The familial-moral discourse	92
5.3.1.	Marriage enables reproduction	93
5.3.2.	Sex outside of marriage is a sin for which you must carry the consequences	94
5.3.3.	Male and female dyad/marital alliance	96
5.3.4.	Parent-children axis	100
5.3.5.	The importance of a good upbringing	101
5.3.6.	Abortion challenges the traditional structure of the nuclear family	103
5.4.	The selfless mother discourse	107
5.4.1.	Mothering is a privilege and fulfilling	108
5.4.2.	Conception implies motherhood	110
5.4.3.	Mothering as a sacrifice	111
5.5.	Conclusion	113
6.	The rights discourses	114
6.1.	Introduction	114
6.2.	Fetal rights discourse	114
6.3.	Reproductive rights discourse	117
6.3.1.	The woman's body is affected most by the pregnancy	117
6.3.2.	Pregnancy affects the woman's future the most therefore she should decide	120

6.4.	The woman-centred discourse	122
6.4.1.	Woman as incapable of making rational decisions alone	123
6.4.2.	Women who have made the mistake of having an abortion are incorporated into a nexus of care	124
6.4.3.	Abortion as a physical and dangerous procedure	125
6.5.	Termination of pregnancy as taboo and stigmatised	127
6.5.1.	Introduction	127
6.5.2.	The discourse of TOP as taboo and stigmatised	127
6.6.	The positioning of the man co-responsible for the pregnancy	132
6.6.1.	The man positioned as an upset future father	132
6.6.2.	The man positioned as an uncaring and relieved boyfriend or fling	135
6.6.3.	The man as a responsible caretaker of the woman and “baby”	139
6.7.	Conclusion	142
7.	Conclusion	145
7.1.	Introduction	145
7.2.	Rationale for the study	145
7.3.	The research	146
7.4.	The theoretical approach	147
7.5.	The methodology	147
7.6.	The findings	148
7.7.	Suggestions for further research and limitations of this study	154
8.	References	156

LIST OF APPENDICES

1.	Vignette 1 – Patricia’s story	163
2.	Vignette 2 – Patience’s story	164
3.	General questions	165
4.	Original Afrikaans extracts	166
5.	Agreement between researcher and co-researcher	183

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CTOP: Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act

PAS: Post-abortion syndrome

SC: Social constructionism

TOP: Termination of pregnancy

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. Introduction: rationale for the study

The purpose of this study is to investigate public discourses around abortion in a low-income community in the Western Cape. Focus groups were used to gather data from three women's and three men's groups. This research forms part of a larger study focusing on public discourses on abortion which is funded by the National Research Foundation. A similar study (Luwaca, 2007) was conducted in the Eastern Cape. Together, the two studies can provide interesting information about the public's understandings of abortion. For the purpose of understanding this chapter, I will provide a brief definition of a discourse; however, this concept will be expanded on in the next chapter, the theoretical framework. The position taken in this research is that language constitutes the world through discourse. "Discourses are practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault as cited in Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999, p. 160). When people describe and explain the world, they are not merely talking, but also partaking in social action, as discourse is more than a means of describing an object. Discourse actually constitutes the object (Hall, 2001a; Parker, 1992). In other words, discourse constructs the world we live in.

International literature (Boyle & McEvoy, 1998; Nyanzi, Nyanzi, & Bessie, 2005) suggests that in the past, research in psychology has mainly positioned abortion as a women's health issue and an individual's issue. The focus has also been on the possible "negative" effects of abortion. Shortly after the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act of 1996 (to be discussed later) was passed, research on abortion in South Africa focused primarily on the accessibility and availability of termination of pregnancy (TOP) (Althaus, 2000; Bateman, 2002; Strachan, 2000). Another area of focus was on the "psychological effects" of induced abortion, particularly with regard to teen-aged women (for example Mojapelo-Batka & Schoeman, 2003; Poggenpoel & Myburgh, 2002). In the year 2000, Strachan maintained that TOP service providers were difficult to access in neglected areas of the country. The problem in South Africa at that time was that the services were available but not accessible and women were still utilising back street services.

Thus although TOP was legal and service providers existed, not everyone had access to them. For example, women travelled far distances to reach a TOP service provider. A study in 1999 in the Eastern Cape indicated that 38% of women presenting for TOP had traveled at least 100 km (Althaus, 2000).

As mentioned above, another area of focus was the perceived negative psychological effects that women would experience after an abortion. Boyle and McEvoy (1998) maintain that the spotlight on the negative post-abortion psychological effects of termination of pregnancy has been accompanied by a “relative neglect of the social context in which women experience abortion and of its role in shaping women’s responses to the procedure” (p. 284). Where public understandings are included, it is frequently from the perspective of attitude research.

Potter (1996a) defines attitude research as “an attempt to specify and measure what we commonly think of as people's views or preferences” and which will determine or significantly influence a person's behaviour, thoughts and speech (p. 123). Social psychologists use various means for measuring attitudes, most often questionnaires. These are completed either in interviews or by the respondents, who fill them in by ticking boxes. A popular technique is the Likert scale where people are asked to place their attitudes regarding an issue on a continuum. The categories would resemble something similar to the following; strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree. This exercise is designed to yield a “reasonably short list of opinion statements and a questionnaire which produces measureable scores” (J Potter, 1996, p. 128). Six problems with attitude research have been identified and will be discussed more fully in the literature review. However, I provide a brief summary here.

The first critique of attitude research is that “attitudes” and behaviour have an unstable relationship and therefore people do not always act according to the “attitudes” documented in the research (Potter, 1996a). Attitude researchers therefore cannot claim to have an accurate representation of “reality”. The second critique of attitude research is that contradictions are often present in people's “attitudes”. According to Wetherell and Potter (as cited in Burr, 1995), people often contradict themselves within the same text, thus the attitude identified is often neither coherent nor stable. Of importance here is what function or purpose does the talk achieve,

and this concept will be discussed later. The third critique of attitude research is that it depoliticises social problems by attributing them to individual processes. In other words, the social process of the formation of “attitudes” is ignored. The fourth critique of attitude research is that it often fails to consider the multiplicity of people’s construction of TOP. This is a complicated concept to explain briefly but will be expanded upon in the literature review. Multiplicity refers to the variety of meanings, experiences and understandings that can be attached to a person’s construction of a subject, in this case, TOP. Thus, a woman’s experience of TOP is not static and unitary but rather complicated and multifaceted. The fifth and last critique of attitude research refers to the taken for granted assumptions with regard to the terminology used to categorise the reasons for abortion. The manners in which these categorisations are presented again neglect the complexity of the decision to abort. In summary, attitude research fails to consider the influence of the social context and the interweaving of social discourses which inform the public’s construction of TOP.

This study seeks to look beyond the confines of attitude research by employing discourse theory and the Social Constructionist notion that no unitary stable reality exists but rather that people create various realities through social action. In other words, various realities are determined by the discourses which are circulating in society. By approaching the above identified problems with attitude research through a discursive lens, one can appreciate the incongruence between behaviour and attitudes and the contradictions often present in people’s “opinions” and “attitudes”. Furthermore, social constructionism acknowledges the multiplicity of one’s experience and the non-static nature of people’s construction of TOP. Lastly, social constructionism and discourse theory considers the influence of social discourses on how people make sense of the world, for example, how a woman’s social context may influence her decision regarding whether or not to abort. In other words, social constructionism questions the taken for granted assumptions which are often adopted by society as “truth” as opposed to representing various discourses. In this way, a social constructionist approach to this study allows for the consideration of various discourses that emerge in the public’s understanding of abortion, as opposed to stable internal mental states or attitudes of individuals.

1.2. Context: the introduction of the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act

Abortion has been legal in South Africa since the introduction of the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act (CTOP Act) in 1996. The new legislation replaced the Abortion and Sterilisation Act of 1975 which made abortion available for women under certain circumstances (Nash & Navias, 1992). Abortion was sanctioned in the event of rape, the possibility of the fetus being severely handicapped (Althaus, 2000) or if the pregnancy was a threat to the woman's mental health (Rogers in Dickson-Tetteh & Rees, 1999, p. 190). The procedure to apply for an abortion was lengthy (Dickson-Tetteh & Rees, 1999). It has been argued that during this time, only privileged wealthy women who could afford to pay a willing doctor to guide them through the bureaucracy and perform the procedure were able to access legal abortion (Dickson-Tetteh & Rees, 1999). Many women therefore utilised back street services or illegal abortionists including doctors, nurses, traditional healers and lay people, who charged between R30 and R1 000 per procedure. Some women used various methods to perform the abortion themselves (Jewkes, Wood and Maforah, 1997). Jewkes et al. (1997) cite estimated figures of 37 women dying for every 1 000 000 live births whilst abortion was illegal.

The new controversial Act (Cameron, 2000; Dyer, 1996; Frank, 1996) was passed in the light of South Africa's political transition from apartheid to democracy after the 1994 elections. By legalising abortion, the government's objective was to address gender issues by giving women increased independence and reproductive freedom and to reduce abortion-related morbidity and mortality (Dickson et al., 2003; Patel & Myeni, 2008). According to the Health Systems Trust (as cited in Patel & Myeni, 2008), the number of reported termination of pregnancies increased from 26 455 in 1997 to 53 967 in 2001. By 2004 more than 120 000 abortions on request had occurred in South Africa (Van Rooyen & Smith, 2004).

The Act specifies three categories under which TOP may be sanctioned. The first category concerns first trimester pregnancies (up to 12 weeks in term). Permission from the woman concerned is the only requirement to undergo the procedure in this category. The second category is relevant to second trimester pregnancies (between 13 and 20 weeks in term). In such cases, doctors have to approve and conduct the procedure, as opposed to the first category in

which the procedure can be conducted by a registered nurse. Also in this category, women can only request a TOP if the pregnancy poses a risk to her physical or mental health, if the fetus may develop into a child with a mental or physical “handicap”, if the pregnancy is the result of rape or if the pregnancy will affect the woman’s social and economic circumstances. The third category refers to cases after 20 weeks into the pregnancy. In such instances, an abortion can only be conducted once a medical practitioner has consulted with another medical practitioner and together they conclude that the pregnancy poses a threat to the woman’s life, would result in severe malformation of the fetus or presents a risk of injury to the fetus (Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1996).

In 2003, Mojapelo-Batka and Schoeman suggested that the increased availability and subsequent utilisation of abortion services could lead to changes in the social discourse or public’s understanding of abortion. Although it has been over a decade since the implementation of the new act, recent research (Patel & Myeni, 2008) reports that sectors of the South African public still oppose abortion and religion is still regarded as a primary influence in this regard (Patel & Myeni, 2008). For example, in their study with female university students in Natal, the authors found that 55% of the 124 participants described themselves as pro-life and disapproved of abortion and almost 76% identified themselves as religious to very religious. According to Rule (2004), South Africa’s reproductive rights policy is not in accordance with the public’s sentiment. It therefore appears that the majority of South Africans generally still have conservative attitudes towards TOP (Patel & Myeni, 2008).

It does seem that the South African public’s discourses regarding the procedure are evolving. However, the new understandings that are emerging are not necessarily in favour of women’s reproductive rights. Rather, research (Patel & Myeni, 2008) indicates that the public are wrestling with the idea of legalised abortion per se and trying to make sense of it. I will speak to two issues here, and a brief discussion on each follows.

Firstly, there is an increasing awareness that the abortion debate is not as clear-cut as previous studies have tried to imply through, for example, the use of attitude scales and surveys. (Further discussion on the credibility of attitudes studies will follow in the literature review). According

to Patel and Myeni (2008), researchers are beginning to acknowledge that people are “ambivalent about abortion and that to categorize a person as pro-choice (supportive of abortion) or pro-life (against abortion) is to oversimplify a deeply complex issue” (p. 737). Rather, the decision regarding whether or not to abort is dependent on a number of contextual factors ranging from the socio-political and historical context to circumstances in which the crisis pregnancy occurs. The abortion debate has thus evolved from merely exhibiting pro- or anti-abortion “attitudes” to taking into account the diverse circumstances which require the consideration of abortion (Bahr & Marcos as cited in Patel & Myeni, 2008). This point will be elaborated in the literature review.

Secondly, the public has begun to question the ways in which abortion has affected the traditional role of motherhood. Today, the increased availability of contraception and legal abortion has facilitated increased choice for women; however, women’s fertility choices are still criticised and scrutinised (Hadfield, Rudoe, & Sanderson-Mann, 2007). For example, in the United Kingdom, the media has focused on how these developments in reproductive health challenge traditional motherhood. The media has also suggested that the traditional nuclear family is in crisis as women are now able to choose when they would like to have children, as opposed to the traditional gender roles defined for women (Hadfield et al., 2007). In South Africa, a similar trend has been observed. For example, a recent study (Shefer et al., 2008) in a Western Cape community closely resembling my study’s sample, reports that women are still expected to submit to their husbands who are considered the primary decision-makers and that these traditional roles are supported by the Christian church. In another South African study with primary health care workers in Soweto, (L. Walker, 1996), the participants indicated that women who undergo abortions are denying their true callings as mothers.

Although Walker’s study (1996) was conducted at a time when abortion was not yet legal, the idea that abortion robs a woman of her true calling has not changed since the passing of the Act, as will be illustrated in the literature review. This implies that the defence of the life of the fetus has been accompanied by a concern for the preservation of the traditional nuclear family, an institution which often controls women’s reproduction. As a result, women are still the focus of criticism with regard to abortion and it would seem that the social context is still ignored.

In summary, these studies mentioned above (Patel & Myeni, 2008; Suffla, 1997) suggest that since the implementation of legal abortion the majority of the South African public still display resistance to legal abortion. The literature also suggests that although people are still primarily negative about abortion, their comprehension and understanding of the procedure is changing. For example, the public and researchers are realising that abortion is a complex issue and cannot simply be reduced to the pro-life vs pro-choice debate. Rather situational factors need to be taken into account. This process of the evolving of abortion discourses is reflected in the ways in which the reasons for opposing abortion are changing. Previously the life of the fetus was the focus in this regard and now research is indicating that in fact abortion is opposed on other premises as well, for example, the preservation of the traditional role of motherhood.

These developments in the last ten years signal a need for more qualitative inquiry into how the public understands abortion since the passing of a number of years since its legalisation. More research is therefore needed which considers the broader context in which constructions of abortion exist, as opposed to examining the apparent “internal attitudes” of people towards abortion. This is because “Common sense cannot be combated with a simple account of what „reality“ is, because our seemingly direct perception of reality is always framed by discourse” (Parker, 2004, p. 154). In other words, individuals’ understandings of abortion need to be unpacked with a consideration of the broader public’s framework of reference, for example religious and moral discourses.

1.3. The research

This thesis attempts to critically explore the public discourses around abortion in a low-income community in the Western Cape. This translates into addressing four questions: (1) what are the constructions of abortion in this community; (2) how are women who have had (or considered) abortions positioned in this community; (3) how do these constructions of abortion and women potentially impact on women, and lastly; (4) how do these discourses refer to or contradict each other. Previous studies (Mitchell, Tucker Halpern, Muthuuri Kamathi, & Owino, 2006) have indicated that “pervasive” public discourses on abortion can shape individual experiences (p. 516). Unlike much research that has been conducted on abortion, the purpose of this research is

not to converse with women who have had abortions, nor with medical (or other) professionals involved in the field. Rather, the emphasis is on the public's constructions of abortion. My aim is therefore to explore the "heavily laden socio-cultural context in which abortion is negotiated, conceived, designed, operationalised, discussed and experienced" (Nyanzi et al., 2005, p. 155).

Two vignettes and a list of general questions were utilised to facilitate discussion about abortion in all six groups. Each vignette presented a hypothetical story of a woman faced with a crisis pregnancy. The groups then discussed the scenarios whilst guided by questions (Appendix 1,2 and 3). Ian Parker's discourse analysis was used to analyse the focus group transcripts. The findings suggest that the agenda of pro-life discourses in this community is not always to defend the life of the fetus. Rather these discourses often serve to protect, preserve and maintain the power of the traditional nuclear family, headed by the husband, over women's reproduction and sexuality. Luker (1984) agrees and maintains that the pro-life movement has been accused of an attempt to control women and that it is actually fuelled more by gender issues than by issues of a religious or moral nature. Instances also occurred where TOP was supported if the husband participated in the decision-making process. Therefore, his presence normalised abortion. Thus, the prevailing discourses around abortion either support or negate abortion in order to further the agenda of patriarchy. The literature supports this finding. For example, Marsiglio and Diekow (1998) argue that the pro-life stance is supported by patriarchal ideals accompanied by religious underpinnings. Furthermore, according to South African authors (Preston-Whyte & Zondi, 1989) women are rarely given decision-making capacity about their fertility: "Control and the power to influence fertility and reproduction lie invariably with the older generation, parents, church leaders, and eventually with governments" (p. 47). Men often occupy positions in the institutional structures which control reproduction.

1.4. Notes on terminology

At this stage, I wish to explain why certain terms are used as opposed to language traditionally used in research reports. I refer to myself, as the researcher, in the first person. In this way, I position myself as taking full responsibility for my practice as a researcher (2005b, p. 198). I refer to the participants as co-researchers in that, together, we are actively producing the research

(Parker, 2005b). This reference implies that the co-researchers are not merely participating in the research process, but actually co-creating the process. The theoretical rationale for this will become clearer as the thesis progresses. I therefore resign as an expert of their experience and rather seek to acknowledge their expertise of their own lives (also to be expanded upon in the methodology chapter). As a Master's student I have a different kind of knowledge of abortion. However, this knowledge is not necessarily privileged in relation to that of the co-researchers. When citing other studies, where the co-researchers have been referred to as participants, I have not enforced my understanding and have maintained the term "participants".

I refer to the woman who has undergone or who is considering abortion as "the woman" and the man who is co-responsible for the pregnancy as "the man" to allow for easier reading. For the purpose of this research, to enable flow and easy reading, instead of referring to generalised individuals in the female and male pronouns (i.e. "she" or "he"), I have used the female form of "she".

Following Luker (1984), I wish to explain why I only use the term "fetus" as opposed to, for example, "baby". For Luker (1984), "a choice of words is a choice of sides". Some refer to the fetus as an embryo, unborn child, life or baby. Each of these words implies a specific understanding with regard to at which stage of a pregnancy the fetus can be considered viable. For example, pro-life activists may refer to the fetus as a baby, implying that life begins at conception. Pro-choice activists often refer to the fetus as an embryo and argue that the embryo can only be considered a viable life at a certain stage of pregnancy. Luker (1984) states that she uses the term "embryo" in a pursuit to remain neutral. Although I have decided to use the word "fetus" and not "embryo", I have made this choice in accordance with Luker's reasons as I wish to distance myself from the debate. I also use the American spelling of "fetus" as opposed to "foetus".

Again, following Luker (1984), I refer to people as pro-life or pro-choice, despite the fact that each party finds this classification limited. I also use the terms pro-abortion or anti-abortion although I realise that these terms are restrictive and reductionist. However, for the purpose of

the research I wish to state my use of terms clearly and acknowledge that they are less than perfect.

Lastly, a definition for abortion is necessary. The term abortion originates from the Latin word *aboriri* which translates to loosening an object from its place (Olivier, Myburgh & Poggenpoel as cited in Olivier & Bloem, 2004). The term also refers to the “expulsion (either spontaneous or induced) of a foetus from the womb, before it is able to survive, especially in the first 28 weeks of pregnancy” (Hanks, McLeod & Makins as cited in Olivier & Bloem, 2004, p. 177). I also use the term termination of pregnancy when referring to an abortion. In the same way, TOP refers to the expulsion of a fetus from the womb. The terms are therefore synonymous. The term TOP has been seen by some as more neutral and accurate medically.

1.5. Outline of chapters

This thesis is divided into seven chapters. The second chapter, following this introduction, is the theoretical framework which introduces the paradigms which inform this study: social constructionism (SC), poststructuralism and feminism. This chapter deliberately precedes the literature review in order to assist the reader in understanding references made to social constructionist studies. My research specifically draws on the work of Ian Parker on discourse analysis and of Michel Foucault on power and knowledge. I also use a feminist interpretation to critically analyse the discourses. There is debate in the academic arena as to what constitutes social constructionism and post-structuralism. Whilst these paradigms are similar in some ways, they differ in their approach to the subject material. The main difference between the two approaches is that post-structuralists, particularly Foucault, place more emphasis on power relations than social constructionists. However, the two paradigms share the same epistemological and ontological ideas, which will be discussed in the next chapter. The theoretical framework therefore addresses concepts pertinent to these paradigms such as the importance of language and the notion that all meaning is constructed through language and interaction. The concept of discourses, reality and truth is explored as well as the significance of power.

The third chapter, the literature review, presents a critique of attitude research followed by a discussion of previous national and international studies which provide insight into how abortion, and women who have had abortions, have previously been constructed by the public. In this section, I pay attention to the social issues which have been documented to influence people's understanding of abortion, for example, religion and the notion of a traditional family unit as a vehicle of morality and patriarchy. I also examine the notion of mothering as well as literature pertaining to the fetal rights vs reproductive rights debate. The relationship between gender and abortion is also considered.

The fourth chapter, the methodology chapter, provides a road map as to how this study was conducted. Two vignettes or hypothetical scenarios of women who were faced with crisis pregnancies were discussed by co-researchers in a focus group. These vignettes were accompanied by general open-ended questions. The means of recruiting the groups as well as a description of each group is included. Furthermore, the actual method of data collection, transcription, coding and analysis is provided. Lastly, I reflect on the research as a reflexive process and comment on the ethical considerations of this study.

The analysis and discussion is spread over two chapters. The fifth chapter focuses on the discourses pertaining to the family and religion. This section includes the "anti-abortion God's will discourse", the "familial-moral discourse" and the "selfless mother discourse". The sixth chapter presents the discourses regarding the rights of the fetus and the woman. This section includes the "fetal rights discourse", the "reproductive rights discourse" and the "woman-centred discourse". This section also includes an examination of the construction of abortion as taboo and stigmatised as this fuels the anti-reproductive rights arguments. The positioning of the man co-responsible for the pregnancy and his rights with regard to pregnancy and abortion is also discussed here.

In the concluding chapter, I summarise the findings and bring them together in a clear argument, followed by the references and appendices. These include the vignettes, list of general questions, the original Afrikaans versions of the extracts cited in the thesis and the Afrikaans agreement between myself and the co-researchers.

1.6. Conclusion

In conclusion, the objective of this study is to investigate public discourses around abortion. In the past, research has positioned abortion as primarily a woman's issue as well as one affecting the individual. A large focus has also been placed on the perceived negative effects that a woman may experience after a TOP. When the public's understanding has been addressed, it has been from the perspective of attitude research, which, as discussed above, fails to consider the plethora of understandings and experiences of TOP and associated circumstances. Attitude research assumes a stable unitary understanding, for example, that TOP leads to negative consequences for women. These taken for granted assumptions have implications for women who are considering or who have undergone a TOP, as will be illustrated throughout this thesis.

The CTOP Act of 1996 replaced the Abortion and Sterilisation Act of 1975. The new government sought to recognise women's rights and enable a safe environment for woman who are faced with crisis pregnancies and thus choose to abort. Despite the new legislation, recent research (for example Patel & Myeni, 2008) suggests that the South African public still resists TOP and that this response to the procedure is strongly influenced by religion. Although there has been some acknowledgment that TOP is a complex matter and merely a case of being either pro-life or pro-choice, another emerging understanding seems to be that TOP may challenge the traditional notion of mothering and this will be discussed later in the thesis.

Chapter 2

Theoretical Framework

2.1. Introduction

As mentioned in the introduction, this thesis is informed by social constructionism and post-structuralism, particularly the work of Parker and Foucault. I have also used a feminist lens to critically analyse the public's discourses around abortion. The chapter therefore begins by briefly describing social constructionism and then moves into a discussion on the crucial theoretical concepts that inform this approach, such as the notion of various realities and truths and how these are circulated by discourses. These concepts will be expanded upon by drawing on examples of feminist understandings of discourse and power in relation to patriarchy. Patriarchy can be defined as "the systematic, structural, unjustified domination of women by men" (Braam & Hessini, 2004, p. 45). Furthermore, patriarchy is comprised of institutions, behaviours, ideologies, and belief systems that preserve, validate and legitimate male gender privilege and power (Braam & Hessini, 2004).

The importance of understanding language as actually constituting the world, through discourses, is discussed. Power, as a product of these discourses, as well as the relationship between power and knowledge and the implications that this relationship has on people in terms of positioning and ideology are discussed. The analysis (to follow the methodology chapter) draws on Parker's (1992) ten criteria for identifying discourses. In his criteria, Parker addresses the relationship between discourses and objects, subjects, institutions, history, power, ideology. He also describes how a discourse refers to itself as well as to other discourses. Although each of these will be discussed fully in the methodology chapter, they will be referred to throughout this chapter as well, in order to illustrate the link between the theory and the wider study.

2.2. From realism to social constructionism

The discipline of Psychology, for the most part, refers to an objective truth or reality and internal mental states of individuals which influence behaviour (Costall & Still as cited in Parker, 1990) and attitudes (Billig, 2001). In this sense language is a mirror that reflects reality in terms of

descriptions, representations and accounts. These realist assumptions are necessary in order for people to converse about personal accounts in their lives (Parker, 2000). As these are distributed in the world, they are understood to be reliable, factual, literal accounts of the world or, in contrast, they could also be construed to be distortions of the “truth”, lies or misunderstandings (Edley, 2001; Parker, 2004; Potter, 1996b). Foucault refers to the knowledge that people accept as truth, despite whether or not it is, as “the regime of truth” (Hall, 2001a).

In contrast, social constructionists focus on language in a manner which encourages a turn away from traditional scientific laboratory oriented research that states a claim to scientific truth (Parker, 2000). Social constructionism is thus interested in social processes as opposed to internal states or “mental paraphernalia” inside the individual’s mind (Billig, 2001). Rather, as people interact socially by writing and talking, they are creating a reality. In other words, social constructionists maintain that people create the world they live in through the use of language or discourses (Burr, 1995; J. Potter, 1996). Discourse is considered to be more than a linguistic concept but rather a system of representation (Hall, 2001a).

Language is not merely understood in terms of syntax and meaning, but rather “as the substance of social action” (Sherrard, 1991, p. 171). As mentioned in the introduction, when people describe and explain the world, they are not merely talking, but also partaking in social action as discourse is more than a means of describing an object. Discourse actually constructs the object (Hall, 2001a; Parker, 1992). Discourses categorise the world by drawing attention to phenomena and bringing them into sight. They provide a means to see things which are not there, and by focusing on the object within a discourse, the object becomes “real”; “discourses provide frameworks for debating the value of one way of talking about reality over other ways” (Parker, 1992, p. 5). This notion is based on two premises: firstly, that descriptions and accounts construct the world, and secondly, that these descriptions and accounts are in fact constructed (J. Potter, 1996). This is the very essence of the constructionist theory of meaning and representation (Hall, 2001a).

An important question, raised by Parker (2002), is to what extent is a discourse “real” and how “real”? In other words, how does discourse relate to the real world? These questions are often

formulated by critics of discourse analysis. Parker (2002) clarifies that discourse analysts do not maintain that objects of discourse only exist within texts nor do they exist only outside of texts, as empiricists believe. When something is interpreted, and therefore becomes a text, it does not lose all object status. In other words, when a block of wood is interpreted as being a stool by one culture and an off-cut by another, it does not lose its existence as a block of wood. Discourse analysts are interested in the interpretation of the block of wood and the implications of that interpretation for the rest of the people involved.

Although it is important to focus on interpersonal dynamics and what people do when they talk, it is also important to consider the context as people use words which are culturally, historically and ideologically available (Billig, 2001; Parker, 1992). Therefore, “the terms in which the world is understood are social artifacts, products of historically situated interchanges among people” (Gergen, 1985, p. 267). Culturally, as people interact with each other, they create meaning and come to understand the world through a collaborative process. For example, a participant in a study (Walker, E. as cited in C. Walker, 1995) explained how fertility entitles a woman to power, not only over her children but within the household. In another South African study (Preston-Whyte & Zondi, 1989) a Zulu teenager described how her pregnancy was not shameful but rather an affirmation of her womanhood. Feminists argue that traditional Western cultural beliefs dictating marital relationships, pregnancy and childbearing have in the past influenced abortion legislation (Braam & Hessini, 2004). Furthermore, the authors argue that religion has had an enormous impact in inhibiting women’s right to control over their bodies and in forming the moral fundamentals for social constructions of sex and sexuality.

2.3. Conceptualising discourse

Foucault considered a discourse to be a group of statements which provide a way of talking about a topic (knowledge) belonging to a particular historical moment (Hall, 2001a). He maintained discourses change and become a “new regime of discourses” (Foucault, 1976, p. 27). Parker (1992) acknowledges this aspect in his criteria for identifying discourses; he maintains that discourses are historically located and one should therefore consider where and how a discourse was formed as well as how the discourse has changed. When a discourse about

something changes, the object is not necessarily spoken about less. Different people say different things in a different way in order to achieve different results (Foucault, 1976). For example, in South Africa, discourses around abortion have changed. Prior to its legalisation, abortion was spoken about in terms of its illegal status, a prevalence of back street abortions and high mortality rates (to be discussed in the literature review). Now that it is legal, it is not spoken about less. However, new discourses have emerged, such as a variation of the pro-life discourses, utilised by medical professionals who are resisting performing the procedure.

Discourses are used by different people to achieve certain results. Parker (1992) raises this issue in his criteria for identifying a discourse. He maintains that when identifying a discourse, one should ask which world or reality is being represented, and why certain words are used and not others. Therefore, one could ask why a legal discourse (“abortion is a crime”) or the criminalisation of abortion occurs today when abortion is legal in South Africa. From a feminist perspective, by criminalising abortion and constantly hindering a woman’s right to autonomy regarding their bodies and decision-making, the desired effect is achieved, which is to have power over women’s wombs (Braam & Hessini, 2004). More discussion on identifying which reality is being represented follows in the methodology chapter.

Discourses therefore determine the way in which the topic/object can be spoken or reasoned about (Hall, 2001a). If a strong religious discourse is prevalent in the community, abortion will probably be constructed as a sin. Therefore, despite its legal status, abortion will be considered a forbidden practice and the reproductive rights discourse will be silenced.

Language therefore becomes politicised; by using certain words, one indicates one’s position on an issue (Hall, 2001b; Luker, 1984). For example, with regard to the abortion debate, the use of the word fetus or baby implies a political judgement (Luker, 1984). Feminists argue that discourse and language regarding abortion has played a significant role in maintaining and entrenching a largely conservative perspective towards TOP (Braam & Hessini, 2004). Anti-abortionists use terms such as life, babies and families. These terms often evoke a morally defensive reaction from pro-rights activists (Braam & Hessini, 2004; Luker, 1984). If pro-life activists were to use the word “embryo” instead of “baby”, their argument or regime of truth would not be as

convincing and hold as much power. Pro-abortionists use the term fetus because they argue that the embryo cannot be considered a human being yet. In other words, physical things exist, but only become meaningful objects of knowledge when located within discourse (Hall, 2001a). For example, the issue in this study is not to establish the science of whether an embryo should be considered a human being or bodily tissue. Rather the research focuses on how the language used constructs the fetus. Thus, this study is interested in what assumptions the language suggests.

For Parker (2005a) “discourse is the organization of language into certain kinds of social bond” (p. 88). As a community organises their actions, they naturally produce a language that is functionally incorporated into their practices, a code of conduct. The code of conduct refers to ideas defining “good” behaviour within the community. A community’s construction of the world maintains its “form of life” (Wittgenstein as cited in Gergen & McNamee, 2000, p. 334). As a result, a variety of ways of speaking about or constructing an event or object exist in different cultures (Gergen & McNamee, 2000). Discourses can instill debasing images of people who are divided from each other according to different categories such as race and class. These images appear daily in many forms of texts such as advertising and news reports. Eventually people believe these images to be true of themselves and others and start to live according to them (Burman et al., as cited in Parker, 2005a). Another example could be that women presenting for abortions may feel that they are supposed to experience guilt and shame after an abortion as this is a predominant idea circulating in the public sphere as will be indicated by the literature review.

According to Eagleton (as cited in Billig, 2001) an “ideology comprises of the ways of thinking and behaving within a given society which make the ways of that society seem „natural“ or unquestioned to its members” (2001, p. 217). In other words, ideology is the “common sense” of the society and is deeply ingrained into language and therefore also into consciousness. For example, members of a community, ascribing to the same ideology, would accept the inequalities of that society as natural or inevitable (Billig, 2001).

Foucault and Parker disagree somewhat on the concept of ideology. According to Parker (1992), a result of the increase in discourse analysis has been that the topic of ideology hardly exists.

Parker (1992) attributes this partly to Foucault's insistence that the term "ideology" implies that there is a "truth" and that we should consider "regimes of truth" to exist rather than a single truth. For Foucault, truth isn't outside of power (more discussion on power will follow):

Truth is a thing of this world; it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. In addition, it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its „general politics“ of truth; that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true, the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned...the status of those who are charged with saying what accounts are true. (Foucault, 1980, p. 131)

In other words, for Foucault, no one regime of truth should be accepted above another.

Parker (1992) asserts that discourse analysis need not always be attentive to ideology; however, one should not avoid the topic completely. Ideology should be regarded as a description of relationships and effects rather than considering ideology as a thing. Furthermore, ideology should be used to describe relationships at a certain place and historical period. The institution of ideology is significant in this study because certain discourses within this study will be moulded by ideologies, for example, patriarchal discourses pertaining to women as primarily mothers, to be discussed in the literature review.

Ideology therefore dictates to people how they should live and contributes towards their understanding of the world. In other words, by focusing on discourse one is able to examine the ways in which we use and are used by language in society. It also allows us to reflect on how people are "positioned in relations of power as „subjects“ by different kinds of language" (Parker, 2005a, p. 88). (Further discussion on positioning follows later.) Discourse analysis then assists in illustrating how powerful images of the self and the world circulate in society as well as providing a means to question and resist those images (Willig as cited in Parker 2005a).

2.4. Power

Power should be considered when talking about discourses. Power is the "effect of social and cultural practice whereby things get done or people are put under control" (Shi-xu, 2002, p. 72).

This dual aspect of power (getting things done or putting people under control) is important, as Foucault maintains that not all power is repressive and to only associate power with a prohibitive law is a “wholly negative, narrow, skeletal conception of power” (Fontana & Pasquino, 1980, p. 119). Power should therefore be understood as a productive system, forming pleasure, knowledge and discourse and acting as more than a vehicle of repression (Fontana & Pasquino, 1980; Parker, 2002). Shi-xu (2002) adds that power should not only be recognised as domination and exclusion, but also as resistance and equilibrium.

Furthermore, power does not function from the top down; rather it circulates and is distributed through a “net-like organization” (Foucault as cited in Hall, 2001a, p. 77). Neither is it controlled by a single central place. It is interwoven with the norms and values of the specific cultural and historical contexts (Shi-xu, 2002) and is to be found in the relationships between people (Warner, 1996). For example, feminists argue, “women’s bodies, as the personification of society reproducing itself, represent a critical arena for power struggles” (Braam & Hessini, 2004, p. 44). Power appears in many areas of social events and practices, including texts and speech, and can also be linked to instruments or resources for action such as knowledge and social position (Hall, 2001b). In this way we are all, to some extent, affected by its circulation, whether we are the oppressors or the oppressed (Hall, 2001a). Various factors need to be considered when addressing power’s relationship with discourses, viz. the way the discourse is used, the creation of knowledge, the context in which the discourse occurs, institutions of power, and the object and subject (audience) (Parker, 1992). These factors will be discussed below.

2.4.1. The way in which the discourse is used

“Every discourse invites a way of life while discouraging or repelling others” (Gergen & McNamee, 2000, p. 335). Foucault (1980), in his interview with Gordon, maintains that each society has its own “truth”. In other words, each society adopts a discourse and presents and believes it to be the truth (as mentioned earlier). In order to break from this tradition, it is necessary to develop an inclusive, comprehensible and attractive discourse (Lamas, 1997). Therefore a group seeking to change another’s perspective will attempt to make their understanding of the world seem better: “All forms of power translate into a capacity to impose

meaning, and customs and traditions are often defined according to the views of those in power” (Lamas, 1997, p. 65). The ability of one understanding of the world to override or seem more convincing than another is not reliant on empirical validity but rather on the nature of social interaction, for example, negotiation and conflict etc. (Daniels, 1997; Gergen, 1985). Foucault maintains (as cited in Fontana & Pasquino, 1980) that “it is a question of statements, and the way in which they govern each other” which determines whether or not they are scientifically acceptable (p. 112). The manner in which the “facts” or “truth” are received depends on who presents them and how. This means that all thought of a political and social nature is “inevitably caught up in the interplay between knowledge and power” (Hall, 2001a, p. 76). In other words, various parties use facts to convince their audience that their interpretation of the world is the correct one. For example, pro- as well as anti-abortionists quote scientific facts in order to further their argument. Anti-abortionists maintain that since the embryo is an unborn child, abortion is actually murder (Luker, 1984). Those who support abortion argue that the embryo has the ability to become a child but is not a child yet and thus the issue of terminating a pregnancy belongs to a very different category from that of murdering a person (Luker, 1984).

Regimes of truth have consequences for the parties involved, regardless of what the “reality” is (Hall, 2001a). The regime of truth informs the social script for the parties involved and leads to certain action and thought. For example, the Christian church has traditionally opposed abortion and their argument has been based on the Bible, the source of truth for the church. The knowledge or idea that the church enforces is that abortion is murder. This “truth” has consequences for how women faced with crisis pregnancies, as well as the church, are perceived. For example, a woman who resolved a crisis pregnancy by having an abortion may not construe abortion to be a sin and therefore would not perceive herself to be a “sinner” or murderer. The church on the other hand may view her abortion very differently and treat her as a “sinner”. When this woman attends church and is exposed to the argument that abortion is murder, she may begin to believe that she in fact is a murderer, or she may perceive the church to be unaccepting and hypocritical. Either way, this regime of truth has consequences for the parties involved.

Discourses also regulate how ideas are implemented in practice as well as how ideas are used to govern the behaviour of others (Hall, 2001a). For example, feminists argue that traditional Western cultural beliefs dictating marital relationships, pregnancy and childbearing, have in the past influenced abortion legislation and therefore controlled women's reproductive choice (Braam & Hessini, 2004). Furthermore, feminists also argue that patriarchy is largely institutionalised in the family resulting in women's sexual identity and rights being governed by men (van Zyl as cited in de Nobrega, 2006).

The contradictions which often occur in people's opinion, "attitudes" and behaviour are of particular interest to social constructionists. Parker (1992) asserts that a discourse sometimes contradicts another discourse and in this way identifies it. For example, the natural motherhood discourse maintains that mothering is a natural and normal role for a woman to adopt and that abortion defies this role and is immoral. A contradictory discourse is the reproductive rights discourse which argues that a woman should be able to decide if or when she would like to bear a child. In other words, the reproductive rights discourse maintains that a woman should be able to choose motherhood and that it should not be taken for granted that she will adopt this role. In this way, the motherhood discourse defines the reproductive rights discourse and vice versa as the one cannot exist without the other. Thus, when doing a discourse analysis one may identify a piece of text that totally contradicts the motherhood discourse and in this way conclude that there is a reproductive rights discourse at play.

2.4.2. The context in which the discourse occurs and positioning theory

Power is exercised by questions of how knowledge is applied in context (Foucault, 1980). The context within which the construct is spoken about makes it easier or more difficult to talk in a particular way (Edley, 2001). For example, it could be difficult for a woman to talk openly about her decision to have an abortion amongst male church leaders because the religious discourse, constructing abortion as a sin, would most likely be prominent. The reproductive rights discourse would therefore be silenced (see next paragraph) by the religious discourse. Another example is the construction of the woman against the fetus. The pendulum swings between constructing the

woman who had the abortion as a victim and the fetus as the victim. Various articles give accounts of the swinging between the two, depending on who is to benefit from the construction. Therefore, the woman and the fetus are continuously being reconstructed (Daniels, 1997).

One should then ask whose interests are best served by the salient discourses in the community as some discourses may oppress one group of people while benefiting another (Edley, 2001; Fontana & Pasquino, 1980; Gergen & McNamee, 2000; Parker, 1992). Braam and Hessini (2004) agree and argue that by considering power dynamics, one is better able to understand the continued marginalisation of TOP by focusing on those whose interests are at risk, those who gain and those who suffer as a result. For example, feminists have regarded restrictive abortion laws as part of men's attempt to control women's reproduction (L. Walker, 1996).

According to Parker (2004) the relationship between power and discourse is complicated and subject positioning theory provides a useful means to address the ways in which the "powerful" and the "powerless" are addressed and recruited. Positioning can be defined as the "discursive process whereby selves are located in conversations as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced story lines" (Davies & Harré, 2001, p. 264). There are two types of positioning. Firstly, interactive positioning occurs where one person's speech positions another. Secondly, reflexive positioning refers to an instance where one positions oneself (Davies & Harré, 2001). For example, often the oppressed participates and reproduces her own oppression (Parker, 2004).

Positioning is not always intentional. Rather people live according to how their self is defined and re-defined and this is a continuous process and can be determined by oneself or another (Davies & Harré, 2001). "What we are is expressed in the categories of psychological discourse, so that, as we change, the categories we use to describe ourselves to ourselves also change" (Louw, 2002, p. 2). This process pertains not only to psychological discourse but to any discourse; we are recreated or positioned by the discourse circulating at the time. For example, a woman who has had an abortion may attend a workshop on women's reproductive rights and thereafter position herself very differently to how she may position herself after attending confession.

2.4.3. Disciplinary power

Foucault identified various institutions, “domination structures”, which wield power through psychological knowledge (Richer, 1992, p. 111). These domination structures may be political, economic, ideological, religious and combinations of these (Richer, 1992). Parker (1992) acknowledges these domination structures and refers to them as institutions. He maintains that one should identify institutions that the discourse reinforces as well as those that are marginalised when the discourse is employed. The literature review will indicate that the church and the state have been instrumental in creating and influencing discourses on abortion. Another example of a domination structure could be the institution of medicine. The following section refers to work by Foucault that examined how domination structures or institutions sought, and still seek, to control the body and the greater population.

In the first volume of “The History of Sexuality”, Foucault documents how power over life and death was initially assigned to the king who decided who could continue to live and who should die. This occupation of power transformed over hundreds of years into a pursuit by political powers to maximise the use of the human body. A transition occurred over time in that the “ancient right to *take* life or *let* live was replaced by a power to *foster* life or *disallow* it to the point of death” (Foucault, 1976, p. 138). According to Foucault (1976), the political power adopted the task of administering life, a process identified by Foucault as biopower. Biopower is described as “an apparently benevolent, but peculiar invasive and effective” means of social control (Sawicki, 1991, p. 67). It developed in two inter-related forms, disciplinary power and a regulatory power.

Disciplinary power exists as knowledge and power over the individual body, including its abilities, movements, location and behaviours. Disciplinary practices transform the body into a machine which is more powerful, productive, useful and docile. These practices exist in institutions such as the army, police, hospitals and schools and include apprenticeship and education (Foucault, 1976). These practices also emerge at the micro level of society in the everyday actions and routine of individuals such as in the family (Foucault, 1976). They ensure their clutch not through the threat of violence or force but by creating desires, attributing certain

identities to individuals and instituting norms. These norms are used as a measure against which individuals measure their behaviours and bodies. In the same way, others judge individuals according to these measures (Sawicki, 1991). An example of this could be the Christian principle which prohibits sex before marriage and which is considered a norm in the Christian church. It creates a desire for a prospective husband and wife to want to marry a virgin. In this way, reproduction is controlled and confined to marriage.

According to Foucault (1980), whilst exercising disciplinary power, the process of fine tuning the body into a machine, one develops mastery and an awareness of one's body by investing power in it through exercises, muscle building, gymnastics, glorification of the body. All of these activities culminate in a desire of one's own body. But once power has resulted in this effect, eventually one's own body reacts against the power for example, "of health against the economic system, of pleasure against the moral norms of sexuality, marriage and decency" (Foucault, 1980, p. 56). In other words, what once fuelled the power is now used against it. The power which worked relentlessly on the body is now itself victim in that very same body. In other words, the disciplinary power educates people about their own bodies as people are forced to engage intensively with their bodies. This process stirs a desire in people to have control over their own bodies and they thus rebel against the disciplinary power exerted on them.

Foucault (1980) refers to child masturbation in the eighteenth century, which was regarded as an "appalling sickness" (p. 56). The institution of the family enforced power over children's bodies through a "system of control over sexuality" (p. 56). By focusing on sexuality through surveillance and control, it "engenders at the same time an intensification of each individual's desire, for, in and over his body. The body thus became the issue of conflict between parents and children, the child and the instances of control" (Foucault, 1980, pp. 56, 57). In other words, the power wielded on children through surveillance and control in an attempt to curb masturbation in fact created an increased awareness of one's body and the desire for pleasure. The power that was invested in the children's bodies therefore launched a counter-attack, resulting in the opposite effect; the child's awareness of the body. As a result, the body became a point of contention between parents and children (Foucault, 1980). This theory is useful in understanding how, when power is exercised from the outside over one's body, the challenge is then to snatch

that power back. For example, for centuries women's bodies have been controlled by others, more specifically men, and particularly through reproduction. The pro-rights movement is an example of the manifestation of this fight in which women want to reclaim the right to make decisions regarding their bodies.

Foucault (1980), continues his discussion by referring to examples of the "panic" of institutions of the social body (society) such as doctors and politicians against free abortion and non-legalised cohabitation (p. 56). In these instances, power does not relinquish its battle but rather re-groups and re-strategises, investing elsewhere; and so, the cycle carries on. For example, in South Africa, where abortion is now legalised, the desire to control women's bodies is now redistributed and channelled through, for example, pro-life groups.

2.5. Conclusion

In summary, the work of Parker and Foucault form the theoretical basis for this research. Both emphasise the importance of language or discourse and social processes. As people interact, they create meaning and different realities. Therefore, language is more than a linguist concept but rather a tool which creates descriptions and accounts to construct the world. There is thus a shift from other psychological research which focuses on individuals and their problems. My research is therefore not interested in individual's attitudes or internal mental states, but rather people's constructions of what they perceive to be reality, in other words, their regime of truth.

Various multiplicities of realities exist, accompanied by strategies such as positioning which attempt to dictate which reality should be considered true. These strategies therefore also define who we are at different times in history. A key objective in discourse analysis is thus to focus on what people are doing when they talk, as people use certain words and techniques to make their regime of truth seem more convincing than others. Discourses should therefore never be considered outside of the context in which they circulate, particularly in terms of culture, ideology and history.

Foucault produced much work on power and how discourse reproduces and restricts power. He maintains that power is not always repressive and can also be productive, for example, it produces knowledge. Foucault identified biopower, comprised of disciplinary and regulatory power, which serves to discipline the body and regulate society respectively. Although the latter developed later, they are interrelated. Domination structures, for example, politics, economics and religion, exert these powers on society in an effort to discipline and control. Surveillance, as illustrated by the panopticon, assists in controlling the population. This theoretical framework will therefore assist in understanding how legal abortion is constructed by the South African public. Furthermore, it will assist in identifying how women who present for or consider abortion are positioned and conceptualised by the public.

Chapter 3

Literature Review

3.1. Introduction

Whilst very little research has been conducted on the public's discourses about abortion, many national and international studies have addressed the public's "attitude" towards abortion (Bernas & Stein, 2001; Bolks, Evans, Polinard, & Wrinkle, 2000; Bolzendahl & Myers, 2004; Evans, 2002; Hertel & Russell, 1999; Hoffman & Mills Johnson, 2005; Schnell & McConatha, 1996; Strickler & Danigelis, 2002; Walzer, 1994). There is thus a need for more qualitative enquiries into the meanings that women (as well as men) attach to abortion (L. Walker, 1996). One of the reasons is that abortion "provides a window into the complex concerns of power, patriarchy and the construction of gender identity" (L. Walker, 1996, p. 45). By simply documenting attitudes one does not address the complexities involved such as the power relationships between the state and the citizen, and the influence of patriarchy and how it is subtly enforced through laws on reproduction. These laws are not only state laws but also the norms or social artefacts of communities. Different constructions of TOP position men and women in various ways.

The literature review that follows is a combination of a critique of attitude research and an indication of previous studies that have been conducted on public discourses around abortion. As already stated, social constructionists discount the notion of stable internal states of the mind and this critique contributes to that argument. Interestingly, the concept of "attitude" as a person's positive or negative opinion only emerged in the mid-nineteenth century, prior to which it referred to how figures were arranged in paintings and statues (J Potter, 1996), another example of contextual, historical and cultural relevance (Burr, 1995). A discussion around recent literature on the discourses around abortion is also presented, these being the religious discourse, the role of the family and morality and the motherhood discourse. The fetal rights discourse, reproductive rights discourse and woman-centred discourse are discussed together as they are inextricably connected. Following this is a discussion on the positioning of the man and woman co-responsible for the pregnancy and the public's construction of abortion as taboo and stigmatised. As mentioned in the theoretical framework, discourses draw on as well as contradict

each other. Therefore, throughout the discussion one can see threads of certain discourses emerging in others. For example, the religious discourse features prominently throughout most of the other discourses. Thus, it has been placed first in the literature review. Other discourses feed subsequent discourses. For example, the Familial-moral discourse informs the motherhood discourse, both of which are in turn, largely, founded on the religious discourse.

3.2. Critique of attitude research

A definition of attitude research was presented in the introduction as well as a summary of the problems identified with this approach. The points that were mentioned earlier are expanded upon below. Before I proceed with the critique of attitude research, I refer to a few abortion attitude studies that have been conducted, in order to provide some insight into the approach and results of such research. A review of studies conducted on abortion attitudes suggest that factors such as feminism, religion and demographic variables (Bolks et al., 2000; Emerson, 1996) as well as gender (Walzer, 1994) are considered to influence attitudes towards abortion.

Hertel and Russel (1999) used General Social Survey data from the United States from 1972 to 1994 to explore gender and attitudes towards abortion. They concluded that men, particularly single men, scored slightly higher than women in their support for abortion. However, married women are more supportive of abortion than married men, possibly due to the need for both parties to work (Hertel & Russell, 1999).

Strickler and Danigelis's (2002) study also used General Social Survey data collected between 1977 and 1996 to investigate how the "determinants" of abortion attitudes have changed during this period. Interestingly, their results suggested that gender has become less of a determining factor and that older people have become more accepting of TOP. Furthermore, the results show that the influence of the Catholic religion has diminished slightly over the two decades whilst religious fundamentalism and political liberalism has increased in their impact on abortion attitudes. According to the authors (Strickler & Danigelis, 2002), religiosity's influence has lessened in terms of predicting abortion attitudes and the attitude toward sexual freedom as well as an ethos for the sanctity of human life have become more powerful factors in predicting

abortion attitudes. Gender inequality is a weak but stable predictor of abortion attitudes. The results of this study suggest that the pro-life framework still plays a stronger role in influencing attitudes towards abortion than the pro-choice perspective (Strickler & Danigelis, 2002). Factors that have increased support for abortion and a negative attitude towards unintended pregnancies include the legalisation of abortion and thus the „education“ that has accompanied the new law. Other factors include the need for fertility control as well as an increase in women pursuing careers, especially amongst mothers of young children. A rise in nonmarital sexual relations and a decrease in men’s salaries has resulted in the need for two incomes in a household (Strickler & Danigelis, 2002) and thus fewer women are able to stay at home and not work.

Walzer (1994) also used data from the General Social Survey collected in 1990. The results revealed that there is no clearcut answer to the question of whether gender shapes attitudes towards abortion. Strong predictors of levels of support for both men and women were that of religious affiliation and behaviour variables. For women, there was a significant difference in support for legalised abortion where the woman was a full-time housewife and black. These factors were not of particular significance for the male sample. On the other hand, men were more concerned about the number of children in terms of levels of support for abortion, whilst for women, this was not significant (Walzer, 1994)

These three studies give an indication of the nature of abortion attitudes research. All three used data from the same source and without interviewing people. I now present a critique of this approach to exploring the public’s view on abortion. I am critical of this method because of (a) the relationship between attitude and behaviour; (b) the occurrence of contradictions within the same text; (c) the de-politicising of social problems by attributing them to individual processes (Burr, 1995); (d) the element of reductionism in attitude research; (e) the lack of consideration for the multiplicity of people’s constructions of TOP; and (f) the means used to categorise or conceptualise TOP.

3.2.1. The relationship between attitude and behaviour

The first critique of attitude research is that attitudes and behaviour have an unstable relationship and therefore predictions cannot be guaranteed. Often people do not act according to the attitudes identified in the research (Potter, 1996a). For example, an individual may regard abortion as evil and later opt for an abortion under different circumstances. According to Sahar and Karasawa (2005), previous research in America, using data primarily from the National Opinion Research Center's General Social Surveys, indicated that a large percentage of Americans do not claim to possess a "stable opinion" but rather change their opinion according to the circumstances. In South Africa, research indicates that the South African public continues to oppose abortion as an everyday solution to unwanted pregnancy. However, this research has also indicated that the same members of society will consider abortion under conditions which they feel sanction the procedure (Mojapelo-Batka & Schoeman, 2003; Varga, 2003). As mentioned above, often circumstances in which abortion is constructed as a preferred option to pregnancy include when pregnancy is a result of rape or incest, a risk to the mother's mental or physical health or a risk to giving birth to an "unhealthy" child (Mojapelo-Batka & Schoeman, 2003; Sahar & Karasawa, 2005). "This is the nub of the so-called attitude-behaviour problem. It refers to the mismatch between what people say when confronted with pencil-and-paper measurement of attitudes, and what they do in practice" (Potter, 1996a, p. 127). This is referred to later in section 3.3.1 on the influence of religion when the "ambivalent majority" is discussed. In attitude research, the statements in a questionnaire that yield contradictory responses are often excluded in order to ensure that there is a clearer discrimination of the sole belief (Parker, 2005b).

Shepard (2000) makes an interesting argument, she maintains that "societies accommodate conflicting views on sexuality and reproduction via a „double discourse“ system which maintains the status quo in repressive or negligent public policies while expanding private sexual and reproductive choices behind the scenes" (p. 111). In other words, women will support restrictive legislation in public but act against it in private. Petchesky (as cited in Shepard, 2000) cites strategies that women use to expand their reproductive choices (in a context where abortion is still illegal or heavily frowned upon by the public) whilst retaining their place in the family and community. "A woman may see no contradiction whatsoever in both acting against a particular

norm and speaking in deference to it. Indeed, accommodation in practice often means a non-confrontational or conciliatory way of achieving one's wishes or sense of right" (Petchesky as cited in Shepard, 2000, p. 114). A large percentage of women in African countries undergo unsafe abortions in an effort to respect the values of their community. Reasons for unwanted pregnancies include pre-marital sex and pregnancy. This may occur in countries where abortion is legal but the woman may still opt for unsafe or backstreet abortions in order to keep her contravention of social values a secret (Teklehaimanot, 2002).

However the "double discourse" is misleading as it implies that private actions, conflicting with the norm, despite their widespread practice, are not favoured with any public discourse at all that defends their legitimacy (Shepard, 2000). In other words, the private discourse does not defend reproductive rights, but rather rationalises individual actions while constructing these actions as being weak or sinful. For example in Chile, reformers supporting sex education were accused of being "permissive" and promoting promiscuity (Shepard, 2000). Women's actions in private are therefore not constructed positively within public discourses.

Kalb (as cited in Tan, 2004) interviewed a couple who considered themselves devout Catholics and who were strongly opposed to abortion. However, when their daughter became very ill they supported embryonic stem-cell research, with the hope that it may help their daughter's illness. A Newsweek article made the following comment:

When abortion foes are willing to destroy embryos for life-saving medical research and abortion rights supporters are willing to define a fetus as a murder victim, the black-and-white rhetoric of the 1970s abortion wars no longer applies. (Tan, 2004, p. 162)

Another example more related to this thesis is illustrated by a Kenyan study (Mitchell et al., 2006) which states that "individuals often have one set of ideal behaviors advocated in the abstract and another set of actual personal behaviors enacted in the face of actual events and circumstances" (p. 524). When the students participating in the study discussed hypothetical situations, they tended to be harsh in their response as opposed to when their peers revealed personal stories about abortion. In the latter case, the students' responses were more empathic.

3.2.2. The occurrence of contradictions within the same text

The second critique of attitude research is the occurrence of contradictions in people's "attitudes". An issue raised by Wetherell and Potter (as cited in Burr, 1995) is that often people contradict themselves within the same text. In their research in New Zealand on race relations, they found an interviewee's talk displayed tolerance of Maoris in one paragraph and prejudice in the next. The "attitude" was therefore neither coherent nor stable. The authors suggest then that instead of accepting what people say as a representation of their internal condition or underlying processes, we should ask what function their talk serves. What purpose are people achieving by saying what they are saying?

Billig (1990), who is highly interested in rhetoric, argues that when attempting to understand an individual's "attitude", it is necessary to find an "argumentative meaning" (p. 52). In other words, one must consider the "counter-attitude" that the individual is attempting to oppose. Similarly, when trying to understand a justification, one must identify the potential or actual criticisms that the speaker is trying to avoid. Thus, by analysing the meaning of a piece of discourse by situating that discourse in relation to its controversy, one can begin to understand the discourse (Billig, 1990). When reading the literature which focuses specifically on attitudes towards abortion, it is useful to consider the counter-attitude of the participants in the studies. This may provide more insight into the discourses at play.

Rance (2005), in her study on discourses of abortion in a Bolivian hospital, noted that the participants' responses were inconsistent. She cites Stone and Campbell who assert that:

To claim that data collected in one context is valid entails the assumption that people's behaviour and attitudes are consistent from one context to another. The assumption is that what people say in the interview context can stand as an accurate representation of what they say (and do) in all other contexts. If nothing else, standard ethnographic fieldwork (or participant observation) has demonstrated that this assumption is false. (p. 190)

3.2.3. The depoliticising of social problems by attributing them to individual processes

The third issue in relation to attitude research is that Psychology depoliticises social problems by attributing them to individual processes. The attitude researcher does not provide an account of how collective and individual “attitudes” link together. Social constructionists on the other hand argue that “attitudes” and constructions or understandings of the world are formed collectively, in other words, that the formation of attitudes is a social process (Burr, 1995). “Though a private action, abortion is socially scripted and often collectively determined by wider social networks” (Nyanzi et al., 2005, p. 159). In other words, through social interaction, people create and negotiate various understandings and constructions of abortion, as opposed to merely subscribing to their own individual internal “attitudes” towards abortion.

Understandings of abortion are therefore formed through social interaction, facilitated by language. For example, by focusing on the “attitude” of a man forbidding his wife, or himself refusing, to use contraception, one fails to address or acknowledge influences on a macro or ideological level, such as patriarchy. According to Remennick and Hestroni’s study (2001), “public attitudes toward fertility and abortion are shaped by social ideologies and core values regarding religion, gender roles, and civil rights – issues too fundamental to change in a matter of years” (p. 430). Thus, it is important to acknowledge how macro issues such as religion and ideology interweave with “attitudes”.

3.2.4. The element of reductionism in attitude research

The fourth critique of attitude research pertains to the reductionism of attitude research in that attitude theorists reduce concepts in order to measure them whilst ignoring the complexity and the macro levels of meaning making. For example, Bolks et al.’s, (2000) attempt to measure the influence of feminism and religion on abortion “attitudes” is a prime example of traditional psychology’s attempt to reduce complex concepts, thereby disregarding the wider socio-political context. Attitudes influenced by feminism are measured by means of a five-point question. One of the questions used is whether “In general, women will be better off if they have careers and jobs just like men”. This statement could be described as reflecting a shallow understanding of

feminism. By referring to what is not said in the statement, one can infer that the researchers assume that feminists protest against the occupation of raising children. Furthermore, the researchers are making assumptions about what feminism entails, and thus adopting taken for granted assumptions to be truth (Burr, 1995).

3.2.5. The lack of consideration for the multiplicity of people's construction of TOP

Attitude research fails to address the multiplicity of people's understandings of various subjects. As mentioned above, attitude theory maintains that individuals have a coherent identity or self which informs our behaviour, attitudes and reactions to certain events. However, individuals actually possess multiple social identities; for example, a woman adopts various roles in different contexts. As a female, she can be a mother, wife, lover, and sister. Regardless of her sex, she can be a student, an accountant etc. (C. Walker, 1995). In other words, various identities emerge or interact with the social identity of the mother, "shaping women's choices in complex and not necessarily consistent or highly reflexive ways" (C. Walker, 1995, p. 29). Therefore, one cannot argue for a consistent attitude which can predict behaviour as people make choices according to the context that they are in. For example, Jane could be a Catholic congregation member who agrees with pro-life arguments, an executive who is not ready to have children yet, a volunteer at a children's hospice and a friend to someone who is pregnant because of rape. There is no easy formula to predict how Jane will react to her friend's decision to have an abortion. Therefore, the essentialist notion that a person possesses a definable and discoverable nature, including "attitudes" towards things, should be challenged (Burr, 1995).

Parker (2005a) argues that one should "look for the multivoicedness of language instead of searching for underlying psychological processes or themes" (p. 89). We should thus attend to the ways in which our experience of speaking and being spoken of is often contradictory (Parker, 2004, 2005b) by looking at how words are different rather than how they are the same. For example, there is a difference between referring to the fetus as an embryo and as a baby. Both descriptions have different implications for how the fetus and others are positioned (Kitzinger as cited in Parker, 2005a). Thus, the ways in which people are forced to fit into certain categories,

marked out as different and how the contradictions within categories work, are very important for analysis (Parker, 2005a). An example relevant to this study is seen in a South African study (Mojapelo-Batka & Schoeman, 2003) in which a teenager who had an abortion stated that she did not approve of abortion but she was happy and relieved because she could return to school. In this instance, perhaps the young woman felt that she had to state her anti-abortion views in order to conform to the predominant socially available anti-abortion script, despite her feelings.

Boyle and McEvoy (1998) transfer the concept of the “unitary rational subject”, assumed in much research in Psychology, to the abortion context. They assert that within this framework of the “unitary rational subject”, a woman’s response to abortion is often limited. For example, if a questionnaire and scale were used to determine a woman’s attitude to abortion she would have to summarise her response in one word or sentence. As a result, the inconsistency and contradictions in women’s responses are de-emphasised. For example, the prevailing construction of abortion in Northern Ireland, at the time of the study (Boyle & McEvoy, 1998), was that it is “murder” or “killing babies”. Many of the women in the research who had had abortions were concerned that this construction would be attached to them if anyone found out about their abortion. Their response to an attitude scale may therefore not have reflected how they really felt. The authors argue that except in extreme cases, contextual reasons for abortion are often construed to be trivial or convenient and are therefore dismissed.

3.2.6. The means used to categorise or conceptualise TOP

The sixth and last critique of attitude research refers to the taken for granted assumptions around the terminology used to categorise the reasons for abortion. Attitude research frequently focuses on the attitudes that people have to abortion when performed under different circumstances. The way in which these reasons or circumstances are categorised neglect the complexity of the decision to abort and are not value-free.

Two main categories are usually referred to. The first category includes abortion: (1) where the women’s health or that of the fetus is threatened, or (2) in the case of rape and/or incest and sometimes where the mother has HIV/AIDS. The other category includes reasons such as

abortion due to the pregnancy being unplanned, financial constraints, a need to complete schooling etc. Various terms have been allocated to the two groups. For example, a South African study divided the reasons into “medical” and “non-medical” or “social” reasons (da Costa & Donald, 2003). Here the “medical” reasons include maternal health, fetal abnormality, HIV/AIDS, rape and incest. It is interesting to note that rape and incest are included in the construction of “medical” in this case. Does the fact that rape is considered, for the most part, to be a justifiable reason for a TOP, influence whether it is considered a medical, non-medical, or social reason? A study conducted in the USA speaks of “traumatic reasons” and “elective” reasons (Hoffman & Mills Johnson, 2005). The reasons classified by da Costa and Donald (2003) as “medical” are considered here to be traumatic whilst the non-medical (unplanned pregnancy, financial constraints) are classified as elective reasons. In a similar way, Remennick and Hestroni (2001), from Israel, classify the reasons according to vital and non-vital. Lastly, Sahar and Karasawa (2005) divide the reasons into uncontrollable and controllable reasons. What exactly determines which circumstances are considered traumatic, vital or controllable? The medical discourse because of its objectivity and claim to truth (Strebel, 1997)? Other examples refer to soft versus hard reasons (Cannold, 2002). It is interesting that the reasons that women state for an abortion are considered to be “soft”, such as financial difficulties or an unplanned pregnancy, whilst the reasons that the state (men) and the medical arena consider important are categorised as “hard” (in other words “justified”), for example rape.

In the theoretical framework, I referred to Foucault’s discussion on binaries. The literature cited above also referred to binaries such as medical/non-medical, traumatic/elective, vital/non-vital, uncontrollable/controllable and hard/soft. Derrida (as cited in Burr, 1995) argues that binary oppositions, in which one term is always given a more privileged position than its opposite, are typical of ideologies. They „con“ the reader into believing in a greater value on one side of the dichotomy rather than the other, when in fact neither can exist without the other (p. 107). In this case, the terms used to categorise the reasons „con“ the reader into thinking that the non-medical, non-vital, elective and controllable reasons position women as able to prevent abortion, thus constructing abortion as the unfavourable option. The woman is thus positioned as irresponsible, promiscuous, cowardly or incapable of making the right decision. The other sides of the binaries, on the other hand, legitimise abortion.

3.3. Social issues in relation to abortion and the man co-responsible for the pregnancy

As mentioned in the theoretical framework, social constructionists are interested in social processes as opposed to internal mental states. Therefore, my research considers the influences of social issues, for example gender and religion, and not only people's individual understandings or experiences of abortion. Furthermore, Tan (2004) argues that the pro-life/pro-choice dichotomy is not the only framework to discuss abortion and that various constructs of the fetus have stemmed from theological, legal and medical arenas. These constructions refer to abortion in a particular way, resulting in a variety of constructions of abortion. In the following section, various social issues and their relationship with abortion are discussed. These include religion, the traditional nuclear family and morality, a public/private split pertaining to women and reproduction, patriarchy, mothering, the rights movements and lastly, men in relation to abortion.

3.3.1. Religion and abortion

The role of religion in opposing abortion has been cited by numerous studies both nationally (Mojapelo-Batka & Schoeman, 2003; L. Walker, 1996) and internationally (Hoffman & Mills Johnson, 2005; Lamas, 1997; Oaks, 2002; Rance, 1999). Kelley, Evans and Headey (as cited in Hopkins, Reicher, & Saleem, 1996), agree that, historically, debates opposing abortion have been based on a religious discourse. According to the literature (R. S. Brown, 1993), the Christian Church has often viewed crisis pregnancy, on a macro level, as a "social problem" that indicates a shortage of moral direction. On a micro level, the church has mainly understood a crisis pregnancy to be a problem of an "irresponsible or victimized individual" (p. 68).

Mojapelo-Batka and Schoeman (2003) encountered the influence of religion in their South African study where many of their participants experienced "guilt" and "shame" after having TOPs. The authors (Mojapelo-Batka & Schoeman, 2003) maintain that these negative feelings were informed by the church, an organisation understood by society to regard abortion as a sin as illustrated by the following response from a participant: "My parents attend church regularly and

they always say abortion is not wanted in heaven and that the child will stop me from entering heaven. They think it is killing and that killing is a sin” (Mojapelo-Batka & Schoeman, 2003, p. 147). Similar findings were reported in Ireland (Boyle & McEvoy, 1998) where the Bible was understood to imply that abortion is baby killing, and in Uganda (Nyanzi et al., 2005, p. 150) where Muslim participants reported abortion as sinful.

Although several religious traditions have been the source of moral outrage over the frequency of abortion in the United States, Hoffman and Mills Johnson (2005) maintain that some religious groups have raised strong arguments for the pro-choice stance. Some have also distanced themselves from the debate, arguing that although the moral concerns are founded, each person needs to be guided by their own conscience regarding decisions involving abortion (Hoffman & Mills Johnson, 2005). These groups are an “ambivalent majority” who are primarily against abortion but maintain it should be tolerated as an “evil necessity” (Cannold, 2002, p. 172) in certain circumstances. For example, despite TOP being considered morally wrong, the male participants in Nyanzi et al.’s study (2005) considered abortion to be justifiable in certain circumstances, such as for pregnant school girls in order to protect their future and avoid the legal implications, such as imprisonment, for impregnating a minor (Nyanzi et al., 2005, p. 151). In this study (Nyanzi et al., 2005), constructions of abortion range from “dependable saviour” or “a solution for many problems” to a “deceptive sin” (p. 56). Contradicting constructions of abortion amongst the male participants indicate tensions and conflict amongst the public’s understanding of abortion and reproductive health (Nyanzi et al., 2005).

Elsewhere (Hopkins et al., 1996) it has been suggested that the religious anti-abortionist argument poses a few problems for contemporary anti-abortion arguments. Firstly, according to the authors (1996), the percentage of people identifying with religion has declined. This statement is debatable within the South Africa context, as illustrated by the discussion above. Secondly, the women’s movement has resulted in considerable changes regarding how women define themselves. For example, women have begun to question “womanhood” and what that means. Therefore, while the traditional anti-abortion argument is subject to a decrease in support, it is also susceptible to accusations that it “ignores the practical realities of women’s experience and is politically reactionary/anti-woman” (Hopkins et al., 1996, p. 540). For example, the rate of

rape and incest affecting South African women is also a practical reality that needs to be considered and one which often results in unwanted pregnancies (van der Westhuizen, 2001).

3.3.2. The traditional nuclear family and morality

The traditional family unit has often been portrayed by society as pivotal to the healthy functioning of individuals and communities (Hochfeld, 2007). For more than a hundred years the home has been regarded as a moral sanctuary and women were given the mandate to safeguard and produce the moral fibre of society (Andersen, 2000), an idea linked to mothering to be discussed later. Today the word “family” represents a number of configurations other than the traditional nuclear family comprised of a mother, father and children, for example female-headed and/or single-parent households, two-earner families and couples without children (Andersen, 2000). However, the predominant construct of an ideal family today still mirrors the nuclear family constitution, implying that newer family forms are problematic and, according to conservatives, indicative of “all that has gone wrong with traditional values in society” (Andersen, 2000, p. 154). Macleod (2003) agrees that marriage and the formation and preservation of the male-female relationship with children are considered to be normal and beneficial. Single female-headed households are therefore presented as “rupturing this marital authority” by forming family structures that threaten the well-being of children (C Macleod, 2003, p. 24).

Foucault (1985) maintains that morality refers to “a set of values and rules of action that are recommended to individuals through the intermediary of various prescriptive agencies such as the family (in one of its roles), educational institutions, churches and so forth” (p. 25). For Foucault, the family is a definite vehicle in instituting morals. Hochfeld agrees (2007) and maintains that South African families have previously been described as the “tools in producing normative behaviour” and are therefore required to be morally sound” (p. 82). Women and girls therefore experience pressure to fulfill the moral expectations as dictated by the family and society, as indicated by a South African study (L. Walker, 1996) with primary health care workers regarding their feelings towards TOP. Surprisingly the nurses did not regard morality to be mainly informed by religion but rather by mothers or women. In the same study women who

have abortions were said to display few morals, ignorance and a lack of responsibility for not using contraceptives (L. Walker, 1996).

The family is a private world and conflicts are dealt with internally without the interference of the state. The family thus mediates between family members and society (Andersen, 2000). Van Zyl (as cited in de Nobrega, 2006) identifies men as being the primary mediators on behalf of women and children. De Beauvoir (as cited in Reich, 2008) maintains: “The life of the father has a mysterious prestige...It is through him that the family communicates with the rest of the world; he incarnates that immense, difficult and marvelous world of adventure; he personifies transcendence, he is God” (p. 12). An example of this negotiation could be that should a teen-aged woman or young woman still residing in her parent’s home fall pregnant, the “matter” would be addressed within the privacy of the home and without outside interference. According to Ackermann and Armour (1989), mainline churches and right-wing religions regard anything that threatens the conservative biblical family model as “inherently evil” or wrong, irrespective of the social context in which it arises (p. 4). This could include abortion which challenges the traditional family, especially traditional motherhood roles. Furthermore Luker (1984) argues that coupled with the belief that motherhood is integral to being a woman, pro-life activists also view the family as being a sacred entity and primary source of moral values and that public policy intrudes into the home and disrupts family relationships.

3.3.3. Public/private split

Feminists criticise the way in which the public/private split operates with regard to women and reproduction. Boyle and McEvoy (1998) suggest three ways in which a public/private split occurs with regard to women and the choice of whether or not to abort. The first public/private split refers to the sexual encounter prior to the pregnancy. De Nobrega (2006) agrees and argues that reproduction is constructed as private. Petchesky (as cited in Hall, 2001b) identifies abortion as a signifier which makes the sexual act visible. This can be problematic for unmarried women, as illustrated by a Northern Irish politician during a debate on abortion in the national assembly: “Most abortions are the result of fornication and lust and not of conception within marriage...these girls have been committing fornication and have had to have abortions to get rid

of the resulting problems” (Boyle & McEvoy, 1998, pp. 294,295). This point relates to the Familial-moral discourse discussed earlier (C Macleod, 2003) which enforces the conjugalisation of sex and reproduction. (This quote also suggests that women are promiscuous and immoral, with reference to “lust”; this positioning of women will be discussed elsewhere, for example section 5.3.6.).

The second public/private split refers to the woman’s decision to have a TOP and her experience thereof or the private experiences of women and public definitions of abortion (Boyle & McEvoy, 1998). In this discourse study (Boyle & McEvoy, 1998), women who had abortions dealt with the conflict they experienced by expressing detachment from, rejection of and resentment towards the public’s definitions of abortion as well as relaying emotional reactions which indicated that the rejection or detachment was not completely successful. For example, one of the participants said, “I know that if I lived [in England] I could have gone ahead no problem. But because you live here you have to abide by the rules of what is right and wrong as far as *they’re concerned*” (Boyle & McEvoy, 1998, p. 295). This point illustrates the implications for women who are having abortions because of the public stigma and sense of taboo around the procedure. Although abortion in Ireland is very restricted compared with to South Africa where it is legal, I would like to suggest that some women considering abortion in South Africa experience conflict around their decision because their construction of abortion is influenced by the prevailing discourses in their community which is likely to still be anti-abortion. For example, a South African study (Mojapelo-Batka & Schoeman, 2003) with women who had undergone TOP indicated that shame and embarrassment were experienced as a result of the anticipated negative responses from others. In other words, these feelings were not direct responses to people’s reaction to the abortion. Interestingly, the women also anticipated negative responses to the pre-marital pregnancy due to prevailing attitudes by parents and community (Mojapelo-Batka & Schoeman, 2003).

The third point relating to the conflict of the public definitions of abortion and the private experiences of women pertains to women’s responses to abortion. (Boyle & McEvoy, 1998) report that the prevailing discourse of murder and the fetus’ right to life in Northern Ireland positions women as child killers who should feel appropriate remorse for their actions. However,

the authors note that some of the participants did not feel that they had acted inappropriately. Rather, they referred to how they supposed they should have felt, based on the public's pro-life discourse. This links to the above paragraph relating to women experiencing certain feelings based on the *perceived* reactions of the community.

3.3.4. Patriarchy within the family

For Daniels (1997), the debate over fetal risk is not really about the prevention of fetal harm, but rather about the social production of truth regarding men's and women's relationship with reproduction. Interestingly, the pro-life movement has been accused of an attempt to control women. Luker (1984) argues that the pro-life movement is actually fuelled more by gender issues than those of a religious or moral nature. According to Luker (1984), although pro-life supporters advocate for the protection of the fetus' life based on religious grounds, their main objective is to secure a traditional social system where men control women's reproductive lives. Marsiglio and Diekow (1998) agree by saying that the pro-life stance is supported by patriarchal ideals along with religious underpinnings.

According to de Nobrega (2006), throughout history, the state, fathers and husbands have regulated women's bodies, including reproduction. L. Walker (1995) agrees when she says that "women have little control over their sexuality and in negotiating the use of contraception with their partners" (p. 820). This thinking has been encouraged by patriarchy which constructs the man as superior to the woman. For example, the man is positioned as the breadwinner (Andersen, 2000; Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998) and the woman as the mother at home. The traditional two-parent structure with the man as the breadwinner fuels women's oppression (Ziehl, 1994). In a recent study (Shefer et al., 2008) in the Western Cape, in a similar community to my study, it was found that traditional constructions of gender roles and (hetero) sexual practices still predominate where women are resigned to domestic duties whilst the men act as breadwinners (Shefer et al., 2008). Furthermore, women are still required to submit to their husbands whilst men are constructed as the primary decision makers. The participants cite the church as supporting these traditional roles (Shefer et al., 2008). According to Van Zyl (as cited in de Nobrega, 2006), as patriarchy is still institutionalised within the family, women's sexual

identity and rights are still governed by men. An example of how patriarchy affects women's reproductive choice can be seen in the patriarchal assumption that potential fathers should have the ability to prevent their partner from having an abortion and should also support their children financially, regardless of whether they reside together or not (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998).

In another Western Cape study (Shefer, Strebel, & Foster, 2000), it was found that some men use violence as a form of „punishment“ for women who “step out of their traditional roles” (p. 11). This was substantiated by another South African study (Conco as cited in Shefer et al., 2000) where women who act against their traditional roles were punished, for example, by being gang raped: “misbehaving women get punished because it is wrong for them to make the boyfriends fools” (Conco as cited in Shefer et al., 2000, p. 11). Furthermore, the authors (Shefer et al., 2000) maintain that some language used to refer to sexuality and sexual genitalia reveal the relationship between heterosexual relationships and violence. For example, in Mokwena's (1991) study (as cited in Shefer et al., 2000) on youth gangs in Soweto, the men participating in the study described sex using the following language; “ugushaya nge kauza” (to hit her with the pipe) and “ukuhlaba” (to stab) (p. 11). The authors (Shefer et al., 2000) argue that these signifiers construct masculine sexuality as active agents who “do it” to women. The result for women is one of violation, invasion and humiliation. In light of the above review on the article written by Strebel et al. (2000), it may suggest that women who challenge their traditional roles as mothers, wives and homemakers (as discussed previously) by having a TOP, may receive punishment in some form from their male partners. Furthermore, the act of sex which resulted in the pregnancy may be constructed as something that the man “did” to her, as suggested by the authors (Shefer et al., 2000). The abortion would then be constructed as an act opposing or “undoing” what the man “did” to the woman.

Bradford (as cited in L. Walker, 1996) states that abortion fundamentally challenges patriarchal control over female fertility and sexuality. Others disagree: “To suggest that abortion, often performed without men's knowledge, fundamentally challenges patriarchal control is to underestimate men's authority over women” (L. Walker, 1996, p. 47). Abortion can be used by men to control women as well as to escape from their responsibility for their actions by abandoning her, threatening to abandon her or forcing her to have a TOP (de Nobrega, 2006). In

South Africa, where abortion is legal, not all women have the same ability to *choose* abortion as some have been coerced into it. Often the decision to abort is made in a context of pressure from parents, husbands, lovers and friends as well as in secrecy (Mdleleni-Bookholane, 2007). These circumstances often result in guilt and remorse (de Nobrega, 2006; Mdleleni-Bookholane, 2007). For example, Denise, a twenty-five year old was forced by her sexual partner to have a TOP as he feared being caught by his wife (Gilligan, 1982).

3.3.5. Mothering

Being a mother is viewed as a crucial, natural and inherent part of the identity of an adult woman (Ireland as cited in Caputo, 2007; C. Walker, 1995; L. Walker, 1996). “Women are expected to find fulfillment and satisfaction in the role of the „ever-bountiful, ever-giving, self-sacrificing mother”” (Bassin, Honey & Kaplan as cited in Kruger, 2003, p. 198). Mothers are also regarded as life-givers (C. Walker, 1995) who are “all-loving, kind, gentle and selfless” (Andersen, 2000, p. 170). Others (Hays as cited in Caputo, 2007; Daniels, 1997; Greene, 2006) agree that often it is expected by society that a mother needs to be intensive, all-consuming and self-sacrificing regarding her child or children, as mentioned above. The task of intensive parenting rests almost solely on a married heterosexual woman, particularly during the child’s initial developmental years (Caputo, 2007), a similar notion as expressed in section 3.3.2 on the family. Duties include nurturing, preserving and protecting (C. Walker, 1995; L. Walker, 1996) as well as instilling moral values (as already mentioned) (Andersen, 2000). Other research (as cited by Jones, Frohwirth, & Moore, 2008) also suggests that conflicting messages are relayed to parents in that such situations can affect the well-being of the woman as well as the children. Therefore, women who choose abortion are often constructed as lacking self-control and responsibility in that they should not have fallen pregnant in the first place if they were not willing to raise a child.

For some, the Western understandings of mothering can easily be understood within the context of patriarchy (Caputo, 2007). However, C. Walker (1995) maintains that one cannot simply assert that motherhood is a role imposed by men on women and therefore inextricably linked to patriarchy:

The equation of motherhood with patriarchal roles provides only partial insight into the complexity of the relationship between a woman and her children, a relationship which may be circumscribed by her relationship to the husband/father but cannot be reduced to that.

(C. Walker, 1995, p. 435)

In her study at a Canadian private school, Caputo (2007) identified mother blame as one of the methods of policing within disciplinary power, as discussed in the theoretical framework. She maintains that good mothers are distinguished from bad mothers by allocating blame to individual women for children's behaviour or inability to comply. "Mother blame is about criticizing individual women for inadequate parenting generally, and holding them accountable for children's health, school performance and a variety of other developmental outcomes, more specifically" (Caputo, 2007, p. 186). In the literature (for example L. Walker, 1996), it is clearly stated that women who have TOPs are neither complying with the norm nor acting in the best interests of the fetus, rather they are constructed as selfish.

Caputo (2007) argues that in her study the ideology of intense mothering (being a stay-at-home mother) resulted in consequences for mothers. In addition to mother blame, surveillance was another method, stemming from disciplinary power, which was used by mothers to judge other mothers (Caputo, 2007). Surveillance refers to "channeling behaviour and maintaining systems in tightly defined ways" (Caputo, 2007, p. 187). The author argues that the ideology of intensive mothering acts as a form of social control by stigmatising and punishing women who "violate norms of motherhood", for example, by socially excluding a woman accused of such acts. The literature has indicated that women who have abortions are often stigmatised.

With regard to TOP, communities may find it difficult to challenge the "mother" construction and accept that a potential mother may not wish to be a mother (Lamas, 1997). For example, some people struggle to question the notion of a self-sacrificing mother and voluntary motherhood. Previous discussions on the traditional nuclear family and the influence of patriarchy have illustrated how the motherhood role has become a taken for granted "destiny" for women and how these institutions have ensured this.

Modern innovations such as films and other media images of women are contributing to challenging the status quo (Lamas, 1997). There are, however, enormous gaps between these modern images and people's everyday experiences. For example, in a situation where widespread unemployment and lack of housing are prevalent, sexual and reproductive practices are questioned in other ways:

There are serious material and ideological obstacles to preventing or dealing responsibly with unwanted pregnancies, leading to an increase in both the numbers of abortions and of unwanted children, in a society like Mexico's, that offers little help in the difficult task of raising children. (Lamas, 1997, p. 64)

In other words, despite the traditional idea that women should only be mothers irrespective of potential contrary desires, unemployment and lack of housing pose big problems for raising a family, let alone a large one. Although Lamas (1997) speaks to the situation in Mexico, the South African situation is not much different.

Studies also suggest that sometimes women abort in order to be good parents. For example, in America, pro-rights activists have stated that "the woman who gets the abortion and the woman who gives birth are the same woman at different stages of life" (Jones et al., 2008, p. 80). The authors (Jones et al., 2008) also maintain that pro-life supporters concentrate on university students as they presume that they are most "at risk". However, a couple of studies challenge this assumption. For example, one study found that the majority (61%) of women participating in the study and who had had TOPs were mothers, 34% of whom had two or more children (Jones, Darroch & Henshaw as cited in Jones et al., 2008). Almost a quarter (23%) of teenagers who aborted already have at least one child (Jones et al., 2008). Furthermore, the majority (57%) of the women having TOPs in the United States are said to be poor or belonging to a low income group as well as unmarried (67%) (Jones et al., 2008). These findings support Gilligan (1982) who maintains that women who make decisions, including whether or not to have a TOP, are informed by an ethic of care and responsibility, considering their relationships and obligations to others, including possible children. This latter statement could be said to summarise the selfless mother construct mentioned above. The authors (Jones et al., 2008) agree when they assert that "women are expected to put the needs of family members above their own" (p. 81).

3.3.6. Fetal rights vs reproductive rights

Various authors agree that the abortion debate is saturated by whose rights are to be most recognised (Gibson, 2004; Jali & Phil, 2001; Smyth, 2002; Tan, 2004); “the rights of the woman are pitted against those of the foetus” (Gibson, 2004, p. 222). Renne (as cited in Mojapelo-Batka & Schoeman, 2003) maintains that theories regarding at what gestation stage the fetus is a viable life influence “attitudes” towards TOP. Although there is some consensus regarding which rights a woman possesses, there is still dispute as to what exactly these rights are, specifically in relation to the moral rights of the fetus (Gibson, 2004).

Crichton et al. (as cited in Izugbara & Undie, 2008) maintains the following about rights, with regard to Nigeria:

Legal rights interact with customary and religious law and practice. Not all individuals are aware of their rights, or take action aimed at making them a reality. Finally, entitlements are also socially legitimated, and the social sphere, including families and communities, plays a role in either protecting individual’s entitlements or violating them further. In Sub-Saharan Africa and elsewhere, this is particularly true of issues that involve many social and cultural beliefs and practices, and are traditionally influenced and regulated by the social sphere, including sexual and reproductive health. (p. 159)

This extract also relates to South Africa in that Crichton et al. (as cited in Izugbara & Undie, 2008) acknowledge the interplay between the law, as well as religion, families and communities, and that many social and cultural beliefs and practices are traditionally influenced and regulated by the social sphere or the public. In this case, TOP is affected by, for example, traditional belief systems about the nuclear family as well as motherhood. In South Africa traditional beliefs concerning polygamy, the extended family and virginity testing may play a role here. Therefore, although women possess a legal right to have a TOP, this right is either undermined or supported by their social context.

(Izugbara & Undie, 2008) suggest that a disconnection exists between international conceptualisations of the “body and the local discourses and realities of the body that circulate in African cultures” (p. 160) or any culture. They argue that an examination of how the body and

cultural constructs of rights are constructed indigenously may prove to further the recognition of sexual rights in various contexts. For example, concerning South Africa, as illustrated in the section on the family and its duty to contribute and maintain the moral fibre of society, it is clear that where patriarchal ideals are present, women are not positioned to exercise their legal right to abortion. Rather the woman's sexual and reproductive rights are negotiated by the husband who is the “head of the home”, the primary decision-maker. This applies to all women living in the household, including the wife and daughters. This point also refers to the conjugalisation of reproduction which stipulates that reproduction be confined within the parameters of marriage.

The wrestling between the rights of the fetus and the woman has been central to the abortion debate. The deciding factor for most is at which stage of the pregnancy the fetus can be considered viable. Three positions can be identified: firstly, the fetus is entitled to life from the moment of conception; secondly, the fetus is attributed the right to life at a certain stage in the pregnancy; and lastly, the fetus does not own the right to life at any stage during the pregnancy (Gibson, 2004). These are referred to as conservative, moderate and liberal positions, respectively. Each perspective is expanded on below.

3.3.6.1. Conservative position

Firstly, the conservative position maintains that a human fetus should be regarded as an innocent human being at any stage of development (Isaacs, 2002). An example of this can be seen in the US, when President Bush signed the Unborn Victims of Violence Act which stipulates that if a violent crime is committed and the fetus is harmed, the person who has inflicted the harm can be tried for two separate crimes. The fetus is thus given a separate status (Tan, 2004). According to Rance (1999), anti-abortionists construct the fetus as the primary actor to be considered, resulting in an “interchangeable mother-uterus whose individuality is invisible if not ultimately disposable” (p. 78). In other words, a unique human value is attributed to the “embryo-subject” (Rance, 1999, p. 78) who must be defended at all costs. For example, a Roman Catholic columnist said, “It is erroneous to defend the women’s right to abortion on the grounds that the fetus is her property, a part of her being: the conceived is a being independent of its mother, a complete person” (Rance, 1999, p. 78).

This position also describes TOP as “unsafe, dangerous, complicated, clandestine, socially unacceptable, criminal, unprofessional, incomplete, often developing into sepsis or other reproductive health complications, or even fatal” (Nyanzi et al., 2005, p. 154). The conservative position also maintains that people are prone to selfishness and harm and that they develop best when regulated and restrained by external hierarchical structures (Emerson, 1996). Thus, conservatives argue that TOP should be governed by law and performed only under certain circumstances, if at all. According to Granberg (as cited in Walzer, 1994) conservatism in personal morality has been recognised as the most likely predeterminant of negative “attitudes” towards abortion.

As a result of the construction of the fetus as fully human from conception, women are often constructed as murderers (Cannold, 2002). For example, Daniels (1997) cites an acting police chief quoted in a newspaper excerpt where a woman is arrested for wanting to have an abortion, “She can pickle herself all she wants, but that child doesn’t have the opportunity to decide whether it’s going to be retarded or not...Somebody has to have responsibility for her unborn child” (p. 584). When the Abortion and Sterilisation Act of 1975 was passed in South Africa, women who protested against not being consulted during the process were met with the following comment from the committee:

It is not necessary for a woman to serve on a committee, if we wish to sound the conscience of the nation. If we wanted to abolish capital punishment, we would not appoint a bunch of murderers to go into the matter. (B. B. Brown, 1987, p. 272)

As mentioned previously, women who have TOPs are also constructed as promiscuous and using abortion repeatedly as contraception. These findings emerged in a South African study conducted with primary health care workers in Soweto who felt that there was no excuse for women to falling pregnant, as they should have used contraception (L. Walker, 1996). Furthermore, the notion that women should be responsible also came to the fore, “I do know the problems of women, but the women...must be responsible. There’s no need to help them with abortion when they can use family planning” (L. Walker, 1996, p. 52). This reference to a “culture of responsibility” was closely linked to the ideal of woman as mothers (L. Walker,

1996). The primary health care workers also constructed women who had had TOPs as devious, deceitful and uncaring (L. Walker, 1996).

3.3.6.2. Moderate view

The second widely held perspective on abortion is that of the moderate view which maintains that the fetus can be attributed a right to life at a certain stage in the pregnancy. In other words, the “moral status could be envisaged as increasing with increasing gestation” (Isaacs, 2002, p. 608). Thus, the further the pregnancy progresses, the more moral status the fetus acquires. For example, the results from Mojapelo-Batka and Schoeman’s (2003) study indicated that abortion before the end of the first trimester decreased the moral tensions about abortion. In other words, participants in the study showed less opposition for abortion if it was conducted before the end of the first trimester. The fetus at this stage of the pregnancy was considered a blood clot or menstrual blood. In other words, the authors maintain that abortion in the early stages of the pregnancy allowed easier justification of the procedure for women. Within this moderate framework, abortion is considered under certain circumstances such as rape or incest or in cases where there would be a medical problem with the fetus. In other words, certain circumstances will justify an abortion.

3.3.6.3. Liberal view

Lastly, the liberals argue that every person is entitled to freedom for self-development and self-expression (McNamara, 1985) and should thus be able to make decisions about their bodies (Emerson, 1996; McNamara, 1985; Rance, 1999). As discussed in previous sections, traditionally women have not had decision-making capacity regarding reproduction and have been subject to the state, and in most cases, decisions made by men. It is often assumed that women who have abortions do not want to be mothers (Jones et al., 2008). For feminists the argument is not that women don’t necessarily want to be mothers but rather that women should have the choice and that it should not be taken for granted that every woman desires to be a mother. For example, Jones et al. (2008) maintain that often the woman who undergoes abortion and the woman who has a child are the same person, just at different stages of their life.

Furthermore, according to Luker (1984), in her study she found that women who had abortions did indeed value motherhood but believed that it would be better for women and their families if it was possible to plan pregnancies. In other words, pregnant women who feel that due to their circumstances, such as economic, relationship or emotional challenges, they would not be able to be good mothers, should have the option of terminating the pregnancy.

Pro-choice or reproductive rights activists thus argue that women should have the right to privacy, self-determination and integrity over their own bodies regardless of the contending rights of the fetus (Gibson, 2004). Penna and Campbell (1998) maintain that one needs to move away from regarding women's rights as pertaining to a minority and rather as representing a large percentage of the population. The purpose of human rights is to challenge existing institutions to ensure that those outside their power structures are protected from the powerful (Penna & Campbell, 1998, p. 17). Ironically, this is what both sides of the debate argue for. The pro-choice activists desire protection for women's rights from patriarchal structures. The pro-life activists argue that the fetus needs protection.

As alluded to throughout the chapter, things cannot be simply reduced. I therefore question the validity of the three positions as outlined above and argue that these positions are not as static as the authors argue. As with the argument regarding attitude theory, people are constantly renegotiating their constructions of the world to meet particular ends. One cannot divide everyone into three camps; it is not that simple. De Nobrega (2006) supports my argument when she maintains that individuals are not divorced from the complex web of moral choices and ethical responsibilities, and perhaps autonomy, independence and interdependence are not the epitome of our self-realisation. Lastly, she states that women should not have to choose between self-affirmation and self-denial as the only two options. In other words, the decision regarding whether or not to abort cannot merely be reduced to the above positions based on the woman's reproductive rights (self-affirmation) or the conservative (self-denial) positions.

3.3.7. Pro-life women-centred approach

A new pro-life discourse has emerged; the women-centred discourse. Traditionally, the pro-life movements have used fetus-oriented discourses (Cannold, 2002) in which the woman has been positioned as a murderer or sinner (as previously discussed) and the fetus as a living being in need of rescue. In the new discourse, the anti-choice movement re-position themselves as the defenders of women considering or who have undergone TOP (Cannold, 2002; Lamas, 1997). The new discourse barely refers to a fetus and speaks to the hurt that women experience after a TOP. Furthermore, the actual opposition towards abortion is not mentioned, rather the focus remains on the woman (Cannold, 2002) who is positioned as a victim (Lamas, 1997).

When fetal rights are referred to, women are constructed as capable of making rational and autonomous decisions to have abortions, while displaying a lack of morality at the same time (Cannold, 2002). However, the women-centred discourse positions women as lacking agency and incapable to “really choose” abortion as well as being “vulnerable” (Cannold, 2002; Daniels, 1997), for example, by being coerced against their better judgement. Reasons for the woman’s lack of judgement have been attributed to hormone levels in the first trimester which cause women to feel “fragile, labile, sad and some women depressed” (Cannold, p. 173). Unhappily pregnant women’s desperation and ambivalence “hampers” their rationality and “consequent moral culpability” (Cannold, 2002, p. 173). Furthermore, the irrationality of the decision is attributed to the woman not considering all the information regarding possible options for a crisis pregnancy. The decision is also not considered autonomous as the woman is “under duress” when considering her options (Cannold, 2002).

Interestingly (Cannold, 2002) asserts that women-centred supporters draw on the notion of patriarchy to accuse the male partner, or young women’s parents, of forcing them into having unwanted abortions. The “playboy philosophy”, they argue, suggests that women should be “available to be „used“, „vacuumed out“ and then „used again“” (p. 173). The irony is that pro-choice supporters also condemn patriarchy which idealises, positions and reduces women’s roles to being only suited for motherhood. The woman-centred discourse therefore both refers to and contradicts the reproductive rights discourse. The focus of blame is shifted from the woman (as

occurs in the fetal discourse) to “less sympathetic targets such as abortionists” (Cannold, 2002, p. 173).

Within this understanding, abortion is constructed as a traumatic event, physically and psychologically unsafe and “bad business” (Cannold, 2002). Anti-abortion activists draw on the notion of a “Post-Abortion Syndrome” (PAS) in order to psychologise and therefore undermine alternative constructions of the experience of abortion (Hopkins et al., 1996, p. 539). The PAS refers to delayed symptoms developing from the physical and emotional trauma of abortion (Hopkins et al., 1996). This syndrome enforces the assumption that all women react to abortion in the same way. Abortion is therefore reduced to being a harmful procedure with long lasting psychological effects.

(Hopkins et al., 1996) address the ways in which this women-centred approach constructs abortion as harmful to women. I will briefly summarise their argument. Firstly, they argue that the PAS argument is saturated with scientific terms in an attempt to present it as the “truth”. This strategy also depicts a particular experience for the women and therefore a particular construction of the fetus. Secondly, the PAS argument constructs a certain relationship between women and anti-abortion groups, one where the latter’s interpretation of experience is superior. Lastly, this argument presents itself as caring for women and therefore constructs anti-abortionists as concerned for women. It thus also enables anti-abortionists to refer to the fetus as an unborn child, implying that they are merely referring to the experiences or references of “everyday” people.

3.3.8. Men in relation to abortion

Studies have shown that TOP has been perceived to be primarily a woman’s issue (Hertel & Russell, 1999; Luker, 1984; Robson, 2002; Walzer, 1994), probably because the procedure is located within the woman’s body (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998). “A disjuncture exists between dominant public health discourse and the reality of local men who relate with women at diverse levels” (Nyanzi et al., 2005, p. 159). In other words, the involvement of men in the history of sexual and reproductive health, including TOP, has been largely neglected in research, despite

men often being actively involved in the abortion process, especially regarding decision-making (Nyanzi et al., 2005). Furthermore Nyanzi et al. (2005) maintain that beneath the surface there is a yearning by men to discuss and dialogue around abortion issues and men's involvement therein. Other studies (Robson, 2002) concur that men feel that they are left out of the process and that the focus is predominantly on the woman.

Competing ideologies relating to family life and relationships, feminist and pro-feminist principles as well as men's rights groups influence men's experiences with abortion (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998). "These ideologies are significant because they play a role in structuring both the interpersonal context in which abortion is discussed and the institutional context in which abortions are performed" (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998, p. 270). The ideologies linked to these movements (family life and relationships, feminist and pro-feminist principles and men's rights groups) view abortion issues through a "gender lens" and subscribe to "conservative" and "progressive" philosophies (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998, p. 271). Examples of discourses linked to these ideologies pertain to mothering and fathering. The former has been discussed in section 3.3.5. The ideology of fathering refers to the ideas around idealised fatherhood; for example, children are regarded as bringing out the best qualities in men as well as providing emotional fulfillment (Reich, 2008). Being a father is also considered to add greater meaning to one's life (Reich, 2008). According to Liss-Levinson (as cited in Reich, 2008),

The traditional male sex role places a high value on external control and evaluation of behaviour. Parenting is simply not reinforced by these means... While the role of the father is certainly part of the traditional image, the notion of parenting, or the actual caring for the child, is not part of the image. (p. 11)

As mentioned in the mothering section, the role of caring for the children has been attributed to the mother. Interestingly, in the same study (Reich, 2008) one of the participants referred to the fetus as a part of him living inside the woman as well as something that he and his partner had created. In this sense the fetus symbolises intimacy (Reich, 2008).

Research (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998) has indicated that not much study has been conducted on how men think, feel and act when they themselves are confronted with decisions about TOP. However, it is evident that men construct abortion in various ways (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998).

These constructions are influenced by their views about the morality about abortion, the type and quality of their relationship with their partner, and their feelings about adopting parenthood at that point in their lives (Reich, 2008).

Some male rights advocates express anger that women can unilaterally decide to abort despite certain men's wishes to raise the child alone or to have the child given up for adoption (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998). For example, as mentioned before, the CTOP Act entitles women to have an abortion autonomously, without the consent or permission of anyone, including the man co-responsible for the pregnancy.

Marsiglio and Diekow (1998) refer to men's rights organisations that have fought to have a part in the decision of whether or not to abort. Some have even successfully sought restraining orders to prevent their partners from having an abortion. However all these women underwent the procedure anyway. Some scholars argue that some men are against abortion purely to reinforce traditional ideas about manhood and that such men would oppose the pro-feminist men's movement (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998). However, there are indeed men who are willing to accept the role of fatherhood but do not get the chance because their partners have a TOP, against their wishes. There is however, the added factor that the women's body is affected by the pregnancy for nine months and not the man's.

On the other hand, Marsiglio and Diekow (1998) mention "forced fatherhood" which refers to impregnating a woman who then decides to see the pregnancy to term and keep the baby, without consulting the father about other options. Most men's rights organisations share pro-feminist's views that abortion should be legal. However, the motive is to further men's rights, particularly with regard to disregarding potential paternity rights and responsibilities prior to conception.

Another viewpoint, expressed by Newman (as cited in Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998), maintains that men should acknowledge women's autonomy over their bodies and accept that men's power begins and ends with their ability to control their own sexuality. In other words, men should

consider their partner's views on TOP, pregnancy and raising a child, before they have sex. In other words men should be more responsible.

Marsiglio and Diekow (1998) maintain that a mounting distrust seems to be growing between men and women which is partly fuelling the pro-life and pro-choice debate in the U.S. In the U.S., the father is legally obligated to provide financially for at least 18 years. Some feminists support the argument by men's rights groups against men being held financially accountable for their children if only women have the right to make the decision to abort or continue the pregnancy to term. Another contrary viewpoint is that pregnancy imposes particular burdens upon women and therefore women alone should be given the freedom to abort if they so wish (McDonagh as cited in Daniels, 1997).

The South African study referred to earlier (Shefer et al., 2000) observed that although women are attributed some agency by the advice to "look after themselves", they are also positioned as victims ("the ones who find themselves in situations") and who therefore have to defend themselves ("take precautions"). There is no recommendation that men should address the situation of inequality, "rather their behaviour is naturalized as inevitable through the presentation of women-centred alternatives" (Shefer et al., 2000, p. 14). In a situation as described above, abortion may be considered to be a suitable way in which a woman "may look after herself" should she fall pregnant and be left by the man for another woman. The issue of "taking precautions" and "looking after oneself" makes the pregnancy the woman's "problem" and the man is relieved of any responsibility (de Nobrega, 2006).

The issue of responsibility is central to gender politics and abortion. There are various aspects of responsibility involved here. The first refers to whose responsibility it is to decide whether to abort. The second pertains to who is financially responsible for the child should the pregnancy be continued. The third issue of responsibility refers to the view that abortion is an easy and convenient way for men to relinquish their responsibility for the pregnancy. The point presented here is that abortion allowed men to relinquish all responsibility and to view women as objects for exploitation.

3.4. Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to achieve two aims: firstly, to provide a social constructionist critique of attitude research; secondly, to provide some insight regarding research conducted on some of the social issues relating to abortion and the man and woman co-responsible for the pregnancy.

The first section concluded that attitude theory does not explain the multiple and often contradictory understandings that people possess regarding certain issues. In other words, the importance of social interaction, context, culture, history, ideology and effects of power are often not considered. Furthermore, research has often neglected to unpack and analyse “attitudes” in terms of taken for granted assumptions. The example of the “ambivalent majority” clearly illustrates that one cannot neatly divide people according to their responses in an opinion poll because “opinions” on abortion change as the need arises. This is evident in the contradictory ways that people speak about abortion.

Religion has been cited as a strong influence on how the public make sense of abortion and it has been found that the church has predominantly framed abortion as murder and as an indicator of moral degeneration. This understanding stems from the idea that life begins from conception and has negative consequences for a woman who may be considering an abortion or who may have already had one as she is understood to be a murderer.

A predominant taken for granted assumption is that the nuclear family, especially the woman, is responsible for instilling and upholding moral values in the family such as regulating reproduction and sexual activity by confining it to marriage. However, the man is positioned as the overarching authority in the home, according to patriarchal ideals. The family unit addresses conflict and challenges within the private boundaries of the family. Therefore, premarital pregnancies would be dealt with within the family. Anything that challenges the patriarchal family structure or morality is considered abnormal and questionable if not condemned. This does not give women much opportunity to make their own decisions about their reproductive capacity.

In most societies, the role of being a mother is considered a vital and natural part of a woman's identity. This role is accompanied by certain expectations such as finding fulfillment in motherhood as well as satisfaction. A mother should also be a married heterosexual woman who is expected to be self-sacrificing and responsible. Furthermore, mothers are required to be kind, gentle and selfless. Thus within this context, abortion is considered to be a selfish and irresponsible act, as well as a denial of a woman's true calling. The influence of the traditional notion of the family and religion cannot be underestimated here, as the previous discussions have illustrated.

The abortion debate is saturated with heated discussions regarding whose rights are to be recognised and protected: the woman's or the fetus's. Three primary positions have been documented; however, I have questioned the value of reducing the arguments to three separate camps, including the conservative, moderate and liberal approaches. Each of these positions varies in their conviction as to when a fetus is considered a viable life and therefore whether the value of the fetus's life should be placed above the woman's right to self-determination.

The relationship between gender, abortion and the public's understanding of abortion has also been documented in research. Abortion has primarily been regarded as a woman's issue. However, there is evidence which suggests that men desire to be more actively involved in discussions around abortion. Some men oppose the idea that women should be able to autonomously decide to have an abortion, especially if they would like to raise the baby by themselves. However, others argue that men oppose abortion merely to control women's reproductive capacity.

The literature review therefore suggests themes that may emerge in the data collection. Amongst others, these include discourses involving religion, the family and morality, notions of motherhood, politics around gender and whose rights are superior with regard to life. Furthermore, other themes include the post-psychological effects of abortion and the various constructions of the woman having the abortion as well as abortion itself. The studies that have been conducted have indicated that these areas are prominent in talk about abortion. Although social constructionism disregards universalism, it is interesting to note that trends have occurred

nationally and internationally regarding these discourses. The methodology chapter follows with a step-by-step strategy for implementing the research.

Chapter 4

The Methodology Informing this Study

4.1. Introduction

The previous chapter presented the argument that attitude research is not particularly useful in understanding the “heavily laden socio-cultural context in which abortion is negotiated, conceived, designed, operationalised, discussed and experienced” (Nyanzi et al., 2005, p. 155). Thus for the purposes of this study, the research design needed to facilitate conversation amongst the co-researchers which would serve later as a text to be analysed. The purpose of this chapter is therefore to clearly map the method of this study, from the research question to the final stages of how the data was captured, transcribed and analysed. For the purposes of ensuring anonymity, the community will be referred to as “Dorpie”. The study focused on the community of Dorpie’s public discourses around abortion. Focus groups, comprised of members of the public, discussed their understandings of abortion, guided by myself and the use of vignettes. The conversations were tape-recorded, transcribed, coded and then analysed. The last section of the chapter addresses the important issues of ethics and reflexivity as they pertain to this study.

The theoretical underpinnings of the methodology were described in Chapter 2. However, it is important to re-emphasise that language and the functions that it performs were of key importance in this study. Therefore, the study was not designed in such a way to extract the co-researcher’s experience of abortion. However, there were instances in which co-researchers shared their own experiences of an unexpected pregnancy and the consideration of abortion.

4.2. Research aims

As previously mentioned, the research topic for this study was “Discourses around abortion: conversations with a low-income rural community”. This study had four aims. The first was to critically explore the constructions of abortion amongst a low-income rural community. Secondly, the research was interested in how women who have had abortions are positioned and constructed. The third objective was to consider the implications that these constructions have

for women who have had abortions or who are considering a TOP and lastly, the fourth aim was to assess how these discourses refer to and contradict each other.

4.3. Sampling and focus groups

The research site was a historically „coloured“, semi-rural low income community in the Western Cape (Lesch & Kruger, 2004). The community is situated in close proximity to Stellenbosch. Orientation to the site was provided by a researcher with a long-standing relationship with the community. Snowballing sampling was utilised to access six focus groups comprised of three men’s and three women’s groups. I contacted my initial three groups of co-researchers through one of the resident ministers, which is discussed later. The way in which each group was formed is explained below.

According to Nyanzi et al. (2005), sub-Saharan African reproductive health studies focus considerably on women’s stories. Men’s participation is often only acknowledged as supplementary data and as not significant in its own right. Men contribute immensely to the politics, economics and decision-making of reproductive health as well while being co-actors alongside women (Nyanzi et al., 2005). According to Marsiglio and Diekow (1998), there is a need for more research regarding men’s views on abortion as well as their personal involvement in the abortion process, for example, decision-making around whether or not to have an abortion. For this reason, it was decided to include men in the current study.

The men and women were interviewed separately to ensure a comfortable space for the co-researchers to unpack their thoughts on abortion. Prior to the study, I considered that some men may experience difficulty talking about abortion (which has primarily been constructed as a woman’s issue), particularly with regard to topics such as motherhood and reproductive rights. “It is impossible to separate abortion from the relations of power that structure gender and sexuality” (Hardacre as cited in Whittaker, 2002). The decision to interview men and women separately thus related to the wish to create an environment in which the participants did not self-censor around sensitive gender issues, or potentially silence particular people. The fact that I was female was discussed in the reflections at the end of the focus groups and both the men and

women's groups stated that my gender had not influenced their responses at all. However, the first women's group had clearly stated that they felt more comfortable as a women's group as men would not feel comfortable discussing abortion openly. Thus I think that because I was a stranger to the groups, my gender was not as significant as if I had been known to the co-researchers.

Age was not considered when recruiting co-researchers and most of the groups reflected a range of ages. This is partially because I utilised snowball sampling. Furthermore, the criteria for co-researchers to know each other was more important than age for the purpose of this study.

Whittaker (2002) experienced difficulty locating willing male co-researchers for focus group discussions about abortion. Therefore, I had to ensure that my first encounter with those who facilitated the formation of the groups, especially the men, was done in a sensitive, respectful and unthreatening way. In other words, establishing trust and rapport with the co-researchers was important, as abortion can be a sensitive topic. According to Nyanzi et al. (2005), establishing trust is a lengthy process. When researching sensitive topics which are often construed as secret and socially unacceptable, not only is sensitive access to the study communities imperative but also time taken in trust building. I was therefore aware that people might be skeptical about the research considering that abortion is regarded by many as a sensitive and controversial issue. Therefore, when meeting with the contact people who assisted in assembling the groups, I conveyed that:

- (1) I am a Research Psychology Masters student, from Rhodes University, conducting a study on the ways in which people or the public understand and talk about abortion;
- (2) I was not interested in people's personal experiences about abortion;
- (3) The use of pseudonyms would ensure anonymity;
- (4) An agreement of confidentiality would be signed by each co-researcher as well as myself (see Appendix 5);
- (5) The sessions would be taped but anyone with access to the data would have to sign a confidentiality agreement;
- (6) The topic of abortion is sometimes sensitive and the group leader's willingness to assist me was appreciated;

(7) The co-researchers would be paid for their time but I requested that the co-researchers not be informed of this prior to the focus groups (more discussion follows later). A description of the three women's and three men's groups follow. Pseudonyms have been used to ensure anonymity.

Women's group 1: Sonskyn's group

The minister gave me the contact number for Sonskyn, who organised my first women's group. I met with Sonskyn at her home, where I explained my research. She agreed to organise one group for me. She also gave me contact numbers for two women (Delores and Mandy) to possibly assist me further. The group consisted predominantly of Sonskyn's immediate and extended family members and we met in her home which was a comfortable environment for all the co-researchers.

Pseudonym	Sonskyn	Cat	Jane	Shany	Rene	Mitchy	Leentjie
Age	50	21	46	20	59	65	69

Women's group 2: The craft group

As mentioned above, Sonskyn gave me contact numbers for Delores and Mandy. Mandy was unable to organise another group in Dorpie as she would invite the same people as Sonskyn and Delores. Delores facilitated access to a craft group who were very willing to assist me. Denny, from the craft group, was very accommodating and organised a women's group to meet in one of the classrooms at the school.

Pseudonym	Denny	Rachel	Elize	Elzane	Jacky	Bianca	Jumbo
Age	42	50	44	21	33	46	49
Pseudonym	Hildatjie	Julie	Sharon				
Age	45	50	45				

Women's group 3: Delores' group

As mentioned above Delores committed to organising a group for me. The group consisted of women that she knew in Dorpie, most of whom attended church with her. We met in her church one afternoon.

Pseudonym	Delores	Rita	Pat	Anna	Sarah	Griet
Age	50	60	33	57	52	51

Men's group 1: Sports club

The minister that I first met in Dorpie gave me the number for Moonstar. Moonstar agreed to meet with me at his home the following day. He agreed to assist me in gathering a group of men at their weekly evening sports practice. This group was conducted in a cloakroom. The group of co-researchers is presented below.

Pseudonym	Moonstar	Popeye	Kwak	Shaun	Zizo	Gersey	Fito
Age	45	25	19	19	28	18	21
Pseudonym	Gerrie	Max					
Age	18	23					

(The ages of Fito, Gerrie and Max may be inaccurate as I did not think to get their ages at the time and had to ask Moonstar the next day).

Men's group 2: Neighbourhood Watch group

On the second day, I returned to Dorpie. I had read about the neighbourhood watch in Dorpie in an article written by an anthropology student. (Unfortunately, I cannot reveal the author as this would reveal the identity of the community.) I asked two women on the side of the road where I could find the head of the neighbourhood watch. I contacted him and he organised a group of men from the neighbourhood watch and a few farm workers. This second men's group met at the school in one of the classrooms. However, the head of the neighbourhood watch did not participate. This group finally consisted of 12 co-researchers as three people joined us late as well as the caretaker of the school (Grootman) who was listening at the door at the beginning. I

suggested that he either join the group or leave to ensure confidentiality. He and the group agreed that he join which proved to be very valuable in that he contributed a lot to the discussion. The following table represents the co-researchers in this group:

Pseudonym	Allan	Tony	Bobby	Wolbek	Klaas	Lindsman	Spyker
Age	30	21	21	38	43	34	57
Pseudonym	Simon	Piepa	Grootman	Piet	Reuben		
Age	21	34	48	27	24		

Men's group 3: Craft group

Although this group did not participate in crafts, the name refers to the fact that the craft group members assisted me in gathering this group. Furthermore, the focus group took place at the school in the other craft room. The second neighbourhood watch group, organised by the head of the neighbourhood watch, was unable to participate owing to church commitments on the appointed day, and they were not able to reschedule before I had to return to East London. I contacted some of the other group contacts and Denny, from the craft group, agreed to assist me. This group therefore consisted of people who did not know each other. This brought a different dynamic into play. For example, George called Afro a murderer after Afro displayed tolerance towards abortion. This may not have transpired in a group where people knew each other. The group, however, felt that they were able to talk about abortion more freely in this context.

Pseudonym	Afro	Koos	Elvis	Greg	George
Age	29	69	43	30	30

The focus groups therefore consisted of family members, church members, sports club members, farm workers, craft group members as well as neighbourhood watch members. The manner in which some of the group leaders were contacted is similar to a Ugandan study on the public's understanding of abortion conducted by Nyanzi et al. (2005). In this study, the researchers recruited commercial motorcyclists while they waited to ferry passengers.

4.4. Data collection

There are two key elements regarding focus groups. Firstly, a trained moderator or facilitator “sets the stage” with prepared questions or an interview guide, in this case two vignettes and a set of open-ended questions. Secondly, the goal of a focus group is to obtain participants’ feelings, “attitudes” and perceptions about a selected topic, in this case discourses around abortion (Puchta & Potter, 2004). There are two kinds of focus groups. The first is simply a way of saving time and money by interviewing a group of people about a specific topic. In this case, the participants are interviewed as individuals but in a group formation. The second kind of group, which pertains to this study, refers to when the group itself provides information that would otherwise not be accessed. In other words, together, the group creates meaning, rather than on an individual basis (Babbie & Mouton, 1998). This rationale for focus groups refers to one of the central arguments of social constructionism - that meaning making is a shared activity and a social action. The focus group discussions themselves were, therefore, regarded as a “social interaction that affects how information is communicated” (Reich, 2008, p. 8). Furthermore, in a focus group situation, the co-researchers are given the opportunity to shape and reshape their understanding on the topic (Babbie & Mouton, 1998). As has been referred to throughout the thesis thus far, this is the very focus of discourse analysis - analyzing how these negotiations occur and their function.

Previous studies (Nyanzi et al., 2005; Whittaker, 2002) conducted on abortion indicate that this method has proven to be very effective for collecting data about practices which are “shrouded in secrecy”, “associated with shame” or “immorality” and “heavily laden with strong personal and cultural values” (Nyanzi et al., 2005, p. 15). A Thai study (Whittaker, 2002) included focus group discussions in order to explore social norms about abortion as well as the ways people talk about abortion decisions.

Morgan (as cited in Babbie & Mouton, 1998) mentions a few factors to consider when working with focus groups. Firstly, one should include enough people in the focus groups to compensate for those who do not say much. This will prevent the group from “falling flat” (p. 292). Too few participants could result in the individual dynamics outweighing the group dynamics. This was

useful advice in this study in that in every group there were people who hardly spoke, despite promptings and encouragement. One of the reasons for this was that I had not spoken to the individuals myself prior to the focus groups but had relied on the contact person that had recruited the group member. Ideally, I would have preferred to be able to meet each co-researcher prior to the focus group discussion. This was not logistically possible. Another suggestion is that one should over-recruit by twenty percent to compensate for those who will not arrive for the focus group. Kelly (1999) maintains that most focus groups are composed of between six and twelve people. I therefore asked group leaders to aim for 6 to 10 people. This strategy worked in that only one group, the last men's group which had been recruited out of emergency, had less than six members. This lower number was compensated for by the second men's group which had more members than anticipated.

It is suggested that one should exclude friendship pairs, "experts" and uncooperative participants. As mentioned above, the logistics of the sampling prevented me from having any control over who exactly was recruited. However, I did emphasise to the contact people that the members should be familiar with each other. My experience with the last men's group, however, indicated that perhaps when discussing abortion people should not know each other. Lastly, it is recommended that the study include three to five groups. I chose to have six to have an even number of men's and women's groups as well as over compensating in case a group failed to meet, which did happen in reality.

Further suggestions in the literature include clarifying taken for granted assumptions, a point which was also referred to in the theoretical framework chapter. The example cited was that of the study in which the male co-researchers (commercial motorcyclists) considered themselves as married when they were in their village but single whilst working in town (Nyanzi et al., 2005). One such assumption that was clarified was that I was not interested in their personal opinions about abortion but rather about their responses to the two vignettes.

As mentioned earlier, focus groups and vignettes were used to collect the data. Before I discuss these two methods, I will briefly address four traps that could discount discourse analysis (Parker, 2005b). Firstly, one should never claim to have an established rapport with the co-

researchers. Of particular significance is not so much the fact that moments occurred where the relationship between the researcher and co-researchers broke down, but rather how the researcher dealt with the situation. Secondly, one should not consider the conversation to be someone's story as stories are always relayed to an audience. What is of importance is the version of the story told and why it appeared in that way. The third temptation is to think that one has come across important information. This would only be the case in an interrogation of some sort. Rather what is important is the differences between the forms of information and the outcome of those differences. Lastly, the discussion should not be used as an opportunity to describe someone's "experience". Although the discussion may contain a person's experience, the experience is being spoken about and transformed into an account. The researcher therefore works with an account and the two are not the same. The important issue here is what the speaker has attempted to convey through that particular account about a particular occasion. The focus group discussion process as well as the vignettes designed for this study will be discussed below.

The vignettes were designed to facilitate conversation within the focus groups. Previous research on abortion has identified vignettes as a useful way of allowing people to discuss sensitive topics as well as exposing co-researchers to scenarios which are in reality otherwise challenging to replicate (Sleed, Durrheim, Kriel, Solomon, & Baxter, 2002; Whittaker, 2002). This method allows co-researchers to freely respond to short accounts of hypothetical characters and their responses to specific circumstances (Sleed et al., 2002). Whittaker (2002) found that the vignettes facilitated discussion about the co-researchers' broader understanding of abortion as well as the relevant laws in Thailand. The inclusion of open-ended questions facilitated co-researchers' discussion of additional issues, perhaps not specifically addressed by the vignettes.

Vignettes can be used to perform the function of externalising abortion (Roth & Epston, 1994; White, 2000), in other words, seeing the problem as separate from the individual. It is easier to assist co-researchers to talk about abortion by inviting them to consider how a person/s should act in a certain situation, rather than directing the focus onto the co-researcher's own ideas about abortion. The process of externalising "shows, invites, and evokes generative and respectful ways of thinking and being with people who are struggling to develop the kinds of relationships

they would prefer to have with the problems that discomfort them” (Roth & Epston, 1994, p. 149). I did not wish to assume that all co-researchers would be uncomfortable reflecting on abortion. However, it was hoped that this technique would assist in helping those who are uncomfortable to reflect, which I think it did.

Critics have asked whether the simulated nature of scenarios and short written themes adequately capture the reality of the context, bringing forth responses and reactions to real world situations (Sleed et al., 2002). However, as has been illustrated in the theoretical framework chapter, for social constructionists, the issue is not so much about whether the co-researchers’ account is valid or “true” on the surface but rather the underlying meanings of the words uttered. Furthermore, “attitudes” are not static and I was therefore aware that the thoughts shared about the vignettes within the focus group context could differ considerably in other contexts, such as in the work place or at home.

Following Whittaker (2002), the vignettes present a range of opinions concerning abortion in order to facilitate discussion on the complexities concerning abortion. When introducing the vignettes, for each scenario, a co-researcher was either nominated or self-appointed to read the vignette. This was to encourage participation. The vignettes were designed to collect the data by asking specific as well as general questions. This process revealed the ways in which abortions are constructed and understood in the community.

The vignettes designed for this study consisted of two scenarios (see Appendices 1 and 2) accompanied by a list of general open-ended questions (see Appendix 3) about women whose circumstances lead them to consider an abortion. The open-ended questions facilitated a level of reflection and self-objectification causing the co-researchers to perhaps share on a level that they had not done before. For example, three co-researchers shared about their personal experiences of crisis pregnancies. The two women from the same group said they found comfort in sharing, as they had not been aware that the other had had a similar experience to them.

A pilot study was conducted prior to the actual data collection to ensure that the vignettes and general questions were effective in exploring the co-researchers’ stories and constructions of

abortion. Comments and suggestions made by the men's and women's group were noted and integrated into the design where necessary.

Vignette 1: Patricia's story

Vignette 1 depicts a scenario of Patricia, a 21-year-old woman. She lives with her parents and four younger siblings. After missing her period, she suspects that she may be pregnant and visits the nearest clinic to find out. The sister confirms her suspicions that she is pregnant. She returns home upset and considers her options. A set of questions guided the discussion process.

The rationale for the first vignette is as follows. According to Mdleleni-Bookholane (2007) the majority of 98 participants presenting for TOP in her study were women between the ages of 21 and 25 years. Another study, comprised of 211 participants, yielded similar results where the majority (34%) age group were also between 21 and 25 years (Bowes & Macleod, 2006). Research indicates that one of the major reasons young women contemplate a termination of pregnancy is to pursue studying or employment opportunities (Calvès, 2002; Ehlers, 2003; Nyanzi et al., 2005). Financial reasons are also cited as a major contributing factor that prompts women to consider abortion (Jewkes, Wood, & Maforah, 1997; Larsson, Aneblom, Odland, & Tyden, 2002). Many women who seek termination of pregnancy live in extended or multigenerational homes (Bowes & Macleod, 2006). Previous studies indicate that women having abortions experience negativity from service providers (L. Walker, 1996; L Walker & McKenzie, 1995). As mentioned before, much literature has focused on the traumatic effects of abortion (Cannold, 2002). The literature also refers to questions about the degree to which the man should be involved in the decision-making process (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998).

Following Whittaker (2002), the vignette asks co-researchers to imagine that they are friends or relatives of the women, which they state in their focus group discussions (using vignettes) "provided deep discussions on the situational ethics involved in abortion decision-making" (p. 5). The vignette is also designed to provide some details but leaves issues such as contraceptive usage, reason for wanting to have an abortion, socio-economic status and the nature of the relationship with the male partner vague to allow the co-researchers space to construct their

particular versions thereof. Again, following Whittaker (2002), the design presents a range of opinions concerning abortion within the vignette in order to facilitate discussion on the complexities concerning abortion.

Vignette 2: Patience's story

The second vignette is about Patience, a 35-year-old woman, who has been married for 12 years. She lives with her husband and two children who are both at school. She has a successful part-time job and her husband has his own business. She discovers that she is pregnant despite consistent use of contraceptives. Patience and her husband decide together that she should have an abortion.

The rationale for vignette 2 is as follows. Research (Buchmann, Mensah & Pillay, 2002) suggests that TOP is an important facet in women's lives at the extreme ends of reproductive age. The literature also indicates a need to research the ways in which men partake in the decision-making process as to whether to abort, for example the circumstances under which men try to persuade or dissuade their partner to have an abortion (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998). This vignette presents a seemingly „blameless“ picture with regard to the woman being responsible for using contraception (Varga, 2003). The literature also indicates that certain circumstances seem to justify abortion and therefore construct it as a “necessary evil” (Cannold, 2002).

The rationale for the general questions (Appendix 3) was to explore the co-researcher's knowledge of abortion in South Africa particularly pertaining to the CTOP Act. The general questions were also designed to explore the sometimes taboo nature of abortion as well as the debate around when a fetus is considered a viable life.

4.4.1. Research Procedure

Although facilitating groups is not foreign to me, I read about focus group discussions in particular to prepare for the study (Babbie & Mouton, 1998; Kelly, 1999; Puchta & Potter, 2004). The literature outlined the basic principles of balancing the skills of listening and

initiating (Kelly, 1999) as well as utilising focus group discussions within discursive psychology (Puchta & Potter, 2004). It is not necessary to describe these skills in detail; however, it was necessary to mention that this aspect of the process was addressed.

The focus group discussions were conducted in Afrikaans, the predominantly spoken language in the community. The vignette and open-ended questions were translated into Afrikaans and back translated into English by an independent translator. The two English versions were compared. Where there were differences, these were discussed by the two translators in terms of the linguistic and conceptual equivalents of the English version and the first Afrikaans version.

The focus group discussions were tape-recorded. Kelly (1999) maintains that focus groups are normally recorded by note taking. However, this method was not appropriate for this study as the text for analysis was to be the transcribed conversations. By facilitating the conversations, making notes at intervals and transcribing the data myself, I was able to prevent overlooking important occurrences and data. I also used a research journal to document the details around gaining access to the groups etc. as suggested by the literature which encourages the use of field notes (Nyanzi et al., 2005).

In order for the discussions to be productive, the structure needed to be flexible and to include open-ended questions to allow the space for co-researchers to relay their descriptions in their own way, despite the socially prescribed nature of abortion (Nyanzi et al., 2005). The study was therefore conducted in a very flexible manner and although the structure was guided by the vignettes and questions, I also allowed time for co-researchers to share their own stories. Apart from accessing rich data, it was also important to give the co-researchers time to use the space in a way that was also useful for them, considering that they had voluntarily given of themselves and their time.

At the start of each of the focus group discussions, everyone was welcomed and thanked for their willingness to participate. It was stated that the length of the conversation would be kept as close to two hours as possible. The literature (Kelly, 1999) says that longer than one and a half hours is not advised; however, in this case the “housekeeping” matters also had to be addressed and

therefore time was allowed for this. Everyone introduced himself or herself (although most people knew each other from the community, except the one group). In the instances where people knew each other, I asked them to share something about the person to their right. This “broke” the ice. In the third men’s group where no one knew each other, each co-researcher mentioned something about themselves. My role as a facilitator as opposed to an “expert” was explained. The concepts of co-researcher as opposed to being called a “participant” were also introduced (as will be expanded upon later).

The research topic was explained once more to ensure that any misconceptions during the recruitment process between the contact person and the co-researchers were clarified. In the case of the first group, the co-researchers had not been informed about the purpose of the group, as Moonstar feared that no one would participate if he told them it was about abortion. At the beginning of every group, I gave the members a chance to leave, should they have misunderstood the purpose of the group. However, no one chose to leave. I spoke about the nature of their involvement (Kelly, 1999) in terms of discussing the vignettes. I mentioned that time would be allocated for reflecting on the process (to be discussed in section 4.7). I also reminded them that the conversation would be tape-recorded. We then discussed issues of anonymity (a detailed section regarding this follows later in section 4.6) and the permission and consent form was signed by each participant. The consent form to tape record was completed either in Afrikaans or in English, depending on the co-researcher’s preference (see Appendix 5 for Afrikaans version). At all times the ethical guidelines provided by Rhodes University were adhered to.

The intention prior to the study was to compile a list of group norms as suggested by the literature on focus groups (Babbie & Mouton, 1998; Kelly, 1999). However, in reality this was difficult to achieve. However, we did agree that cell phones should be switched off and that we should respect each other’s opinions. This latter point was reiterated throughout the sessions. For example, I often said that there is no right or wrong answer. Confidentiality was also emphasised by referring to the fact that after the group the co-researchers would live with each other in Dorpie and that they should therefore not discuss anything that was mentioned in the group and that we needed to respect each other’s opinion and privacy (Kelly, 1999).

4.5. Data analysis

The focus group discussions were transcribed verbatim using Parker's (2005b) as well as Puchta and Potter's (2004) conventions for transcription (see below). I decided to do the transcription myself for two reasons. Firstly, I was able to better interpret the audio version as I had been present in the discussions and would have recognised certain pauses, laughter, sarcasm, reluctance, in the context of the discussion. These occurrences would have significance but seem trivial to someone else whose task was to merely transcribe the conversation (Parker, 2005b). Secondly, the transcriber makes decisions that shape the text in particular ways which introduce interpretations which are difficult to avoid once on paper: "As you make the transcription you are already translating from one kind of language into another, from something that was designed to be heard to something that is meant to be read" (Parker, 2005b, p. 65).

The following is a summary of the method that was used. Any emphasis in the speech was indicated by underlining the words or parts of words; shouting was indicated with capital letters (Parker, 2005b). Quieter speech was enclosed by „degree“ signs, for example, °hello° (Puchta & Potter, 2004). Laughing was indicated by "heh heh" (Puchta & Potter, 2004). Aspiration (out-breaths) was signalled by "hhh", the number of "h"s depending on how long the out-breath was (Puchta & Potter, 2004). The speed of speech was indicated by greater than and lesser than signs enclosing the speech (Puchta & Potter, 2004). Inspiration (in-breaths) was indicated by ".hhh" (Puchta & Potter, 2004). Where points of interruption occurred, they were marked with a square bracket and the following sentence was started on the next line with a square bracket. Overlaps refer to where someone carried on directly, taking over a sentence, and this was indicated by "inserting an equals sign at the end of the person who finished and the same sign at the beginning of talk by the person who takes it up and carries on" (Puchta & Potter, 2004, p. 65). Moments of hesitation were represented by round brackets around a space and, where necessary, the number of seconds was inserted within the brackets (Parker, 2005b). Where the moment was hearable but too short to measure a full stop enclosed by round brackets was used (Puchta & Potter, 2004). Round brackets around the word "unclear" were used to indicate where I could not hear the speech or when I could vaguely make sense of what was said and inserted what was probably

said. Round brackets were once again used where other things occurred such as cell phones ringing or laughter.

I checked the accuracy of the transcriptions by checking the transcripts against the recordings twice. After this process, the next step was to code the data. The task of coding was a very different process to the actual analysis itself (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). The goal here was to “squeeze an unwieldy body of discourse into manageable chunks” (p. 107) to assist in the analysis. I read through each interview and then highlighted, in different colors, the sections which belonged to the same category. The categories used were crucially related to the research questions (Potter & Wetherell, 1987) and were extracts from the text that potentially represented different discourses. I then photocopied all instances of potential discourses and filed them separately, according to each discourse. Where certain extracts referred to more than one discourse I made multiple copies of that extract as such (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). I then read the interviews in their “whole” state repeatedly and thoroughly (C. Macleod, 2002) to familiarise myself with the data again. This was followed by taking each section that had been highlighted and comparing them to Parker’s (1992) ten criteria (including three auxiliary criteria) for identifying discourses which were used as the means of analysis. The criteria are discussed below.

4.5.1. Parker’s criteria:

4.5.1.1. A discourse is located within a text

Texts are to be treated as objects of study where texts can be defined as “delimited tissues of meaning reproduced in any form that can be given an interpretive gloss” (Parker, 1992, p. 6). Therefore, it is vital to specify which text is to be studied as all “tissues of meaning”, everything in the world that has been attributed meaning, can be described as textual (Parker, 1992, p. 6). As already mentioned, the text to be studied in this case was the transcripts from the focus group interviews conducted with the six groups. Once I treated the text as an object, I started to explore the “connotations”, “allusions” and “implications” that the text triggered (Parker, 1992, p. 7). In other words, I attempted to imagine how different audiences would react to the transcripts.

4.5.1.2. A discourse is about objects

Discourses create the objects that they refer to (Foucault as cited in Parker, 1992). In the theoretical framework chapter, the ability of language to create or construct an object and bring it into reality was discussed. It is at this stage in the analysis that this is considered. There are two layers of objectification. The first is the layer of “reality” to which that object refers. Berger and Luckmann (as cited in Parker, 1992, p. 8) describe this as the process whereby “language brings into being phenomena, and that the reference to something, the simple use of a noun, comes to give that object reality”.

The second reality or objectification that a discourse refers to is the discourse itself, the set of statements about the object. The following statement illustrates this point: “Perhaps this sounds moralistic but women who consider abortion are a symptom of the decay of society”. In this case, a moral discourse is used and referred to. Another example could be “I don’t mean to sound conservative, but having an abortion is murder”. Here a pro-life discourse is used and referred to. Therefore the task in this step is to systematically list the objects, usually identified as nouns, that appear in the text (Parker, 2004).

A single object can be attributed to many realities. For example, to South Africans, a wooden block elevated and supported by four pillars or poles above the ground is commonly referred to as a table. For Chinese people, a table of the same height may not be recognised as a dining room table. However, the structure remains a wooden block with four poles attached to it. “The object that a discourse refers to may have an independent reality outside discourse, but is given another reality by discourse” (Parker, 1992, p. 9). To continue with the above example, abortion services may be understood by the health workers in a community to be an effective way of assisting women to deal with unplanned pregnancies. Another example would be that the women in the community might see abortion as being a procedure accompanied by stigma and loss of self-respect. Either way, abortion refers to the procedure whereby a pregnancy is terminated, regardless of how the procedure is constructed.

4.5.1.3. A discourse contains subjects

“A discourse makes available a space for particular types of self to step in” (Parker, 1992, p. 9). Therefore when analysing the text, one needs to ask how the text is calling us, and whether it is telling us something. Discourses initiate certain ways of us seeing others and ourselves. Firstly, one should focus on the relation between the addressor (the text) and the addressee (the reader). What position does the addressee or subject have to adopt to hear the message? For example, a snippet from a transcript may describe a 16-year-old girl who is opting for an abortion as stupid and irresponsible. People influenced by the moral discourse, for example “Doctors for Life”, may influence the reader to construct the girl as irresponsible, the religious discourse may influence the reader to construct the girl as sinful, and the women’s rights discourse may construct the girl as entitled to have an abortion.

Secondly, the addressee or subject needs to ask what rights they have to speak in a discourse, in other words, what are they expected to do when being addressed. In this step, we are forced to take a position. For example, an addressee/subject who supports abortion may find herself being constructed by the moral discourse as lacking moral fibre and contributing to moral decay in society. In this way, we are involved in a power relationship with the addressor, the text.

“We are also positioned in a relation of power when we are placed in relation to the discourse itself” (Parker, 1992, p. 10). For example, the church has power in a state. Therefore, the religious discourse could either position a person as a sinner or as a saint, depending on their stance on abortion. There is nevertheless a power relationship as the church has been given the mandate to “judge” as such. We may resist the power relation, but we have to take a position either way (Parker, 1992).

This stage involves identifying what types of people are described in this discourse, some of whom may have been identified as objects. Furthermore, one needs to explore what these people/objects may say in the discourse as well as what we could say if we could identify with them. In other words, what rights are made available to the object and the subject. In summary,

as with step 2, one needs to systematically list the “subjects” referred to in the text and “map the networks of relationships into patterns” (Parker, 2004, p. 152).

4.5.1.4. A discourse is a coherent system of meanings

This aspect of discourse analysis is based on Foucault’s work. According to Henriques et al. (as cited in Parker, 1992, p. 11), a discourse is “any regulated system of statements”. What this means is that the statements in a discourse which refer to the same topic can be grouped together. It is important to consider the culturally available understandings within a theme, as different cultures will prescribe to a different reality or understand the discourse differently. For example, cultures may differ in terms of whom the discourse benefits or oppresses. In this step, it is important to identify the “world” that this discourse presents and to think about how a text using this discourse would address objections to the terminology. With reference to the latter part of this statement, an example may be abortion as a “sin” as opposed to abortion as a “right”. When abortion is presented as as a reproductive right and thus a suitable means of dealing with an unwanted pregnancy, objections from a pro-life perspective with respect to fetal rights needs to be addressed. This is usually achieved by alluding to the integrity of the woman’s body and the non-viability of the fetus below 24 weeks of gestation (Luker, 1984).

Text and discourse analysis also requires the skill of reflexivity, the ability to read the text and ask questions such as, “Why was this said and not that? Why these words, and where do the connotations of the words fit with different ways of talking about the world?” (Parker, 1992, p. 4). With regard to this study, these questions were pertinent in identifying discourses around abortion. For example, most of the co-researchers were adamant that the fetus should be referred to as a “baby”.

4.5.1.5. A discourse refers to other discourses

In order to reflect on a discourse, one often has to employ other discourses. “Discourses embed, entail and presuppose other discourses to the extent that the contradictions within a discourse open up questions about what other discourses are at work” (Parker, 1992, p. 13). This involves

identifying contradictions between ways of describing something (Lamas, 1997). In other words this step involves setting contrasting discourses against each other and examining the various objects they constitute (Layne, 1997; Parker, 1992). A relevant example is the debate regarding at what stage a fetus can be considered a baby. The fetal rights discourse is in contrast to that of the women's reproductive rights discourse. The one cannot be defined without the other. One must also identify where these discourses overlap and where they appear as the same objects in different ways. Within these two discourses, the fetus is at some point recognised by both discourses as a human in terms of the number of weeks into the pregnancy. There will inevitably be conflict surrounding this matter.

4.5.1.6. A discourse reflects on its own way of speaking

It is possible for a discourse to "comment" on itself. This occurs when the terms chosen within the text are themselves commented on, for example, the phrase "don't get me wrong" (Parker, 1992, p. 14). One needs to ask, "How are the contradictions in the discourse referred to and how would another person or text employing this discourse refer to the contradictions within the discourse?" (p. 14). One can therefore complete two more steps at this stage in order to identify a discourse. Firstly, one can refer to other texts to expand the discourse as it appears and perhaps approach other audiences. Secondly, one can reflect on the term used to describe the discourse. The process requires the researcher to make moral/political choices, for example, describing a discourse about a girl having an abortion as patriarchal. Also, the reproductive rights discourse became possible with the rise of feminism(s). In conclusion, identifying an occasion where this reflexive process occurs often suggests that a discourse has been identified.

4.5.1.7. A discourse is historically located

As already mentioned, discourses are historically located. This is further illustrated by the ways in which discourses relate to other discourses, change, and develop their connections with each other. Often one finds that the discourse refers to something which was always there to be found. In other words, "a discourse refers to past references to those objects" (Parker, 1992, p. 16). For example, the reproductive rights discourse refers to when abortion was illegal in South Africa.

The creators of the reproductive rights discourse considered this legislation as violating women's rights and as oppressive. It is thus important to consider where and how a discourse was formed as well as how the discourse changed.

4.5.1.8. Discourses support institutions

Discourses are present in aspects of the structure of an institution. For example, the medical discourse can be found in various texts: medical publications, lectures and television programmes as well as speech in consultation with doctors. In situations such as these, the use of a discourse often reproduces the “material basis of the institution” (p. 17). According to Parker, discursive practices include giving an injection or cutting a body. In this way, one could say that the abortion procedure is a discursive practice. Foucault (as cited in Parker, 1992) maintains that discourses and practices should be regarded as the same thing and treated as such. “It is true both that material practices are always invested with meaning (they have the status of a text) and that speaking or writing is a practice” (Parker, 1992, p. 17). This aspect of discourse analysis involves identifying the discourse and the institution that the discourse reinforces. Conversely, one should also identify the institutions that are marginalised when the discourse is utilised. Institutions that may arise in this research are those of the government, health institutions, the family and the church.

4.5.1.9. Discourses reproduce power relations

According to Parker (1992), “we should talk about discourse and power in the same breath” (p. 18). (This point links with earlier discussion in section 4.5.1.3 about the subject/s and who is allowed to respond to the discourse.) Power relations are given structure and reproduced by institutions. The ability of the medical discourse to give and take away the rights of the patient to speak is an example of the close relationship between power and knowledge (Turner, as cited in Parker, 1992). This is one of the rationales for men and women being separated in the focus group discussions as one group may be silenced by the other.

It is important to note that power and knowledge are not the same thing. Although discourses do often reproduce power relations, the presence of power is not a criterion for identifying a discourse. Two key steps for identifying discourses include, firstly, identifying which categories of person benefit and lose when the discourse is utilised and secondly, looking at who would want to promote the discourse as well as who would want to discourage it. For example, some men influenced by a patriarchal discourse may oppose a reproductive rights discourse (advocating for legal abortion) in order to retain control over women's bodies.

4.5.1.10. Discourses have ideological effects

As mentioned in the theoretical framework, there is a dispute between Foucault and Parker with regard to the concept of ideology. Parker (1992) asserts that ideology should be acknowledged whilst Foucault refers to a regime of truth. For the purpose of this study, ideology is considered to exist in the way that Parker describes. The importance of ideology for this study has been mentioned in the theoretical framework in section 2.3.

In terms of this characteristic of discourses, one should illustrate how a discourse relates with other discourses which endorse oppression. One should also show how the discourses permit dominant groups to tell their stories about the past so as to justify the present, and thus prevent those who utilise dominated discourses from making history (Parker, 1992). One can then address the ideological force of language by highlighting the patterns and structures of meaning. In other words, one needs to identify those discourses which define entities that we see in the world and in relationships, and as things we regard to be psychologically real in ourselves (Parker, 2004).

Although all of the above criteria needed to be considered to an extent when the analysis was conducted, a few of the criteria held particular relevance concerning the three aims of the study. The first, second, third and fourth criteria were obviously important in that they describe what constitutes a discourse. The second criterion was important as it relates to positioning, which is central to this research which seeks to explore the ways in which the public position women who are considering or who have had abortions. The fifth criterion directly pertained to the fourth aim

of the research question which addresses the discourses referring to or contradicting other discourses. The sixth criterion, regarding a discourse's ability to reflect on its own way of speaking, was particularly important in meeting the first aim of identifying constructions and discourses around abortion. The eighth criterion, "discourses support institutions", was important for discussing the implications that the constructions of abortion held for women. Certain constructions of abortion support institutions, for example, the family, and this has direct implications for women. Power relations produced by discourses also affect women and for similar reasons to the eighth criterion, the ninth criterion was crucial for the analysis. Again in terms of the implications for women, the last criterion, pertaining to ideology, is relevant because the stories of both dominant and minority groups will influence women's lives because abortion and related stories especially affect women.

The whole process of analysing the data was conducted in Afrikaans. For the purpose of presenting the data in the thesis I translated specific extracts into English. Once translated into English I was able to ensure that my interpretations of the text had been correct, this acted as an extra measure to ensure that I had understood what was being relayed in the text. The same person who assisted with translating the vignettes, an Afrikaans first language speaker, then assisted with verifying the transcript's translation. The English extracts are included in the analysis chapter in order to present the results, the Afrikaans versions of these extracts are attached as Appendix 4. I have included the Afrikaans extracts in the event that a reader may wish to read the original text. I have also specified which group the extract originates from, in brackets below each extract. For example, MG 2 refers to the second men's group and WG 1 refers to the first women's group. "T" refers to where I am talking in the extracts.

4.6. Ethical considerations

The following section addresses the ethical precautions that were taken in the study with regard to anonymity, confidentiality, remuneration and the multi-level consequences for co-researchers who participated in the study. The important issue of reflexivity is then addressed in a separate section.

Many of the ethical issues were discussed with the co-researchers before we commenced with the focus group discussions. This was facilitated by the agreement that I and each co-researcher signed (see Appendix 5). Each co-researcher also left with a copy of the agreement. After distributing the agreement to each co-researcher, we read through the agreement together and after answering any questions, that arose, we signed the agreement. The agreement addressed issues such as the purpose of the research, that I am a student at Rhodes University and the duration of the sessions. The agreement also specified that each co-researcher had the freedom to leave at any time as well as to decide not to participate in any way. The co-researchers also gave permission for the sessions to be tape-recorded. Issues of confidentiality and anonymity will now be discussed separately.

It has previously been found that co-researchers were willing to share their stories because they trusted that the information would be kept confidential (Nyanzi et al., 2005). To ensure that co-researchers were confident that all information would remain confidential, a clause was included in the agreement which stipulated that anyone who reviewed the transcriptions or listened to the tapes would be bound to confidentiality. This was relayed and emphasised to the person who assisted me with the translating.

With regard to anonymity, Wise (as cited in Banister, Burman, Parker, Taylor, & Tindall, 1994) states that she has developed a measure of acceptable risk for disclosing information about her participants. She considers her prime responsibility to ensure that the participants' neighbours are unable to identify them. She did this by changing obvious information that would reveal the participants to those who know them, for example, number and age of children. In addition, she also excluded information known to the public. I had to take similar precautions for those who wish not to be known, as the community is small. There is an added risk here as members of the community are likely to know who participated in the study and therefore the chances of identifying the co-researchers are increased. Public information that I had to omit included the names of the village, churches and the type of craft and sports club. As mentioned earlier, at the beginning of the process, the groups established a shared understanding of what is acceptable within the focus group context, for example, group confidentiality. Owing to the nature of the sampling method, this aspect is especially important in this study where most of the co-

researchers knew each other. The agreement (Appendix 5) also stipulated that I would remove any information from the research report that would identify the co-researchers.

The literature suggests that it is important to show appreciation for the co-researcher's involvement and payment is one of the means of showing this (Kelly, 1999). The co-researchers were paid for their contribution to the study; however, they were unaware of the remuneration before the groups began. I informed the contact people of the remuneration beforehand, to initiate goodwill; however, he/she was requested not to divulge this information until afterwards. This was to ensure that people did not participate merely to receive payment. I also asked whether anyone would like a copy of the study once completed. I recorded the addresses of the contact people in order to post them a copy of the research. Although no-one specifically requested a copy, I assumed that I should send them one in order to be transparent. In hindsight I should have asked whether anyone would like a copy instead of assuming.

It is imperative to consider the multilevel implications for co-researchers after participating and sharing in the study (Nyanzi et al., 2005). For example, the community is small and it is therefore likely that community members witnessed who the co-researchers were when they entered and left the focus group venue. The mere attendance of co-researchers at the sessions could have led to the community making assumptions about the co-researcher's "position" on abortion. Therefore, in order to counter this possibility, I emphasised that participation in the study did not require people to support or oppose abortion, or even to discuss their own position. As mentioned above, this was done whilst gaining entry into the community, and whilst recruiting co-researchers as well as at the beginning of each focus group discussion.

Although abortion is a sensitive topic which sparks heated debate, the groups were rather calm in their discussions, albeit there could have been power relations that I was not aware of between the co-researchers which may have dictated what people could say. There was one instance in the last men's group, comprised of co-researchers who did not know each other. At one point Afro said something in support of abortion and George called him a murderer. The way in which it was said was half in jest, half seriously, but I diffused the situation by reminding everyone that they are entitled to their opinions. The dynamic didn't change and the process continued as it

had. I was shocked at this statement and I think it was evident in the way I said that we should not say things like that. Such situations can occur in research and I am pleased that it was diffused quickly and Afro did not seem affected by the remark. I should have followed up with Afro after the session, once everyone had left. However it seemed at the time that the statement had been addressed in the moment.

4.7. Reflexivity

Reflexivity involves reflecting on how the material and the analysis was produced and has been referred to as disciplined self-reflection. In other words, the researcher should recognise that the structure of language is not transparent and therefore everything said is reflexive in nature (Marks, 1993). During the study, the research topic, design and process as well as the researcher's personal experience were critically reflected upon and evaluated throughout the process (Banister et al., 1994). A diary (Parker, 2005b) was kept in order to assist in this process and I reflected after the focus groups when I was on my own.

It is useful at this point to discuss three issues related to reflexivity and discourse analysis, namely, the existence of other interpretations of the texts, the reflexive nature of the relationship between the researcher and co-researchers, and the role of the researcher in the interpretation of the texts (Burr, 1995).

The theoretical chapter discussed the social constructionist notion that no one true reality exists. In the same way, no single interpretation in discourse analysis can be considered to be the only valid version of the text (Burr, 1995; Parker, 2004). I therefore acknowledge that my interpretation is not the single valid analysis of the text. Linked to this is the fact that whilst analysing the text, I am in fact also reproducing or transforming it in some way or another. In other words, I am "implicated in the production of the forms of knowledge" described (Parker & Burman, 1993, p. 159).

Reflexivity also refers to the equal opportunity for myself and the co-researchers to comment on each of the other's accounts. The implication is then that the research process must allow for the

co-researchers to comment on their own accounts as well as that of the researcher (Burr, 1995). At the end of the focus group discussion, we spent time reflecting on the process and the conversation. This was guided by questions which focused on their experience of being interviewed by myself, a white middle-class woman. All of the groups indicated that the fact that I was a stranger to them did not impact on the process as they reported feeling comfortable with me.

Apart from influencing the analysis by ascribing alternate meanings to the text, the researcher can also position herself as an expert. In this way an “analytic expertise” replaces the “scientific expertise” (Widdicombe, 1993). I attempted to avoid falling into the “expertise” trap by, as referred to in the beginning of this thesis, regarding the co-researchers as being co-researchers, actively involved in the research process (Parker, 2005a). This active involvement was made possible by valuing the co-researchers’ contribution as equally valid as my own. I therefore erred on the side of caution with regard to possibly enforcing my role as “expert”.

Marks (1993) maintains that the use of this power is worse when disguised by the false impression of “democratization” and the illusion of “empowerment”. Therefore, the issue of the researcher being a psychology masters student and thus possibly perceived to be an “expert” was discussed. At the commencement of the focus groups, I clearly explained that I did not perceive myself to be an expert on their experiences. Rather I regarded the co-researchers to be experts of their own lives (Parker, 2005b). Furthermore, I explained that the knowledge that I have about abortion is not necessarily privileged over theirs, rather it is just a different kind of knowledge.

I made an effort not to give the false hope that the co-researchers would somehow be empowered by the research; however, the remuneration for participating would be a token of appreciation for their time and willingness to talk about abortion, although at this stage they were unaware of the payment arrangement.

A unique aspect of social constructionist research is the responsibility of the researcher to constantly reflect on how the research process is being affected by the researcher (Marks, 1993). Parker and Burman (1993) and others (Marks, 1993; Stenner, 1993) refer to the issue of power

that the analyst has to impose meaning on another('s) text. This power and control over other people's words poses an ethical problem (Stenner, 1993). Sherrard (1991) maintains that interviews are similar to conversations and rely on the participation of both the researcher and co-researchers and yet discourse analysts typically fail to examine explicitly their role in the production of the discourse they are analysing. It is therefore crucial for the researcher to be aware of the potential influence that he or she may have on the interpretation.

I found this study very challenging personally, as I am a practising Christian, but also someone who ascribes to feminist principles. Therefore, throughout the analysis and interpretation I had to ask myself how these "conflicting" positions influenced my findings. At times I also felt that I was betraying the co-researchers, fellow Christians, even though I regarded most of the their responses as oppressive to women. One of my fears was that my research would inaccurately represent all Christians and imply that the religious discourse and its effects as found in this study would be regarded as a reflection on Christianity as a whole. However, I had to remind myself that, as mentioned throughout this thesis, the findings of this study are not necessarily universal and do not reflect one stable reality.

The methodology was greatly informed by previous studies that have been conducted. The design was not intended to produce findings that could be generalised universally as that is not the aim of discursive research.

4.8. Conclusion

To summarise, this study sought to explore discourses of abortion amongst the public, specifically in a low-income community in the Western Cape. This translated into four aims, viz to explore constructions of abortion, the ways in which women who have or are considering TOP are positioned, the implications for these women and lastly, how these discourses refer to and contradict each other.

Snowball sampling facilitated access to three women's and three men's focus groups. The discussions were conducted in Afrikaans and were guided by two vignettes and a list of general

questions. The data was then transcribed and analysed by myself. Accuracy in translation was verified by a first language Afrikaans speaker. Parker's (1992) framework for analysis was used to conduct the analysis.

The ethical considerations were addressed by means of an agreement (Appendix 5) signed by the co-researchers and myself. I also spent much time reflecting on the process, including my position as a young white female with strong Christian beliefs and how these characteristics could impact my research in various ways. The analysis follows and has been divided into three chapters for easier reading.

The findings provided interesting insight into how this community constructs abortion, women who have had abortions as well as the implications for women. The central thesis emerging from the discourses is that the protection of the life of the fetus is often a strategy to preserve and maintain the nuclear family. In other words, if the public were to accept abortion as a legal option to an unplanned or crisis pregnancy, the nuclear family, as an institution, would no longer be able to control either reproduction or women's sexuality. Eight discourses were identified in the analysis which has been divided into two chapters. The first section (Chapter 5) includes the anti-abortion God's will discourse, the Familial-moral discourse, and the selfless mother discourse. The second section (Chapter 6) consists of the fetal rights, reproductive rights and woman-centred discourses. The positioning of the man co-responsible for the pregnancy as well as the discourse of TOP as taboo and stigmatised is also discussed. Post-abortion psychological effects are not treated in a separate section as these constructions emerge throughout in other discourses and will therefore be discussed as they appear.

Chapter 5

Discourses relating to religion and the family

5.1. Introduction

Dorpie is described as a predominantly Christian community in which the church plays a prominent role (van der Waal, 2005). Therefore, it was not surprising that religion emerged throughout the conversations with the focus groups and informed, referred to and opposed most of the discourses. For example, the religion informed the anti-abortion God's will discourse, the familial-moral discourse, the fetal rights discourse and the woman-centred discourse. The religious discourse also refers to the taboo and stigmatisation discourse. Lastly, religion is used to strongly oppose the reproductive rights discourse. In this chapter, I discuss three discourses that draw heavily on notions of religion. These are the anti-abortion God's will discourse, the familial-moral discourse and the selfless mother discourse.

Within the anti-abortion God's will discourse, the Bible and the church's laws are referred to as voices of authority. Abortion is constructed as murder and therefore a sin, resulting in the woman being positioned as a murderer and a sinner. These constructions also emerged in the fetal rights discourse. A tension exists between rebuking abortion and yet supporting the woman who has "lost her way" and made a "mistake". This tension is strongly linked to the pro-life woman-centred discourse in which the woman is positioned as lacking the ability to make the right decision. It was also assumed that a Christian would not have an abortion. These central points are expanded upon below.

As mentioned in the literature review (for example Anderson, 2000), the family is traditionally constructed by society as a moral sanctuary, responsible for instilling moral values and providing children with a "good upbringing". Certain norms and values are thus prescribed and instituted by the family. Interestingly much anthropological research (for example, van der Waal, 2005) has been conducted in this community, and a theme of "good upbringing" and the difference between the decent people and the indecent people often emerged. This finding was also evident in my study.

From the analysis it is evident that the moral standard in this community is predominantly measured against biblical principles. However, there were often texts that referred only to a good upbringing and not religion, which suggested a presence of two discourses: a familial-moral discourse as well as the anti-abortion God's will discourse. Six dominant themes or family norms within the familial-moral discourse emerged during the analysis. These are discussed below.

The literature suggests that being a mother is considered a crucial and inherent part of an adult woman's identity (for example Walker, C., 1995). Women are expected to receive fulfillment and satisfaction from their motherly role. Furthermore, it is required that a mother is an "ever bountiful, ever-giving and self-sacrificing mother" (Bassin, Honey & Kaplan as cited in Kruger, 2003, p. 198). A "selfless mother" discourse has been identified in my research which supports the literature. More discussion follows below.

5.2. Anti-abortion God's will discourse

Within this discourse, it is taken for granted that the Bible and subsequently God's plan should determine Christian's perspectives on abortion. Abortion as a legal procedure is also opposed within this discourse. If a woman does have an abortion, the consequences for her "actions" are drastic, as will be illustrated in extract 3.

In the anti-abortion God's will discourse, God's plan and the Bible feature as determinants of Christians' position on abortion.

Extract 1:

Sonskyn: yes everyone must make their own opinion about abortion. For me personally it is that it is a choice of my whole personality and my way of life and that which I can understand the Bible says because Jeremiah says that before you were formed and before you were in your Mother's lap I knew you and if we look at how left and right abortions are done what is the law's purpose? What did God perhaps plan for that child and that now this decision is just made for economic reasons and very often there isn't even a reason, it's just that I had sex and now I don't want the child so in my personal viewpoint it is = it's totally not what I would want for anyone or prom (.) = even if I have to help someone raise a child or give to someone that can raise the child never do it in my whole life = abortion is against my principles
(Appendix 4, WG 1)

Firstly, in extract 1, Sonskyn refers to a divine plan that God had for the "unborn child", implying that to abort the pregnancy would be to hinder God's plans, an action which would

surely be a sin. She also uses the Bible to justify her position. Secondly, Sonskyn refers to the CTOP Act and implies that people are using abortion as a contraceptive. Her words, “it’s just that I had sex and now I don’t want the child” implies that the woman is irresponsible and did not think about the consequences of having sex. This finding supports the literature (R. S. Brown, 1993) which says that traditionally the Christian church has regarded crisis pregnancies to be indicative of a lack of moral direction as well as a problem of an “irresponsible or victimized individual” (R. S. Brown, 1993, p. 68). She concludes her argument by stating that she would rather assist the woman in raising the child herself than aborting the pregnancy. In this latter statement, Sonskyn positions herself as a selfless mother, a construct which will be discussed in the section on the selfless mother discourse. Sonskyn also positions herself as non-judgemental as “everybody must make their own opinion”.

The legalisation of abortion is opposed through recourse to the “anti-abortion God’s will discourse”:

Extract 2:

Moonstar: that the abortion doesn’t happen look uh abortion in our community traditionally

T: [mm]

Moonstar: is not acceptable for us. The Bible says it’s unacceptable, the Bible says it’s wrong even if the uh government says = then a law comes through the cabinet that abortion is applicable in the country, the Bible stays always

(Appendix 4, MG 1)

In extract 2 above, Moonstar reiterates that the Bible states that abortion is wrong, despite what the government says. This text supports the literature cited that despite the legalisation of abortion, it is still being opposed on moral and religious grounds (Varga, 2002). Furthermore, Suffla (1997) maintains, “changes in the law do not necessarily produce a fundamental transformation in the social discourses on abortion” (p. 214). This appears to be the case here.

The following extract illustrates that the implications for a woman who has had an abortion are drastic:

Extract 3:

T: ok, no-one knows how it happened but the community found out (1) that Patricia had an abortion, ok so now the community knows what do you think you would

Lindsman: [oh no]

T: the community’s reaction would be

Simon: murderer

Wolbek: [mm, yes]

Reuben: sinner! She’s committed murder

Simon: she must be crucified stone
 Reuben: [stone her]
 T: ok real, really? Um as in for real or um
 All: [mumbling]
 T: heh heh heh
 Lindsman: no we wouldn't
 (Appendix 4, MG 2)

Extract 3 clearly constructs abortion as murder and subsequently Patricia as a murderer. Reuben and Simon felt very strongly about Patricia having an abortion without telling anyone. When I clarified with the group whether they would really crucify or stone her, the group erupted into an unclear discussion ending in Lindsman compensating for the obviously serious suggestions. Although the group clarified that they would not seriously crucify or stone Patricia, the extract does relay the “atrociousness” of her actions and the notion that Patricia must account for her actions and that she must be punished. This extract closely resembles the findings of another South African study (Mojapelo-Batka & Schoeman, 2003) and a Ugandan study (Nyanzi et al., 2005), amongst others, in which abortion was construed to be killing and a sin.

The implications for women being constructed as murderers and sinners is that access to safe and legal abortions is still restricted (Varga, 2002). Furthermore, women are judged in their community as will be illustrated throughout the analysis. This first section places the remainder of the analysis in context as many of the constructions of abortion and women refer to the “anti-abortion God’s will discourse”.

5.3. The Familial-moral discourse

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, six themes appear within the Familial-moral discourse. The first theme is the idea that reproduction should be confined to marriage and that as a result, sex is also reserved for marriage. The second theme is that sex outside of marriage is constructed as a sin. This idea originates from religious understandings (as referred to in the literature review) and in this study the anti-abortion God’s will discourse. The third theme is that the marital relationship between husband and wife is highly esteemed and very powerful and therefore any decisions made by the marital alliance needs to be respected. The fourth theme or norm is that children are in subordinate positions to their parents, resulting in a parent-child axis (C Macleod, 2003). Children therefore need to obey their parent’s decisions, be accountable to

their parents and families and heed their “good upbringing”. The fifth theme of a “good upbringing” will be discussed towards the end in section 5.3.5 as it summarises the points made above and aptly introduces the sixth and last norm which is that anything that challenges the structure of the traditional nuclear family should be opposed. These norms or taken for granted assumptions informed the community’s constructions of abortion resulting in various implications for women, as will be discussed below.

5.3.1. Marriage enables reproduction

In this theme marriage and reproduction are linked. Marriage enables people to have children and therefore abortion should not be considered.

Extract 4:

- Mitchy: I don’t think so because with Sonskyn I’m going to talk about her the same as how I talk about a teenager because Sonskyn is in a position to raise another child and she chooses an abortion (.) so I am going to the same I’m going to approach her as well so I’m going to = you
- T: [°ok°]
- Mitchy: spoke now about the teenager = because that was not right. Because in my eyes it is not right because they have a big house they have everything why is she wanting an abortion because she can raise the child for sure. So there’s no difference, I don’t think there is a difference in it (.) whether you are young or if you older or married = an the abortion stays an abortion
- Cat: The one that is now married
- Mitchy: [we going to judge the most]
- Jane: because I will say she is a grown woman and couldn’t she have thought and we talking about the children and but look at what the grown ups do. We still have that kind of we always look up to older people here and I will say “gee but Leentjie I had always thought they are such good people”
- Others: [muttering in agreement]
- Jane: see the first thing
- Sonskyn: yes yes be a role model
- Jane: so we going to so we will judge her more the older person than compared to the younger °teenager°

(Appendix 4, WG 1)

Marriage is thus viewed as an enabling environment, as illustrated by referring to “the one that is now married” as being in a “position” to raise another child. A married woman is also perceived to be “grown up” and “responsible”. There are consequences for women who do not make use of the enabling context of marriage to give birth to a child in the event of an unwanted pregnancy. Firstly, they are positioned as irresponsible as indicated by “and couldn’t she have thought”. Secondly, they are positioned as morally lax or poor role models as suggested by “we are going to judge the most”, “we always look up to older people” and “yes be a role model”.

In extract 4 Mitchy is consistent with her views on abortion. Earlier when discussing vignette 1 she maintained that abortion was wrong and when discussing the second vignette she said her feelings towards abortion remain the same, regardless of the age of the woman. This was interesting as in the other discussions the co-researchers moved either from against abortion to partially tolerating it and vice versa, depending on the circumstances of the woman in the vignettes. Therefore, it was not surprising to discover that the first and second women's groups maintained that regardless of whether Patience was married, abortion remained wrong and both the man and the woman were considered responsible for murder.

5.3.2. Sex outside of marriage is a sin for which you must carry the consequences

Foucault (as cited in C Macleod, 2003) refers to the "conjugalisation of sexual relations" where he follows the evolvment of Christianity forbidding non-reproductive sexuality to the introduction of the institution of marriage including sexual activity. This relates to what was found in this analysis where sex was also constructed differently within and out of marriage. Out of marriage sex was constructed as a sin and a problem as opposed to within marriage where it was construed to be something beautiful. It is important for this study to include this section as it contributes to understanding why abortion is so vehemently opposed in this community. Petchesky (as cited in Hall, 2001b) identifies abortion as a signifier which makes the sexual act visible as women who have an abortion and inform people publicly are also revealing that they have engaged in sex. The following extracts illustrate this point:

Extract 5:

- Greg: [in the first place if you are a child of God, with all respect if you are a child of God, and you know your Bible, and you live according to that which is said and stated there and so on then in the first place you ought to not have done it]
 Afro: because sex is for marriage
 Elvis: he's right
 Greg: because it's sin
 Elvis: listen to what I wanted to say (2). Then you not going to do it (1) but (2) now say = look these things do happen it happens. You're only, you are only human
 Afro: [heh heh]
 (Appendix 4, MG 3)

Extract 6:

Popeye: and now what if you are married and you weren't ready for a baby and you didn't use a condom and she falls pregnant and she has gets an abortion uh

Zizo: [no I don't agree with that. If you (married) and you fall pregnant then it is in marriage which is more special]

Popeye: abortion is relative

Zizo: [look I'm not for abortion finished]

Popeye: [I understand what you saying; you must carry the consequences]

T: we going to talk about that just now = in marriage

(Appendix 4, MG 1)

Within this second theme the assumption that sex is forbidden outside of marriage and that it is sinful, irresponsible and cowardly to have an abortion emerges. Therefore the woman must accept responsibility and raise the child. In a Kenyan study (Mitchell et al., 2006) with adolescents, cited in the literature review, abortion was constructed as cowardly whilst parenthood was constructed as accepting responsibility or a physical gesture of atonement for the sin of sex outside of marriage.

The underlying core issue in which sex outside of marriage is seen as unacceptable, implies that women are responsible for policing sex and when pregnancy does occur, for accepting the consequences.

Extract 7:

Wolbek: or you could also have said uh look if you were now one of those strict parents then it would yes (.) I would have said uh you could have looked after yourself you knew this thing would happen to you

Reuben: [when you sexed]

Wolbek: if that was not a safe option now you must use the opposite (.) and now she sits like that (.) so carry on with your day

Reuben: just accept your package

(Appendix 4, MG 2)

Perhaps Wolbek is referring to abstinence or to using contraceptives when he says, "looked after yourself". In other words, he is implying that Patricia should have been responsible and that now she must accept the consequences ("just accept your package"). Interestingly the exact phrase "look after yourself" emerged in another study (Shefer et al., 2000), cited in the literature review, conducted in the Western Cape. In this study, women were urged to look after themselves and positioned as victims by being in a situation of an unplanned pregnancy. They therefore had to defend themselves by taking precautions such as using contraceptives. In my study, Wolbek

suggests that Patricia knew she was going to have sex; therefore, she should have taken precautions.

In extract 8 below, the statement “which is something you know you are doing”, implies that sex is wrong and that you should acknowledge that you may fall pregnant. In such a case you should accept your responsibility of motherhood and not run away from it by having an abortion:

Extract 8:

Zizo: but not just that, abortion is almost as in (.) you you do something that you know (.) what you doing = now it happens and you fall pregnant so then you say “no I can just go for an abortion”, it’s almost like a “get out of jail free card” where you actually should know you must take responsibility

Max: [that is so]

Zizo: for your deeds there is so much stuff nowadays on the TV; condoms for men and contracep – contraceptives there’s everything everything is offered nowadays so why must you still

T: [mm]

Zizo: take chances

(Appendix 4, MG 1)

Raising a child as opposed to having an abortion is therefore regarded as paying penance for your “deed”. Abortion is constructed as cowardly and referred to as a “get out of jail free card”. There is no excuse as “there is so much stuff nowadays”.

5.3.3. Male and female dyad/ marital alliance

The power of the male and female dyad/ marital alliance will now be addressed. It was found that many of the participants placed great emphasis on the marital union and its authority in the family. This power attribution emerged in discussions of both vignettes. In the discussions of the second vignette, it was felt that because the decision to abort was made by Patience and her husband, as a married couple, the decision should be respected (see extract 9). This contradicted the group’s discussions pertaining to the previous vignette in which it was felt that the fetus is a baby and that abortion is murder. Therefore, in the case of marriage, the decision to abort was tolerated because of the authority of the married couple. The life of the “baby”, previously defended, was superseded by the authority and sanctity of the marital alliance. In extract 9, the decision made by the married couple was even superior to the authority of the Bible:

Extract 9:

- T: ok so Patience is married, she has two children, she has a successful business, her husband works um and they decided together that she must have an abortion (1). How do you feel about Patience's abortion? (2)
- Moonstar: (they are a) married couple uh (I presume there is something) wrong so if they have decided together (I must) respect their decision. There is nothing that anyone can do about it even if she gets religious counselling or whatever but it is the husband and wife's decision and yes if they decided that then= I am just a third party I can do nothing about it
- T: ok (1)
- (Appendix 4, MG 1)

In extract 9, it is interesting that Moonstar assumes that something must be wrong with the pregnancy which caused the married couple to consider abortion. In other words, it could be that for Moonstar, a medical reason could justify the abortion and not merely because the couple had only planned for two children. Because the couple is married, it could be that Moonstar felt the need to justify or defend their actions in order to protect the image of marriage. This finding is supported by the literature which maintains that certain circumstances justify abortion or make it tolerable as a practice. For example, other studies cite constructions of abortion as an "evil necessity" (Cannold, 2002, p. 172) and justifiable in certain circumstances in which abortion is a "dependable saviour" (Nyanzi et al., 2005, p. 56). In extract 10, one of the co-researchers, Popeye, noticed the contradiction and challenged the group:

Extract 10:

- Zizo: it doesn't matter whether your girlfriend is using contraceptives, she can use antibiotics and that cancels the contraceptives – remember that. In this case I agree with these two, they have a successful business, they have two children, they in, they know what they want. It was not planned, it was a small error so I agree a hundred percent with them. She's also in her later years so I agree with the abortion
- T: ok
- Popeye: what? Are you saying this now because it's in marriage, are you saying yes because she is older, more mature, according to you, that she can decide this, are you saying yes because she = there's an involved supportive husband there's already two children, that they successful do you think it will be easier for her to live with the abortion?
- Zizo: I don't think it's going to be easier
- Moonstar: it won't be easier
- Popeye: ok, are we now looking at the mom that has to undergo the abortion or are we looking at the little life that is taken, according to you, because it is still taken out (except for the) circumstances it will still be taken so do the circumstances (make abortion right for you?)
- Zizo: abortion is abortion stays abortion
- Popeye: ok so it's wrong?
- Moonstar: abortion is wrong in my eyes
- Popeye: [ok, I understand]
- Moonstar: But as I said one must respect their feelings their decisions that they have made, respect because if as husband and wife they have decided then the decision prevails and if the husband and wife come to an agreement and they decide together ok they going for an abortion, fine why must we interfere?

(Appendix 4, MG 1)

In this extract, Zizo positions the older married couple as responsible. Their error is also considered small and they know that they only want two children. Moonstar and Zizo defend the couple's decision to abort, as mentioned earlier, on the basis of it being a conjugal decision and that they decided together. Popeye, in contrast to these points, removes the decision from being conjugal to the fact that Patience is older and can therefore decide. In other words, Popeye wishes to clarify whether the status of being married qualifies the couple to have an abortion or whether it is because Patience is older than Patricia (who is 21 years old). It would seem that the presence of the man or husband normalises the decision to have an abortion.

The implications for a woman who falls pregnant and has an abortion outside of marriage or the conjugal bond, is that she is positioned as a murderer. The conjugal bond however, rescues a woman from this positioning and instead she is perceived to be reasonable and rational, having discussed the matter with her husband.

Extract 11:

- T: um what other word would you use for the woman who has had the abortion or would you just call her the woman, that's the woman who had the abortion (3)
- Grootman: I would = I'm looking from another point of view because I have heard two stories
- Klaas: [mm]
- Grootman: here now the one story is a married couple and the other story is now a
- Klaas: [mm]
- Grootman: girl that (xxx) the married couple I would say no one would know, they decided together
- Reuben: [xxx]
- Grootman: and the young girl uh she didn't decide with anyone (else) she decided alone and the
- Klaas: [mm]
- Grootman: community will regard her as a murderer, a child murderer
- Lindsman: [child murderer]
- Bobby: yes it's like that
- T: ok
- Grootman: but in the married couple's case no one will look at them negatively
- Klaas: [mm]
- T: ok, ok
- Reuben: because they have marriage
- Grootman: because they have marriage and they made the decision
- T: ok, ok thank you
- (Appendix 4, MG 2)

The emphasis on the joint decision-making emphasises the importance of the institution of a heterosexual marriage and potential patriarchal arrangements within the conjugal bond.

Extract 12:

- T: ok, how do you feel about Patience's abortion?
- Piepa: (cough)
- T: in these circumstances?
- Reuben: Patience is unnecessary (2)

T: ok, why do you say so?
 Reuben: she is privileged
 T: [ok]
 Reuben: to raise another child (2)
 Piepa: I just want to come in there Reuben [cough]. Listen to what Piepa read Reuben uh Patience did not make the decision alone
 Lindsman: [both of them]
 Piepa: Patience was with her husband and they and together they uh uh
 Klaas: [planned]
 Lindsman: planned
 Piepa: no it was not a planned thing
 Klaas: Oh pardon me Piepa
 Piepa: it was not a planned thing, they decided together about what needed to be done now
 Klaas: [mm]
 Piepa: because the thing was not planned. So Reuben slow down a bit
 Lindsman: [ok]
 Klaas: Reuben
 All: heh heh heh
 (Appendix 4, MG 2)

Reuben's argument that Patricia is privileged to raise another child refers to the selfless mother discourse which will be discussed later. For Piepa two "facts" needed to be emphasised: firstly, the fact that the decision was made in a marriage needs to be respected and that Patricia did not make the decision alone. Secondly, the abortion was not *planned* by the couple, rather they decided about *what to do* about the unplanned pregnancy. It could be said that Piepa is trying to convince the audience that the couple did not plan or intend to have an abortion; rather they are doing damage control. This could be indicative of Piepa's attempt to "protect" the institution of marriage. Furthermore, the emphasis on the fact that the couple decided together is important in that the only difference noted by the researchers between the first and second vignettes is that a man is present in the second scenario. Therefore, what makes Patience's decision more acceptable than Patricia's but the presence of a man? According to van Zyl (as cited in de Nobrega, 2006) patriarchy is still present in the family and women's sexual identity and rights are still governed by men. Other authors (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998) agree when they argue that it is indicative of patriarchy when potential fathers assume they should have the right to prevent their partner from having an abortion, regardless of whether or not they reside together. The key issue here is the influence that the man is perceived to have regarding the decision of whether or not to terminate, and which is reported to be a manifestation of patriarchy. An interesting assumption that was made was that if Patricia had a boyfriend she would not have considered an abortion.

Extract 13:

Grootman: I know I'm probably talking a lot. If I read the story the story that I read

- Klaas: [uh]
 Grootman: then firstly, she had gone to the clinic. Then she found out that she is pregnant and then she was upset. So that was maybe a one night stand if I (understand) the thing,
 Klaas: [mm]
 Grootman: there's no boyfriend involved because if there was a boyfriend involved
 Klaas: [mm]
 Grootman: here she wouldn't have considered that abortion
 (Appendix 4, MG 2)

The assumption in this extract is that the woman will not or should not consider abortion if she is in a long term relationship with a man. However, should the man be part of the decision, then the abortion act becomes normalised.

5.3.4. Parent-children axis

Macleod (2003) refers to the parent-children axis with respect to pregnant teenagers. Although Patricia is 21 years old, many co-researchers felt that as Patricia still resided in her parent's home, she was still under their authority and therefore accountable to them. Most of the groups therefore felt that Patricia should seek advice from her parents regarding the unplanned pregnancy as illustrated by extract 14 below. This extract was in response to the first question from the first vignette which asks the group what response they would give her if she asked them for advice. Prior to the extract below, Delores had mentioned that Patricia could consider three options regarding the unplanned pregnancy, namely raising the child, adoption and abortion.

Extract 14:

- T: um, ok, so there are three options, um (.) so what what advice would you give her? (2) she should go to her parents?
 Rita: yes and discuss it with them. Look sometimes one thinks you are scared of your parents but you are also aware that possibly they will give you the best advice and support you. I think that's probably the first thing one would do to go to your parents
 T: mm, ok (2) do we all agree?
 (Appendix 4, WG 3)

(In the first sentence, it appears that I am leading Rita to suggest that Patricia should discuss the pregnancy with her parents. However, I was referring to what had been said prior to this sentence. However, I am not denying that this could have influenced her response, but rather that the idea came from the group and not me.) Once the groups were informed that Patricia had decided not to talk to anyone, including her parents, about the pregnancy and that she had decided to have an abortion, most of the co-researchers felt that she had acted against her parents. There were numerous instances in which co-researchers from every group described

how the parents would feel betrayed, angered and embarrassed by Patricia's pregnancy and abortion and the fact that she had not spoken to them before having the TOP. The main feeling expressed by all was that the parents would be disappointed in Patricia and interestingly that they would be disappointed in themselves for having failed her. Extracts indicating these feelings will be presented below.

5.3.5. The importance of a good upbringing

As mentioned above, a "good upbringing" is highly important in this community. Abortion is therefore often constructed as indecent behaviour because it goes against the family's principles and a "good upbringing" as the following extracts suggest. Extract 15 evolved from the question "How would Patricia's parents feel when they find out about the pregnancy and abortion?"

Extract 15:

Elvis: but if I can say now, it actually depends on the parents themselves how she raises the child (1)
because if you raise your child properly (2) then he will live life in the right way
(Appendix 4, MG 3)

Extract 16:

Allan: abortion is actually wrong
Grootman: it's actually about the family home itself. If I grow up in a good family home
Klaas: [mm]
Grootman: I create a good family home for my daughter where everything the values good
Bobby: [mm]
Grootman: values have then (xxx)
Bobby: is like that yes (xxx) make decisions
Grootman: so (xxx) a good family home
T: uhmm
Grootman: so it's about values actually I think
(Appendix 4, MG 2)

The notions of "live the right way", "the values good values" and "a good family home" are often utilised but never explicitly explained. They are the taken for granted assumptions and do not need further explanation. This pressure on the parents to give Patricia a good upbringing and the pressure on Patricia to adhere to the good upbringing leads to an interesting twist. Patricia is expected to feel bad for not acting according to her good upbringing and the parents are expected to feel bad for failing Patricia in some way. This echoes the findings in a study in Northern Ireland where the public expected women to show remorse after having an abortion (Boyle & McEvoy, 1998).

Extract 17:

Popeye: I am am am (I will be) disappointed firstly (you will think) what values did I raise her with and then possibly you could also feel sore because as a father you think how why could she not have come to me and spoken to you about it and given her advice = but I will firstly kick her butt

All: heh heh heh

T: her butt?

All: heh heh heh

T: just want to make sure. No no no I just want to make sure so that when I listen to the tape I will know

Popeye: first her butt and then the idiot I will –

(Appendix 4, MG 1)

Extract 18:

T: mm, ok what do you guys think her parent's reaction would be, they didn't, didn't know before about the pregnancy or the abortion, now they find out

Sarah: disappointed

Rita: yes they are going to be deeply disappointed (2)

T: ok does everyone agree?

Anna: mm very disappointed

Pat: they may also feel "hey man, where did I go wrong that my child didn't have faith in me so

Anna: [mm]

Pat: or um maybe I am not an approachable parent and the child is afraid to speak with me = because it is confidential conversation. Patricia's (xxx)

Anna: [mm]

Pat: every parent will react differently

All: [heh heh heh]

Anna: [mm]

Pat: but I think they will feel rather hurt "oh man where did I really go wrong?"

(Appendix 4, WG 3)

The literature refers to mother blame as a type of disciplinary power (Caputo, 2007). Mother blame is not only used to distinguish bad mothers from good mothers but also as a means of judging one's own motherly performance. In this case of the extract above, Pat is evaluating her hypothetical shortcomings in that Patricia did not feel she could talk to her about the pregnancy and abortion. According to the author (Caputo, 2007), mother blame positions the child as "appendages to adult society" which disregards the child as an active member of society. In the case of Patricia being advised to consult her parents about her decision, her autonomy and ability to make decisions is undermined. Caputo (2007) further argues that mother blame is a limited and essentialist construction of motherhood which suggests that mothers know what is best for their children.

5.3.6. Abortion challenges the traditional structure of the nuclear family

In the literature review it was mentioned that some authors maintain that anything that challenges the traditional family unit is opposed (Ackermann & Armour, 1989) by the family as the family is understood to be a private world which deals with conflicts internally, without interference from the state (Andersen, 2000). Luker (1984) maintains that public policy is considered to interfere with the sanctity of the family. The family, specifically the husband, is thus regarded as the mediator between society and family members (van Zyl as cited in de Nobrega, 2006). Furthermore, the traditional roles defined for the woman, as a mother, and the children, as obedient parts of the axis, need to be protected. The findings suggested that the CTOP Act is constructed as a threat to the sanctity of the family, as illustrated by the extract below:

Extract 19:

- T: what is your knowledge about abortion, um we have already spoken about it, that it is legal now = that you can go to the hospital and um people (.) the social worker or the psychologist will talk with you (.hhh) what else do you know about it?
- Reuben: it does cause friction between communities and (parents houses) and so on but it does the state a principle for overpopulation (.) to prevent it (xxx)
- Piepa: so you would say your point is right
- (Appendix 4, MG 2)

In extract 19, Reuben maintains that the legislation of abortion causes friction within the community and families. The translation of this extract from Afrikaans into English was tricky as the word “beginself” directly translated into “principle”. Therefore, it would seem that Reuben was saying that the state uses abortion as a principle to prevent overpopulation. However, I understood him to mean that TOP does the state a favour in reducing overpopulation. It also became clear in the conversations that many of the co-researchers resented the new legislation, the CTOP Act, because it gives young girls and women the right to have an abortion without parental consent. The following two extracts, 20 and 21, were in response to the question regarding what the group’s knowledge of abortion was:

Extract 20:

- Pat: yes she doesn’t have to ask for an abortion
- Delores: I’m talking about abortion
- ?: [mm]
- Pat: you don’t need parents’ permission
- Delores: but you have to be sixteen to kiss in public otherwise you are fined if a young person kisses and they are sixteen then = but if you want an abortion then you can be twelve years old and go on your own without your mother knowing, without your father knowing, without your boyfriend knowing, no one knows
- Pat: you can just go there at eight o’clock and when the schools come out then you fine

Anna: [and healthy]
(Appendix 4, WG 3)

Extract 21:

Jacky: it is legal now
Julie: they have made it legal
Voorsitter: they have made it legal so I actually don't have a say now if say now my child goes for an abortion what can I do? It is the law
Jacky: [the law]
Elzane: because the children can now without (a parent's permission)
Voorsitter: [at twelve years of age, imagine at twelve years of age a child has a say over whether you want an abortion or not]
(Appendix 4, WG 2)

A question that could be explored in further research is whether abortion is considered to threaten the marital dyad as women are now legally entitled to make the decision to have an abortion without the consent of the husbands. Previous research (de Nobrega, 2006; Shefer et al., 2008; L. Walker, 1995), as cited in the literature review, has indicated that even today, in some South African households, the husband is regarded as the decision-maker to whom the wife must submit. In this research, it appeared that the participation of the husband in the decision to abort normalised or sanctioned abortion, as opposed to when Patricia, a single woman, made the decision alone. Other examples of where abortion is thought to bring disunity to relationships are referred to later in section 6.6 when the positioning of the man co-responsible for the pregnancy is discussed.

Numerous extracts position Patricia as a failure for disappointing her younger siblings and not being a good role model. This relates to theme two where sex outside of marriage is a sin. The following extract is an example:

Extract 22:

T: mm °ok ° and Afro what did you want to say (.) her age is important for you?
Afro: yes and the fact that that she still what-you-call-it = that = you = the oldest child in the house is always an example for the younger ones that come after, isn't it like that?
T: mm
Afro: so if you have four other what-you-call-it after her (then she must) if the child is now born that she now (what-you-call-it) then surely they will now (think it's cool) to have children at that age, you understand?
(Appendix 4, MG 3)

The literature (Andersen, 2000) indicated that women are still often regarded as responsible for instituting morals in the family, the moral compass for society (Foucault, 1985; Hochfeld, 2007; L. Walker, 1996). In the above extract, Patricia is positioned as an older female moral role model

who has failed by having sex and falling pregnant out of wedlock. The irony is that Afro recommends that Patricia have an abortion in order to protect her sibling's "image" of her and to prevent influencing them negatively by having the child. He asserts that should the child be born, Patricia's younger siblings will think it is "cool" to fall pregnant at a young age. This extract also pathologises young single women falling pregnant outside of marriage.

The co-researchers also maintained that Patricia's parents would be angry with her for falling pregnant and having an abortion. This is tied to theme 2 where sex outside of marriage is irresponsible and a sin. One co-researcher, Afro, from the third men's group, felt that the parents could feel relieved that Patricia had had an abortion given their strained financial situation. However, this was an isolated response and the overarching feeling was that the parents would be angry, disappointed and that abortion enables "children" to rebel against their parents, as illustrated by the following extracts:

Extract 23:

T: mm

Julie: I think the parents must stand by the child

Voorsitter: if it's now me, my daughter fell pregnant without telling me and she underwent an abortion and then came and told me! Well! Then I will

All: [heh heh heh & talking together, unclear]

Voorsitter: rights in the land. I would just squeeze her dead.

(Appendix 4, WG 2)

Many of the participants said that as parents they would be very disappointed in Patricia for falling pregnant and having an abortion without telling them:

Extract 24:

Voorsitter: Look at me, I have a daughter that turns fifteen in June and all the information is given to them; don't do that, this comes from that, this comes from that. There she sits, she didn't have the guts to say "gee mom I am pregnant". She ran away rather than to tell me "I am pregnant". As mother I was deeply disappointed what could I do?

(Appendix 4, WG 2)

In this extract, Voorsitter described how she felt when her fourteen-year-old daughter fell pregnant and didn't tell her. She refers to her daughter as not having the guts to talk to her about it, implying that she was a coward. Following Foucault (1977), it could be said that Patricia has contravened the disciplinary power enforced by her upbringing, which resulted in her disappointing her parents. In other words, Patricia rebelled against the social script that was formulated for her in terms of who she should be etc. Furthermore, mother blame (which was

introduced above) is represented here by a feeling of helplessness where she asks, “what could she do?” As mentioned above, many of the co-researchers also felt that Patricia had betrayed or wronged her parents and that she should ask them for forgiveness. Again, this emphasises that Patricia is not considered an adult in her own right, capable of making her own decisions. Her body is not considered her own but rather she is still under her parent’s, or even father’s authority.

The following extract refers to the idea that abortion enables daughters to “rebel” against their parents by having sex:

Extract 25:

Rita: the children think now that we can do what we want

Anna: [mm]

Rita: it’s bad that our children can just do what they want and then know that they can just go; my mother and father won’t know, gee it’s

Anna: [xxx]

Rita: it’s too much

(Appendix 4, WG 3)

(In extract 25 Rita says “do what we want” which refers to the “children” doing what they want). As in the previous section, abortion is therefore constructed as a contraceptive method as well as the daughters doing what they like or being promiscuous. I would like to suggest that abortion may threaten parents’ control over their daughter’s sexuality and therefore abortion is perceived to be a threat in this regard. Therefore, although pre-marital pregnancy is strongly resisted in this community, it is preferable to abortion, perhaps because then parents are aware of their daughter’s activities which can then be controlled:

Extract 26:

Greg: that’s something that you said earlier, to come back to you (2) our communities, they would recognise the opportunity to rather raise that child as opposed to (trouble) the child and with that to go for an abortion

(Appendix 4, MG 3)

Within the Familial-moral discourse, a woman who conceives out of wedlock and has an abortion is stigmatised and is constructed as promiscuous, a failure, incapable of making her own decisions as well as raising a child on her own. On the other hand, a married couple who wishes to abort is constructed differently in that the presence of a man in the decision-making process “normalises” or makes the decision to have an abortion tolerable. The woman is caught between a rock and a hard place because should she decide to carry the pregnancy to term and raise the

child on her own, she will experience hostility as single female-headed households are pathologised (C Macleod, 2003). On the other hand, should she decide to abort, she will also be ostracised, as she will represent immorality and thus contribute towards the “degeneration” of the traditional nuclear family.

Furthermore, the woman who still lives in her parent’s home, as in the case of Patricia who was 21 years old, is considered to be under her parent’s authority. She cannot act independently as she is construed to be an extension of them, part of the family. She therefore cannot be autonomous regarding her sexuality or reproduction capacity. She is also at the mercy of pressure to conform to her “good upbringing”, which serves as a form of control or surveillance. Abortion is constructed as a “cop-out” or cowardly approach to a “problem” unless there are medical reasons present to suggest that an abortion would be the best decision.

The primary theme that emerged in this section was that the preservation of the authority of the traditional nuclear family unit and institution of marriage was very important to the co-researchers. Opposing abortion was also strongly linked to living according to one’s good upbringing and strong moral principles. Falling pregnant out of wedlock was considered immoral and irresponsible but a preferred situation to abortion.

The findings in this research were concurrent with that of the literature reviewed by Macleod (2003), who highlights the ways in which the marital alliance regulates reproduction. These findings were pertinent to this study which found that the marital alliance (C Macleod, 2003) also regulates abortion.

5.4. The “selfless mother” discourse

The notion that being a mother is a privilege and an honour, ordained by God, and that it is therefore offensive to throw that privilege away, emerged throughout the analysis. This point was illustrated earlier in the familial section (extract 12). Furthermore, the co-researchers indicated that mothering provides fulfillment for a woman. Interestingly, these findings are substantiated by literature (for example, Bassin, Honey & Kaplan as cited in Kruger, 2003;

Luker, 1984). The groups also maintained that a woman who has an abortion and denies this “calling” or “privilege” will feel regret, grief or a sense of loss and guilt. This finding is also reported in the literature (for example Mojapelo-Batka and Schoeman, 2003). These emotional or psychological consequences of abortion relate to post-abortion “psychological effects” or PAS as referred to in the literature review. A construct of a selfless mother thus emerges, referring to a woman who accepts her calling to be a mother including the labour and challenge that mothering implies. Each of these findings is discussed below.

5.4.1. Mothering is a privilege and fulfilling

The following exact illustrates that, within this community, being a mother is considered a privilege and a child is considered a gift from God, in any circumstance, including rape:

Extract 27:

- Jumbo: I have a friend who had a child and it's her only child that she had (.) who doesn't know where he came from. She was raped, but she kept the pregnancy and we all reasoned how can a pregnancy come from rape, no she's mad, pregnancy doesn't come from rape does it, it =
- Voorsitter: [mm]
- Jumbo: mustn't it be hundred percent from the man and the woman's side how could she then = they said in that rape you come to feelings that you have, that you also started now
- Voorsitter: [mm]
- Jumbo: uh come up and uh understand, I also, ok fine, today she is so happy with that child. Today it is her shadow tree her (xxx) now she says sometimes rape works she sits with that child and today that child means so much. She said now one day to me “Ooh Jumbo, I am so proud of my child”, she said “there is my shadow tree. Never mind I don't care where he came from whether he came from rape because today I can sit under a cool tree nicely sit and my child cares so many times for
- T: [wow]
- Jumbo: me. And she says when she looks at him then the tears want to bubble out of her and she says “Lord I don't mind where you got the circumstances = how I got the child, You allowed that this happened to me so that I could become a better person out of this and today (he) is my shadow tree, I made sure of him, he is here and I can sit under him”. So it's not always so bad if you go through pregnancy, it's not so bad to (have) that child that was formed with love. God blew the life in there not you. But but uh uh that ball of love never mind you want to eat them up when they there. Me and the mom and the dad have been very stern at times, then I was scared of my granny, then all the = then he was all the family's joy and everyone just wanted to eat him up so uh the children, yes and exactly it won't take long.

(Appendix 4, WG 2)

In the beginning of extract 27 Jumbo indicates the widely cited finding that the public regards rape to be a justifiable reason to abort where she says that everyone thought that her friend was mad for keeping the pregnancy. The public view that rape justifies abortion has been documented in the literature as well as the fact that certain circumstances make abortion tolerable

(Caldas da Costa & Donald, 2003; Mojaelo-Batka & Schoeman, 2003; Sahar & Karasawa, 2005). Despite this public view, Jumbo's friend embraced motherhood and was in fact, a "selfless mother". The fetus who is now referred to as a child is constructed as a blessing to Jumbo's friend, she also refers to her own child as bringing joy to her family, despite her pregnancy being out of wedlock and initially a disappointment to her family. The underlying message in this extract is that no pregnancy is too difficult to carry to term. In other words, no circumstance, not even rape, can rob a woman of the joy of motherhood. This supports Bassin et al. (as cited in Kruger, 2003) who assert that women are expected to find fulfillment and satisfaction in the role of the "ever-bountiful, ever-giving, self-sacrificing mother" (p. 198).

Extract 27 thus refers to women who have denied their own selfish interests in favour of the life of the fetus (Daniels, 1997; Greene, 2006). In the group discussions this construction of women often emerged, especially pertaining to the second vignette in which Patience and her husband decide together to have an abortion. In other words to have an abortion is selfish, to raise the baby is considered to be selfless.

In extract 28, it is assumed that the experience of having a baby is more valuable than not having one. If one looks at the extract, having an abortion is construed as being left with nothing, in other words one gains nothing. Therefore, motherhood is constructed as something valuable, something good as opposed to not being a mother:

Extract 28:

T: ok, and the last one, is teenage pregnancy a better option than abortion?
 Elvis: if you have a baby then it lives, if you have an abortion then you have nothing. Look today we learn you must stick a bottle in this way, tomorrow I learn you must rub a wind out there but every day you learn a little more

(Appendix 4, MG 3)

This notion of being a mother as something good as opposed to not being a mother once again forms a binary where not being a mother is abnormal or pathologised. In this sense, not being a mother contravenes furthering the traditional notion of the nuclear family. Furthermore, Lamas (1997) maintains that communities may find it difficult to challenge the "mother" construction and accept that a potential mother may not wish to be a mother, although modern innovations such as films and other media images of women are contributing to challenging the status quo.

Many of the group members expressed concern that a woman may not be able to have children again after having an abortion. Within the “selfless mother” discourse, this is constructed as a problem as it is a natural occurrence for a woman to have and want children:

Extract 29:

- Jumbo: You know it’s something that (xxx) it’s all in your mind. You walk for years you walk with it and it is not something that goes out of your mind easily
- Voorsitter: I mean you can think “Lord what could that child have become, Lord how = wouldn’t I all those things
- Jumbo: [Maybe the Lord blessed you with just, God blessed you with the one pregnancy (all talking at once – unclear). Now there is not a child after that maybe. If I want another child after that I must have lots of money to have a child you must pay to have a child].

(Appendix 4, WG 2)

5.4.2. Conception implies motherhood

In extract 30 below, Mitchy maintains that once a mother, you’re always a mother.

Extract 30:

- T: so we have um Sonskyn has spoken about it a bit what she her her fee - feelings would be. But after the abortion ok look now this is now before the time when she arrives at the hospital we have spoken about um what will she experience there people will talk to her about it and everything um but after the abortion what would her feelings be? (3)
- Mitchy: I think there would surely be a feeling because the = whether you now = it = abortion= it was a life that you had that you felt, contributed even if it was for only two months it’s a life but you will always think of it even if it’s a year later ok as she said you will always think but did I = what would I have done now if my child was so old because if you were a mom you stay a mom. That is the other thing
- T: ok, ok what does Cat say?
- All: heh heh heh
- Cat: she will maybe feel regret about what she has done and hurt and disappointed in herself

(Appendix 4, WG 1)

The statement “if you were a mom you stay a mom” suggests that motherhood is implied by conception and not by a relationship with a child. Furthermore, being a mother is part of a woman’s identity. Despite the fetus being physically removed from a woman’s body, it will always be a part of who she was. It is interesting that Mitchy says that the woman will have contributed by having a life in her. In this way, perhaps she means that bearing a “child” or bringing a “child” into the world is in fact a valuable contribution to the world.

With regard to the extract above it was mentioned that Mitchy implied that being a mother is part of who a woman is. A logical progression in this understanding therefore, is that if you have an abortion you may wonder about whom the fetus could have developed into and this idea is illustrated in the following extract. Delores refers to a “vermisting” (see Afrikaans extract 31,

Appendix 4), something that is missing. In other words, Delores implies that the fetus or “baby” is part of who you are as a woman, a similar idea to what Mitchy alluded to above. The notion of guilt is also raised here implying that the abortion is wrong. One study (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998) reported that the male partner had similar feelings of wondering what the aborted fetus could have become.

Extract 31:

T: ok, (clear throat), what do you think her feelings would be after the abortion? (3)
 Delores: she could feel she has something missing, maybe something that she will, as Pat said, she will wonder if it now = how I wonder what kind of baby it would have been
 Anna: [mm]
 Delores: I wonder what he would have looked like? There =
 Anna: [she is going to ask herself and wonder]
 Delores: it could perhaps be
 Anna: and also search herself for answers (2)
 Pat: and guilt feelings
 Few: [mm]
 Anna: [mm, guilt feelings]
 (Appendix 4, WG 3)

5.4.3. Mothering as a sacrifice

The following extract is a snippet from an experience that Voorsitter had in a hospital waiting room one day. A woman came and sat next to her and started telling her that she was about to have another abortion. Voorsitter suggests that despite motherhood being fulfilling it is hard work and that the fetus is an integral part of who she is:

Extract 32:

Voorsitter: she comes in, she sits, then she talks as if she has known me for years and she says “you know, I want to have an abortion done. It’s not my first” and I say “what? Do you think child bearing is fun?” I say child = abortion, it’s as if a part of me personally is taken away from me, it’s as if a part
 Jumbo: [mm]
 Voorsitter: of = I feel it is murder murder that I am committing.
 (Appendix 4, WG 2)

When Voorsitter asks “what? Do you think child bearing is fun?”, she is implying that although motherhood is fulfilling, it is hard work. Therefore mothering is a sacrifice (Kruger, 2003) but abortion is out of the question. This latter statement reflects the expectation that a mother should be selfless. It is clear in extract 32 that Voorsitter regards motherhood as being an integral part of who she is. This is seen where she described the fetus as being a part of her personally that is taken away from her, and perhaps we can assume that she was going to say a part of herself. The notion of motherhood as a integral and natural part of the adult woman has been discussed in the

literature review (Caputo, 2007; C. Walker, 1995; L. Walker, 1996). The fetal rights and anti-abortion God's will discourses are also drawn upon here with regard to abortion constructed as murder. The former will be discussed later in a separate section.

As already mentioned, many of the co-researchers felt that it was selfish of Patience to abort as they felt it was unnecessary. They argued that she was financially able to provide for another child and that she was not too old. Furthermore, the fact that she was married and the child would therefore have a "family" was an important factor for many of the co-researchers, again emphasising the importance of marriage and the family. Another co-researcher, George (men's group 3) referred to Patience as having a "happy life" and that the abortion would therefore be unnecessary. Another co-researcher, Anna (women's group 3) felt the abortion was unnecessary because Patience's husband is employed. In other words, many of the co-researchers felt that Patience was unwilling to make the necessary sacrifices to raise the child and that she had no "justifiable" reasons to have an abortion.

The importance of the financial situation in constructing abortion as unnecessary can also be seen in extract 33 below:

Extract 33:

Sarah: and if Patience has a problem with the child
 Anna: if the child is now a problem she knew what was waiting for her in the future. Someone that can look after the child for Patience, it's
 Rita: [mm]
 Anna: not that Patience doesn't have money. Patience has money (2)
 Griet: and I believe the sister and the brother would also be happy to (have another brother or sister)
 (Appendix 4, WG 3)

With reference to extract 33, in the instance that the "child" would be viewed as a problem it was argued that Patience knew the consequences of having sex. She would be irresponsible or selfish to terminate as she can afford to have someone care for the baby. Furthermore, the argument that the children in the vignette would like another baby brother or sister again, places the children's desires above those of the woman (and in this case the man as well).

One of the co-researchers also shared how she fell pregnant when she was 39 and that although it was a shock, she decided to have the baby. She therefore argued that Patience's age is not an

issue and that she should have the baby. In other words, Patience should be prepared to make the necessary sacrifices.

5.5. Conclusion

In this section, various taken for granted assumptions have been discussed regarding woman and mothering. Three main themes emerged in the analysis. Firstly, many of the co-researchers felt that mothering is both fulfilling and a privilege. This was illustrated by the extract in which even pregnancy because of rape was not considered a circumstance that could rob a woman of the joy of motherhood. Another extract illustrated the assumption that the experience of motherhood is superior to not being a mother. This assumption fails to consider all contexts and situations in which women find themselves. Secondly, it was assumed by some of the co-researchers that conception implies motherhood. For example, it was mentioned, “Once a mother, you’re always a mother”. Mothering is therefore part of a woman’s identity. Therefore, an abortion will lead to regret and guilt. It is assumed that all women will experience abortion in the same way. Lastly, mothering is constructed as a sacrifice and women are expected to be selfless and prepared to make sacrifices to raise a child. This construction seems to prevail despite the woman's circumstances, as illustrated by the extracts.

In summary, the implications for women within the selfless mother discourse is that she is either perceived to be selfish (Boyle & McEvoy, 1998) and irresponsible, or selfless and responsible (L. Walker, 1996). Both constructions are a result of the widely held assumption that motherhood is an essential part of being a woman. Abortion is therefore constructed as a selfish and unnecessary act as well as the cause of emotional problems such as hurt, guilt and regret, should the woman refuse the “privilege” of being a mother.

Chapter 6

The rights discourses

6.1. Introduction

As mentioned in the literature review, Daniels (1997) argues that the anti-abortion argument, traditionally based on religious rationale, has transformed into a discourse of fetal rights. The literature review also presented three positions regarding the rights of the fetus: the conservative, moderate and liberal views (reproductive rights discourse). All three views, as documented by Isaacs (2002), emerged in the analysis. The predominant view was the conservative position which maintains that the fetus is a life from conception. This idea was also referred to in the selfless mother discourse section, where motherhood is implied at conception. The woman-centred discourse, another pro-life discourse, emerged in the analysis. The moderate view, which maintains that the fetus develops into a life from a certain stage in pregnancy, was only represented twice. Lastly, the liberal viewpoint is addressed in this thesis as the reproductive rights discourse. Although this discourse was referred to vaguely in isolated instances, only one extract truly reflects this discourse. The other instances refer to how abortion is sometimes considered a necessary evil under certain circumstances. The discourse of TOP as taboo and stigmatised has been included in this chapter as it feeds into a climate that is anti-reproductive rights. Lastly, the positioning of men in terms of the question of men's rights with respect to pregnancy and abortion is discussed.

6.2. Fetal rights discourse

Within the fetal rights discourse, the fetus is constructed as a person, entitled to claim a right to life. This discourse emerged throughout the discussions with all the groups. It is positioned against the reproductive rights discourse pertaining to the rights of the woman wanting an abortion. The literature suggests that this is more than often the case where the rights of the fetus are pitted against those of the woman (Gibson, 2004). Extract 34 has been inserted here as an introductory text to this section on the fetal rights discourse:

Extract 34:

T: ok. (.) ok. And the woman that had the abortion?
 Elvis: murderer
 T: is it?
 George: (xxx) murderer
 T: ok
 Afro: murder
 E: cold murderer
 ?: sick
 Afro: cold-blooded murder
 T: ok
 Afro: just shows where we are going in our community because I believe that in the (wide) world those two are = there are always reasons aren't there as the man said, for everything as in (2)
 Elvis: do you want to say now that abortion = abortion will just stay murder but you can
 Afro: [yes the Bible]
 Elvis: now you can't describe it any other way because it is a life that you take
 George: [xxx]
 Elvis: all abortion – it's a life that you take (.) you can now say, you can give whatever name, the name that you give it, it's just a name
 Greg: [it's the same but it stays a life]
 Elvis: it stays a life
 T: ok (.) and the choice on termination of pregnancy act, the legislation that has just come in
 Elvis: if I, if I must honestly say
 T: [mm]
 Elvis: that the law that they have brought in (2) is how can I say, (3) it's unacceptable
 Greg: [mhmm]
 Elvis: because why – if you examine the Bible (.) you will see in the Bible (.) that murder stays murder, you can't call murder something else
 T: mm
 Elvis: it's murder
 T: ok (2)
 Elvis: even if it took three days after the other uh uh "what-you-call-it" to die it's always murder (2) even if it's done in another way, you've committed murder
 (Appendix 4, MG 3)

As illustrated by extract 34, the fetus is considered a life or living being from conception and as already mentioned, this was the predominant construction of the fetus that came to the fore. One of the questions in the general section (see Appendix 3) asked whether the co-researchers would use another word for "fetus" and most of the groups felt that the fetus should be called a baby and not a fetus because the embryo has life from conception. The fetal rights discourse therefore draws heavily on the selfless mother discourse because the woman is positioned as a mother from conception who will lose her child should she abort. These feelings of loss were discussed in the previous chapter as well.

Therefore, because a fetus is constructed as a living being, a human baby from the moment of conception, abortion is understood to be murder and the woman having the abortion, a murderer. Interestingly all the groups referred to the woman as being a murderer. The binaries of life vs death and mother vs murderer are evident within this discourse. Furthermore, the extract also refers to the “Anti-abortion God’s Will” discourse as Elvis refers to the Bible, arguing that the Bible regards abortion as murder.

The construction of abortion as murder and therefore the woman as a murderer appeared in all the group’s responses. Some of these instances were in direct response to questions posed in the vignette (see Appendix 2, questions 5a and 5c respectively) which asked the groups whether they would use any other word for TOP other than abortion and how they would refer to the woman who had had the abortion. The other references to “murder” and “murderer” occurred randomly in the discussions of the vignettes. In other words, these responses were not prompted in any way. A second construction for the woman having the abortion is implicated by constructing the fetus as a baby. The next obvious assumption then is that the woman is a mother. In other words, the woman who may not wish to be a mother is by default positioned as a mother because the fetus is referred to as a baby.

The themes of this section therefore include: (1) the fetus is a life from conception and (2) therefore regarded as a baby and the woman as a mother, (3) abortion constructed as murder leading to (4) the woman who has an abortion positioned as a murderer (Cannold, 2002). The literature review cited other studies in which abortion was constructed as murder (Boyle & McEvoy, 1998; Mojapelo-Batka & Schoeman, 2003; Tan, 2004)

The theoretical framework for this study maintains that various parties use facts to convince their audience that their interpretation of the world is reality. The argument regarding at what stage the fetus can be considered viable has been cited as an example of this strategy (Luker, 1984). It was also stated that regimes of truth have consequences for the parties involved, regardless of what the “reality” is (Hall, 2001a). Within this discourse, abortion is constructed as murder. The implications for women who have abortions are degrading and patronising. Women who have had abortions are constructed as murderers and are therefore criminalised despite abortion being

legal. They are also referred to as sinners and backstabbers. This latter construct refers to the Familial-moral discourse in which the woman is constructed as betraying her parents by falling pregnant and having the abortion. She is therefore expected to ask for forgiveness. In conclusion, the woman and abortion are both stigmatised and pathologised. The implication is that women who otherwise may consider or seek a TOP may decide against it because of internalised moral pressure or fear of stigma. This discourse also has implications for women's emotional response to TOP. If TOP is predominantly constructed as murder, then women will be likely to experience reactions that mirror this construction.

6.3. Reproductive rights discourse

As described in the literature review, the reproductive rights discourse maintains that the woman should have the right to decide about the pregnancy. The discussion on the reproductive rights discourse has been divided into two sections according to the issues raised by the groups: The woman should have the right to decide as to whether or not to abort because: (1) it is her body that is affected by the pregnancy, and (2) it is her future that is most affected by the pregnancy. Each of these points will be discussed however; some of the extracts overlap.

The reproductive rights discourse as it has been identified in this research is not strictly a "pure" reproductive rights discourse. Rather, it emerged in a distancing manner, in other words, there were seldom instances where participants own the discourse or position themselves as advocating it. Rather they refer to it as something that others, for example, the "younger ones", the women or the person to whom they are giving advice, may invoke.

6.3.1. The woman's body is affected most by the pregnancy

As mentioned in the literature review, the liberal stance on abortion advocates for a woman to have the right to make reproductive choices and thus have rights over her own body (McNamara, 1985). The following extract demonstrates that things like parenthood and pregnancy occupy different meanings for different people. For example, in extract 35 below, Jane states that not

everyone approaches pregnancy in the same way and therefore people should decide for themselves:

Extract 35:

- Jane: umm Sonskyn just said that for us pregnancy is almost like a second nature thing but many of our young people differ about pregnancy and many times uh it is actually the very one that we never expected that falls pregnant and then it's a very big problem and then she comes to me for advice and what do I do now? Because she = the person looks up to me. How am I going to handle the situation now? Will my advice
- T: [mm]
- Jane: be the best for her or will she at the end of the day have to follow her own head. Do you understand? So it is a big uh uh thing because with us (take everything) we generalise pregnancy but not everyone handles it the same
- T: mm (1) mm (1) mm (1) ok (5)
- (Appendix 4, WG 1)

A study (Izugbara & Undie, 2008) conducted in 2008 argued that the concepts of the “body” and “rights” are cultural constructs and therefore constructed indigenously. This relates to Jane’s argument in which she states that not everyone, in other words, not every individual, “handles it” (pregnancy) in the same way. It depends on the woman’s context and whether she is able to exercise her reproductive rights. As mentioned in the literature review, in the context of this community, where patriarchy is seemingly present, it would appear that the woman is not able to freely exercise her rights as the husband is often still regarded as the head of the home.

Although the majority of the co-researchers (except the four individuals who were more sympathetic to TOP) displayed anti-abortion sentiments most of the time, a few at times suggested that because the woman’s body is affected by the pregnancy she should have the right to decide. For example, in extract 36 below, Klaas and Grootman from the first men’s group were vehemently opposed to TOP and yet when asked whether women think differently about TOP now that it is legal, they stated that they could not answer that question as only the woman would know and it is the woman who walks around pregnant for nine months. Grootman clearly stated that men cannot comprehend the impact that pregnancy has on a woman. The irony is that these responses might suggest that these individuals are pro-choice, yet their earlier discussions were saturated by pro-life themes. This example reiterates the argument presented in the literature review regarding attitudes and the fact that they are neither predictable nor stable. The contradiction here is that TOP is constructed as murder and a sin and not condoned as a medical procedure. However, in these extracts it is suggested that it is the woman’s decision to have an abortion, as it is her body. Therefore, the possibility of abortion does exist.

Extract 36:

T: .hhh, ok, do you think women think differently about abortion now that it's legal?
 Piepa: yes
 Grootman: my viewpoint is that women think differently because we as men don't realise what
 Klaas: [yes]
 Grootman: impact it has on the woman
 Klaas: [mm] (.)
 Grootman: so we can't actually give the answer to you
 Klaas: [yes]
 Grootman: around abortion = it's just the woman
 Reuben: [just the woman yes she alone would know]
 Grootman: (and a) another viewpoint around abortion the woman perhaps has another
 Klaas: [yes]
 Grootman: viewpoint around abortion because she is the one that must take the (step)
 Bobby: [is so yes]
 T: ok
 Klaas: yes uh Grootman I rather agree with you I also just want to come in on that point, it's actually
 the woman's issue that because the woman walks around for about nine months now I
 Lindsman: [heh heh]
 Klaas: think namely Klaas [surname] I wouldn't actually know (.) this that the woman, the direction
 in life that the woman takes so she will be better able to to address you on how she feels about
 abortion.

(Appendix 4, MG 2)

Yet another example of the incongruence of people's "attitudes" towards issues is seen below in extract 37. Popeye clearly points out that some were opposed to abortion in Patricia's case, the younger single unemployed woman, and referred to it as murder and yet they supported Patience's situation. Popeye states that he would rather support Patricia, as her circumstances are the more "desperate" as she is single (implying that an unplanned pregnancy in marriage is less desperate) and unemployed. However, he maintains that despite the circumstances it should still be the woman's decision:

Extract 37:

Popeye: see for me um what I heard now from the different mouths, the way it sounded to me, that the
 one before = that one you won't agree that she undergoes the abortion but with this one you
 will while I would have said just the opposite because (Zizo) said they can't and the (one
 before) she may but as things go, I still say it all depends on the woman herself
 T: [mm]
 Popeye: if she didn't want it (and she) does not see a way chance to raise the child then (.) so be it but
 see they are successful, they can afford it, they have the resources to give the child a life, a
 good life um (xxx) but for me it still all depends on the woman
 T: ok, so what what factors are important regarding your feelings about it? Is it the
 circumstances, that's what I'm hearing, it's the
 Popeye: [for me everything depends on the woman]
 T: ok, ok
 Popeye: she is the one that's pregnant she's the one that will raise the child. She can either have the
 child adopted or she can raise the child or she can, she can leave the child for someone to find
 but she's going to sit with the child. So she = circumstances everything depends on her (I am
 not the one that) is pregnant
 T: ok

Popeye: so it all depends on her
 T: ok
 (Appendix 4, MG 1)

6.3.2. Pregnancy affects the woman's future the most therefore she should decide

A few issues were raised regarding the woman's future and the decision to abort. Some felt that her circumstances would affect the fetus's future quality of life. The following extract speaks to the widely held belief that the man co-responsible for the pregnancy often does not support the woman and child financially:

Extract 38:

T: ok (2) and um Cat, you you are this age, twenty-one, if if what do you think your boyfriend would have thought about it (.) if he found out now?
 Cat: I don't think he would have ag-agreed but for me I also think that it is not for him to say because he is not the one that will be left with the child. Tomorrow he will take another woman and then I must still struggle with the child and most men don't pay the child so it's difficult to raise a child on your own.

(Appendix 4, WG 1)

In extract 38 above, Cat suggests that it is hard financially to raise a child as a single person. This is a noted challenge cited by feminists (Andersen, 2000). Other studies further support this argument, for example, in their study in the United States, Jones et al. (2008) found that two-thirds of 19 participants were at or below the poverty line and were receiving little or no support from the man. Cat's suggestion that the man will probably leave Patricia and "take another woman" is echoed in the literature, as cited in the review, which adds that this is likely to occur, especially if she is pregnant (Shefer et al., 2000).

The following text, extract 39, suggests that abortion allows for a better life:

Extract 39:

T: ok, what what are you saying?
 Afro: abortion (actually leads to a better life)
 T: sorry what did you say?
 Afro: abortion actually leads to a better life

(Appendix 4, MG 3)

What is implied but not said in extract 39 is that raising children is not a good life. Afro is one of the younger co-researchers compared with the other groups and he is not married and has no children. In other words, he has not been a parent whereas many of the other co-researchers are parents. According to a study conducted with men whose previous partner had had abortion, one

male participant expressed that his views on abortion had changed once he had had children (Reich, 2008). The statement he makes here emphasises the social constructionist idea that our understanding of the world is shaped by the world we live in. In other words, things like parenthood and pregnancy occupy different meanings for different people.

In the following extract, Mitchy maintains that only Patricia can make the decision about the abortion.

Extract 40:

- T: °Thank you°, hhh ok, so i-f Patricia uh came to-o you, um..(1) for advice what would you say to her? An - , anyone? There isn't a right answer, there isn't a wrong answer, we just talking about it
- All: (muffled noises, acknowledging they understand what I'm saying)
(5)
- Mitchy: I would probably have to listen to her. But I = the decision also lies with her because I can't make the decision for her. It's difficult. You can't decide for someone else because tomorrow that what-you-call-it will turn against you, that decision against you
- T: [mm]
(3)
- Mitchy: I would show her all options except that
(2)
- T: mmmm
(4)
- T: if you now say except that, except to (tell) her (what to do). ok
- Mitchy: (<tell her what to do>)
- (Appendix 4, WG 1)

In extract 40 Mitchy maintains that Patricia needs to make the decision because she needs to live with the consequences. Mitchy is in other words not prepared to take responsibility for her advice should it not end well. Mitchy also says she will present all the options to Patricia except for abortion. Perhaps what Mitchy is not saying here is that she does not want to be involved in Patricia's decision if that is to abort as the chances are good that Patricia will regret her decision at a later stage and blame her. It also seems that Mitchy begins to say that she would show Patricia all options except that of abortion and then changes her mind to say, "except to tell her what to do". This is interesting, as that would have contradicted what Mitchy originally said about letting Patricia decide for herself. Mitchy's response is similar to that of the participants in the Kenyan study (Mitchell et al., 2006), who felt that it was inappropriate to offer recommendations for the vignettes used in the study.

In this discourse the woman is constructed as possessing the ability to make decisions about her own body and future, although this discourse was not a pure reproductive rights discourse and was tainted by aspects of the Familial-moral discourse. Furthermore, abortion was also constructed as a decision that could “backfire” or have negative consequences in the end. It is perhaps for this reason that some co-researchers did refer to the reproductive rights discourse in order to clearly state that it is the woman’s decision and that therefore they (as the person offering advice or support) are not willing to take responsibility for the woman's decision.

6.4. The woman-centred discourse

As discussed in the literature review, although the woman-centred discourse is pro-life, it focuses on the woman as opposed to the fetus. Previously women have been positioned as murderers and sinners whilst the fetus has been positioned as a living being in need of rescue (Cannold, 2002), as indicated in the previous section on the fetal rights discourse. In this new woman-centred discourse, the anti-abortion movement has repositioned themselves as defenders of women who are either considering TOP or who have had the procedure (Cannold, 2002; Lamas, 1997). Therefore, within this discourse women having TOPs are constructed as vulnerable victims who are often forced into having an abortion against their better judgement (Cannold, 2002; Daniels, 1997). Women are also positioned as lacking agency and as incapable of making the right decision (Cannold, 2002). Furthermore, abortion is constructed as a traumatic event and physically and psychologically unsafe (Cannold, 2002). All of these constructions were found in this research except that none of the co-researchers suggested that perhaps the women in the vignettes had been forced to have an abortion.

This section on the woman-centred discourse will therefore be divided into sections; the first section will address the notion that women are incapable of making the right decision alone and that they therefore need to consult with experts and other people in order to avoid making the mistake of having an abortion. In the Familial-moral discourse section, the suggestion that Patricia should discuss the unplanned pregnancy with her parents was addressed. Therefore, although this aspect contributes to the idea that Patricia is incapable of making the decision on her own, it will not be discussed again here. The second section discusses the interesting idea

that women who have made the “mistake” of abortion are incorporated into a nexus of care. The third section is a discussion of the construction of abortion as a dangerous procedure.

6.4.1. Women as incapable of making rational decisions alone

The following extract echoes many of the points made in the literature review above. Please note that this discussion occurred in relation to the abortion and not the pregnancy.

Extract 41:

Piepa: I have now listened attentively but there’s one thing that I just quickly want to draw to our attention (.). No-one asks (.) for a failure in your life (.) no-one asks for something negative in your life no-one wants to do something

Klaas: [mm]

Piepa: negative and um if I consider the sit= the difficult circumstances

Kl: [mm]

Piepa: that this young girl is in (.) and um it is a difficult choice that she must make

Kl: [mm]

Piepa: (.) >but before she can make the choice< = its not just about herself, it’s also about her future and this is where the thing has come out and the thing now

Kl: [mm]

Piepa: is about the community (.) but the community must remember that we are not perfect we make mistakes so what will it do to Patricia if we as a community are going to uh reject her

(Appendix 4, MG 2)

Although Piepa states that Patricia had a difficult choice to make, it is clear in extract 41 that Patricia’s decision to have an abortion is regarded as a mistake. This construction of abortion as a decision lacking sound judgement occurred throughout the analysis. Linked to this understanding of abortion was the role that the family or parents play in the decision-making process to have an abortion. When her family found out, it was expected that Patricia had to ask for forgiveness from her family, implying that she had wronged her family. Every group maintained that as parents they would be terribly disappointed if they were to find out that their daughter had firstly fallen pregnant out of wedlock and secondly had an abortion. Here again is the issue of sex out of marriage as a sin, a link to the Familial-moral discourse.

In the following text below, extract 42, Delores suggests that some people may say that if only Patricia had spoken to them they may have been able to change her mind. Again, abortion is constructed as a mistake or the wrong decision and Patricia, the woman, is constructed as incapable of making her own decision and needing assistance:

Extract 42:

Delores: you are going to get people that say it's actually a pity that this now happened to Patricia because maybe if she had come to talk to me then if I could have perhaps

Anna: [mm]

Delores: been there = Patricia would not have had an abortion then we could have perhaps looked at other solutions (2) and also listened to Patricia, surely there will be people, there will be people

(Appendix 4, WG 3)

6.4.2. Women who have made the mistake of having an abortion are incorporated into a nexus of care

Despite viewing the abortion as a mistake or failure, the woman-centred discourse incorporates the woman into a nexus of care. The co-researchers thus indicate that the community should not reject the woman or turn their backs on her for having an abortion. Rather they should support her and understand that she was “confused”.

Extract 43:

Piepa: is about the community (.) but the community must remember that we are not perfect we make mistakes so what will it do to Patricia if we as a community are going to uh reject her

Klaas: [mm]

Reuben: [turn our backs against her]

Piepa: turn our backs against her, what will that do to her now = for what people will will it make = is that not our duty now to support her =

T: [mm]

Piepa: because the deed that's been done is (.) is between her and the Lord because this fruit = the Lord created her as a fertile vineyard and she lost her head along the way (.) and she will have to account for that with the Lord because as uh uh uh

Klaas: [mm]

Piepa: Klaas said to Reuben; sex is for marriage and Patricia got confused along the way through her own desires she got confused along the way and so but

Klaas: [mm] [mm]

Piepa: now we as a community must support Patricia in this situation (.)

(Appendix 4, MG 2)

As mentioned above, one of the objectives in the woman-centred discourse is to support the woman who has been “hurt” through the experience of abortion (Cannold, 2002). In extract 43, above, it is clear that this is what Piepa is trying to communicate. The interesting dynamic here is that the anti-abortion God's will discourse is drawn upon, for example, when Piepa states that Patricia will have to account to God. In other words, he is implying that although he wishes to support her, what she has done is wrong and although he is not going to “discipline” her, she will

need to atone to God. This clearly illustrates that whilst the focus is on the woman who had the abortion, the discourse is still pro-life. Piepa also refers to the woman or Patricia as a fertile vineyard; this could imply that she is destined to have children. In other words, it is taken for granted that as a woman she should be a mother, a reference to the selfless mother discourse. If this is the case then Patricia has acted against what is natural and expected by her community. The hurt that Patricia is expected to feel is illustrated below:

Extract 44:

Reuben: but now she will feel a little hurt because she has made a mistake (.) people will all want to know when you have made a mistake, there will be stones coming to you and then rocks to you (she couldn't) handle the situation (.)

T: ok

(Appendix 4, MG 2)

Extract 44 also refers to the idea that Patricia will be judged and spoken about negatively, but perhaps this will be done with sympathy.

6.4.3. Abortion as a physical and dangerous procedure

Abortion was not only constructed as a mistake and leading to feelings such as guilt and regret but also as a physically dangerous procedure. It was also cited in other literature (Mitchell et al., 2006; Nyanzi et al., 2005). The following extract is a response to the question "What do you think her parent's reaction will be as they only found out after the community?"

Extract 45:

Julie: now I just want to say; fine you go for the abortion, something can happen in an abortion can't it? Now the parents don't know and the child dies.

Elzane: then the child doesn't come home that night

Julie: what then? Anything can happen can't it, surely it is not impossible that such things can happen

(Appendix 4, WG 2)

It is clear that Julie perceives abortion to be a life-threatening procedure. Furthermore, this issue speaks to the issue of frustration felt by the co-researchers that parents need not know about the abortion. The following text, extract 46, taken from the same group, illustrates further understandings of how abortion may affect a woman physically in terms of not being able to fall pregnant again as well as other psychological complications:

Extract 46:

Elize: That abortion takes things out of you, it

Voorsitter: [mm]

Elize: automatically takes things out because those doctors give you stuff (xxx) the abortion is made, am I right, and if you don't have an abortion miscarriage then it comes by itself, right on its own without = or

Voorsitter: [mm]

Elize: you (xxx) or something but then something got hurt now what do those things do, I mean what the doctors give you to have an abortion = what does it do? It damages your life, it damages definitely because if a person looks carefully where pregnant = where your baby (xxx) I mean a baby must come out there, if that stomach is sore, if she has an infection, if you have a strong a infection; that baby and the infection comes through where the baby must come through, am I right? And that is the point it cannot be stopped, what happens then? Then you lose a baby. And next time you won't easily go because that baby is sick, am I right? That baby is automatically sick, there won't be another baby so easily and some mummies get hooks placed inside. Why keep a baby some times = now how will he abort. He must come through. He is pushed through by drugs to come out, he doesn't come through your intestine. An abortion comes out, it comes out underneath, there where a baby must come, that's why I always say to people "if you are pregnant you must take precautions from the beginning if I know I'm pregnant or whatever make it because otherwise one day (xxx) abortion. Everyday in your mind. Everyday. Because if I see that man, Lord, I did away with his child go away. I have done (xxx) to those people

Julie: (xxx)

Elize: but everything really bad

(Appendix 4, WG 2)

In extract 46 Elize constructs abortion as a dangerous procedure which can result in the woman not being able to have children again. She maintains that abortion "damages" your life. Elize also maintains that one will live with daily guilt and remorse for taking the "baby" away from its father. What is interesting is the way that Elize has made sense of the "logic" of abortion in her own mind regarding how it is constructed and how it affects the body. It may be significant that she shared her own story of how she was pregnant without knowing it. She therefore continued to take her prescribed medication for high blood pressure as well as contraceptives and, as a result, today her child has been adversely affected. In light of this perhaps, it makes sense as to why Elize conceptualised abortion in this way, as a negative procedure which does harm as the abortion is induced with drugs.

In summary, within the woman-centred discourse, women are constructed as vulnerable and in need of direction to make the "right" choice. Abortion is constructed as a mistake and women who have erred in this way are incorporated into a nexus of care. In this way the focus is on the woman who needs to be rescued, despite this discourse being strongly informed by the pro-life viewpoint. Abortion is also constructed as a dangerous, life-threatening and damaging procedure.

The psychological effects of abortion were mainly in terms of guilt and shame as discussed in the section on the woman-centred discourse. These taken for granted assumptions about abortion result in the procedure being constructed as taboo and stigmatised, a discussion of which follows.

6.5. Termination of pregnancy as taboo and stigmatised

6.5.1. Introduction

As mentioned above, within this study, abortion was mostly constructed negatively including as murder, a sin, a mistake, and a physically dangerous procedure. Although the construction of abortion as a stigmatised and taboo procedure has emerged throughout the analysis, it is necessary to allocate a separate section to the discourse of TOP as taboo and stigmatised because an interesting contrast is evident in that although TOP is regarded as stigmatised and taboo, it is in fact still spoken about within the community but not promoted.

6.5.2. The discourse of TOP as taboo & stigmatised

As the term taboo suggests, many co-researchers maintained that abortion is not regarded as a topic of everyday conversation:

Extract 47:

T: ok, ok (.). Do people talk about abortion in the community?
 Max: (in our) our community, our own community (x) people don't really talk about abortion because it's wrong (x).

(Appendix 4, MG 1)

In the extract above, abortion is not spoken about because it is “wrong”. Rance (2005) in her study in a Bolivian hospital found that when talking about abortion people would avoid directly using the term. The irony in my study is that because of the taboo nature of abortion, it makes for very interesting gossip resulting in the woman who has had the abortion being stigmatised. Therefore, I would like to suggest that in fact abortion is actually spoken about publicly but not condoned as a socially acceptable procedure.

The literature (Boyle & McEvoy, 1998) refers to the public definitions of abortion and the private experience of women. In my study, some co-researchers said that they didn't feel they

had the freedom to talk about abortion (extract 48 and 49). Others described abortion as a private matter (extract 50). In instances when abortion is referred to, it is constructed as something negative and therefore those women who have had abortions are judged (extract 52). This echoes the findings in Mojapelo-Batka and Schoeman's (2003) South African study in which women who had had abortions reported feelings of embarrassment and shame because they feared social disapproval. More specifically, they were referring to "rumours, gossip, negative judgments, criticism, condemnation and/or a loss of dignity" (p. 149).

Extract 48:

- T: This is my first group that now don't know each other (.) did it um influence uh did it uh influence how you answered the questions and so (2)
- Greg: no for me irrespective of (.) in what circumstances or with whom, it is just how in general how I would have shared my opinion with any group
- T: [mhmm]
- Afro: such a topic it is actually better to be with an unknown group
- Greg: [I think yes yes it is ok, yes yes because to with friends (.) I would say with my friends we can discuss it we have discussed it given my work, the work that I do (.hhh) we have discussed something like this (.) but it's not something that any group of friends would just feel]
- Elvis: [mm]
- Greg: comfortable to talk about. You wouldn't on an evening (bunch of men) come sit and they wouldn't just talk about it
- T: [mm]
- Greg: and it's not a conversation that they feel, we as a community feel, as men feel to talk about
- T: [mm]
- (Appendix 4, MG 3)

The interesting point about this extract is that Greg feels that abortion is not really a topic that men talk about freely. This has been substantiated by a vast body of literature (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998; Nyanzi et al., 2005; Reich, 2008). However, it was found in this study that men spoke rather openly about abortion and the vignettes. It became more challenging to encourage them to discuss freely when they were asked to think about how Patricia, a woman, would have felt in certain circumstances. But even in this instance with some assistance the men were able to discuss the question. Perhaps these men would have been reluctant to discuss their own experiences of TOP.

Greg also mentions that it is easier to talk to strangers about abortion. This statement challenges much of the literature which recommends that focus groups consist of people known to each other, especially when talking about potentially sensitive topics such as TOP. Perhaps Greg and Afro felt it is easier to talk to strangers about abortion for fear that people that they know may judge them. Social constructionist theory maintains that one speaks to an audience and therefore

different settings or contexts evoke different responses. It would have been interesting to see how the responses of this group would have been different had they known each other. In most instances, Afro was supportive of TOP and Greg despite his overarching pro-life theme was sympathetic at times. George was perhaps also able to call Afro a murderer due to a pro-abortion statement more easily than if he had known him well. This incident was addressed in the methodology chapter.

The following extract was in response to the question as to whether more information should be made available to the public about abortion:

Extract 49:

Piepa: I I will = I just want to support Grootman there it would be so = in other
 Klaas: [mm]
 Piepa: words (.) uh our people don't have the freedom to talk and that is
 Klaas: [mm]
 Piepa: why our people do many such things (.) to just take newspaper water and say "ok right let it pass by" now Piepa wants to propose, my name Piepa, wants to now
 Bobby: [yes, yes]
 Piepa: propose because if there is not = to have boldness before the time um, to go and see a social worker what must I do in this situation or what must I do before I am in this situation what must I know = what I am letting myself in for

(Appendix 4, MG 2)

In the extract above it is clearly illustrated that abortion is stigmatised within the community in that it appears that people may not feel they have the freedom to talk about abortion openly. Piepa is suggesting that this is why people still utilise backstreet abortion methods, such as newspaper water, to induce abortions. Piepa is also proposing that perhaps if people had the freedom to talk about abortion they would consult a social worker about their situation. The following passage, extract 50, is another example of the "private" or taboo nature of abortion in that people do not talk about abortion, you just do your own little thing. The literature has also referred to abortion as a predominantly "private dilemma" (L. Walker, 1996, p. 45).

Extract 50:

T: °ok° (2) °ok° (1) um (.) now do people talk about abortion in the community here in Dorpie? Do people talk about it? (4) or is it something that people don't
 Mitchy: [You not going to now say if I go and do an abortion because I won't do it (3) I will just do my own little thing. People don't talk about it (1)]
 T: um you said you will do your your own little thing
 Mitchy: I mean I will I will I can go to the hospital then no-one has to know
 T: yes?
 Mitchy: because
 T: [it's private?]
 Mitchy: it's private

(Appendix 4, WG 1)

This extract illustrates that if a woman has an abortion, the “news” or gossip will travel around the community, according to the co-researchers (see extracts 51, 52). Many co-researchers felt that because Dorpie is such a small place, eventually the “news” about someone having an abortion circulates in the community. In such cases, the woman is spoken about negatively and judged (extract 52). Interestingly, one of the co-researchers said that the woman would be judged despite the fact that no one knows the circumstances (extract 53). This suggests that perhaps if the community had known the circumstances and if they felt that the abortion was justified, the woman would perhaps be judged less. In other words, certain circumstances could dictate as to how the woman was spoken about and treated. For example, if Patricia had been raped and opted for an abortion, she may be received differently as opposed to choosing abortion because it is an available option. The following extract was in response to whether more information should be made available to the public. The group responded by saying that abortion doesn’t only affect the woman who had the abortion but also those around her:

Extract 51:

Pat: at some point or another it comes out, you don’t know
 Rita: [Yes because I mean it’s bad]
 Anna: but you must be confidential hey. It’s amazing how it happens I must be confidential but in the end it does come out
 (Appendix 4, WG 3)

Extract 52:

T: Ok, what do you think the community’s reaction will be towards towards Patricia?
 Jane: firstly our community judges, we never listen
 Mitchy: [heh heh heh]
 Jane: If I heard Sonskyn or Cat had an abortion “Yes so and so and so” but we don’t know the situation behind it what is the situation behind it. That is the first thing that happens in our community, we judge
 (Appendix 4, WG 3)

Extract 53:

T: yes of course. No one knows how it happened but the community found out that Patricia had an abortion
 Klaas: [mm]
 T: so now the community knows, what do you think the community’s reactions will be?
 Wolbek: they are going they are going to look at her with negative thoughts
 Klaas: [mm]
 T: that’s what that what Lindsman is saying hey?
 Reuben: if they all maybe, she’s 21-years-old, she’s still very young in life (if everyone shouts and curses at her). Look perhaps she was a decent girl or she was not worried about herself
 Klaas: [mm]
 Reuben: at all and now there will be different kinds of stories thrown to her no one will wear the
 Klaas: [ja]
 Reuben: truth the way that she is wearing the truth
 (Appendix 4, MG 2)

Extract 53 reiterates that perhaps people will judge Patricia. She was known as a “decent” girl or “she was not worried about herself”. In other words, perhaps what is implied here is that a “decent” girl would not have an abortion. The idea that there may be a “truth” as to why Patricia had an abortion, other than the rumours, implies that Patricia may have had a very “good” reason to abort. This implies that Patricia’s right to decide to have an abortion is not respected by the community. Rather, she needs approval from the community based on whether they consider that her circumstances justify abortion.

The extracts and discussion above has clearly indicated that in this community, abortion is not recognised as a viable option for women, except in certain circumstances such as rape. The “TOP as taboo and stigmatised” discourse obviously has negative implications for women seeking to have TOPs or considering TOP as an option. The study conducted in Northern Ireland (Boyle & McEvoy, 1998) was discussed in the literature review with regard to how women who had had abortions tried to make sense of their experience amongst the pro-life themes that saturated their contexts. Although they didn’t feel any of the negative feelings associated with the competing definitions of abortion, they referred to how they thought they *should* have felt. In other words, the women in the Irish study almost shaped their lives according to the available public script in the sense that the prevailing constructions of abortion informed how the women should feel after their abortion. A South African study (Mojapelo-Batka & Schoeman, 2003) also found that although abortion is legal, many of the women who had had abortions did not disclose it to anyone and therefore had to deal with the experience and their feelings alone.

This discourse directly challenges the reproductive rights discourse in that women’s rights are not respected regarding their bodies and the decision to have an abortion. Examples of this can be seen in the extracts where it is stated that the community may judge Patricia less if the reason for the abortion was exposed. The community therefore decides whether the woman’s reason for the abortion was warranted.

Abortion is also constructed as a private matter and as a procedure which is not promoted. However, despite the “private nature” of abortion, the co-researchers shared that they often hear about women who have had abortions. So, abortion is spoken about but not as a viable option but

rather as a clandestine and immoral procedure utilised by “onordentlike” (indecent) women who “don’t care about themselves”.

6.6. The positioning of the man co-responsible for the pregnancy

In the literature review it was mentioned that abortion was been conceptualised primarily as a woman’s issue (Hertel & Russell, 1999; Luker, 1984), possibly because the procedure is located within the woman’s body (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998). According to Nyanzi et al. (2005) and Robson (2002), many men yearn to discuss abortion and their involvement in the decision-making process. This was found to be true in the focus groups as men were eager to discuss how the men in both vignettes would have felt.

The analysis revealed three primary ways in which the man was positioned in relation to the pregnancy and the abortion. (The man responsible for the pregnancy will be referred to as “the man” for the purposes of this discussion.) These positions included: (a) as an upset future father, (b) as an uncaring and relieved boyfriend or fling, (c) the man as the responsible caretaker of the woman and “baby”. These positionings will be discussed further below.

6.6.1. The man positioned as an upset future father

Many of the co-researchers were concerned about whether Patricia had informed the man co-responsible for the pregnancy about the abortion. In some instances, before the structured question regarding this issue was raised the co-researchers enquired about how the man felt. This indicates that despite the CTOP Act stating that women can make the decision to have an abortion autonomously, sectors of the public (male and female) still feel that the man and/or the parents should be involved with the decision-making. This may also suggest that the woman is regarded as not capable of making the decision on her own. This latter idea often emerges from the woman-centred discourse, constructing the woman as a victim, incapable of making her own decisions. However, from a familial point of view, some simply feel that the “father” needs to be involved. The following extract illustrates this point:

Extract 54:

- T: what do you think the man uh responsible for the pregnancy's reaction would be (.) he also didn't know about the pregnancy or the abortion (.) now he hears (.) the same way that the
- Greg: [there is going to be a quarrel definitely because he feels that he had a right on it on the baby to also decide she should have involved him with her decisions and I think he he will begin a
- Afro: [mm]
- Greg: (quarrel) between them because she didn't admit in the first place that she is pregnant and didn't admit that she went for an abortion
- T: [mm]
- (Appendix 4, MG 3)

The literature reports this as a widely held sentiment amongst men. For example, Marsiglio and Diekow (1998) maintain that some male rights advocates express anger that women can decide to have an abortion without consulting them.

Earlier it was mentioned that a woman was constructed as a mother because she had conceived and not because of a relationship with a child. In the same way, the man was constructed as a father after conception:

Extract 55:

- George: In many cases then she and her boyfriend talk then maybe the boyfriend doesn't want it and she wants it then they go to the hospital and have the abortion and the boyfriend = um the doctor does nothing about it then it is said to the boyfriend but she has murdered the child I
- Afro: [mm]
- T: [mm]
- George: think that's now wrong to take away the baby from that child's father, to take, the unborn child
- (Appendix 4, MG 3)

George states that many times the man would like to raise the "child" whilst the woman wants to have an abortion. In this instance, the woman is constructed as a murderer who has taken the "child" away from its "father". The doctor is described as having done nothing to "save" the "baby". In the following example, it is proposed in the second men's group that the man would have been upset, especially if it would have been his first baby. The assumption is made that every man looks forward to his first baby:

Extract 56:

- Wolbek: So what if it was now my, if it was now my child (.) in such a case uh Piepa I would become a little upset, I wouldn't feel nice about it because it could possibly be my first baby
- Klaas: [mm]
- Wolbek: and everyone looks forward to it Reuben if it's your first child, you look forward to your first child
- Reuben: [°first child°]
- Klaas: [mm]

Wolbek: and now you hear Reuben that there is nothing going on any more. So what would, what would your reaction be?
 Klaas: [mm]
 Wolbek: and you really wanted a child
 (Appendix 4, MG 2)

In extract 56, another parallel is seen to the taken for granted assumption mentioned earlier, that every woman wants to be a mother. In the same way, the comment “everyone looks forward to it Reuben if it’s your first child” implies that every man wants to be a father.

The following text, extract 57, is a response from the same men’s group as the previous extract. Here it is stated that there are many men who do not support abortion and look forward to bringing a child into the world, despite how their families would feel. The speaker concludes by calling abortion murder and a sin. This extract also refers to the fetal rights as well as the anti-abortion God’s will discourse discussed earlier. It also positions the woman as a murderer and a sinner.

Extract 57:
 Reuben: it also breaks = for me it’s a spirit when a woman undergoes an abortion
 Allan: he didn’t mean it
 Reuben: because there are many men that don’t support it (they look forward to a) little boy or little girl to bring into the world
 Allan: even if the family members are (not so happy about it) they must also = it’s a murder actually that she commits, a sin
 Reuben: mm
 T: ok (.) ok
 (Appendix 4, MG 2)

The “anti-abortion God’s will discourse” is referred to here by use of the word “spirit”. It is unclear whether the “spirit” referred to here belongs to the woman or the fetus. Irrespective of that, a spirit is broken which implies that abortion is destructive. Allan starts to say that “the family must also...” perhaps he was going to say that the family must understand or support the unplanned pregnancy. Again, abortion is constructed as a murder and a sin and therefore the woman is a murderer and sinner. It is clear from this extract that some men feel very strongly that abortion is unacceptable.

Extract 58 below illustrates the anger that a man could feel towards the woman, after learning about the pregnancy and abortion:

Extract 58:

T: he didn't know about the abortion, he didn't, he didn't know about the pregnancy. What would he think if he heard through the community?

Klaas: mm

Reuben: I would get a fright (.) go to her and say this to her (don't know what I'll do) with you now. You a murderer and a big sinner and a backstabber (.) in other words (.) what I did to you (.) you don't accept (.) although I say that what happens next (.) you will accept (.) so I think (you are a) total murderer

(Appendix 4, MG 2)

For Reuben, Patricia had committed an unforgivable act by having the abortion. He refers to her as a murderer, a sinner and a backstabber. He also suggests that she needs to pay for what she has done and that she must accept what he is about to do to her. This latter point insinuates that the woman is under the man's authority and that she must be punished, which reflects a patriarchal relationship. Furthermore he refers to the sexual act that occurred between them as something that he did to her. There is a sense here that she should have been grateful for him impregnating her and should have accepted the pregnancy. In another study (Shefer et al., 2000) it was found that some men use violence as a form of „punishment“ for women who “step out of their traditional roles” and make fools of their husbands or boyfriends (p. 11). It could be said that Patricia's decision to have an abortion directly contravened her socially scripted gender role of being a mother. Although Reuben does not clearly state that he would harm Patricia, he does say that she must accept what he is going to “do to her”. Shefer et al. (2000) refer to a study by Mokwena on youth gangs in Soweto. The men participating in the study described sex using the following language; “ugushaya nge kauza” (to hit her with the pipe) and “ukuhlaba” (to stab) (p. 11). The authors (Shefer et al., 2000) argue that these signifiers “construct masculine sexuality as active agent who „does it“ to women” (p. 11). The result for women is one of violation, invasion and humiliation. These findings are similar to the way in which Reuben described the hypothetical sexual encounter with Patricia: “what I did to her”. These latter points also contradict the reproductive rights discourse in which the woman is free to exercise her reproductive rights.

6.6.2. The man positioned as an uncaring and relieved boyfriend or fling

Some of the co-researchers suggested that in a long-term relationship the man may suggest having an abortion, particularly if he is young and feels that he is not ready yet to be a father

and/or he may want to finish his schooling (extract 59). (Similarly some co-researchers felt that Patricia may have wanted to pursue her studies and therefore decided to abort.) Interestingly, one of the co-researchers in the second women's group shared the story of her pregnancy and her boyfriend and his parents' request for her to have an abortion. She refused and raised the child with the help of her parents.

The following extract, taken from the third men's group, clearly illustrates the notion that some men will feel relieved if their partner has an abortion.

Extract 59:

- Afro: it also depends on what age the (what you call it of hers) is = if it's a young like me or the same age as her, I wow! I would feel excited to say it's ok you should have purged the baby long ago or so because I still have a long life ahead but if it was someone like you, older than me, sorry, then you are going to feel dissatisfied because it is your first (baby doll), understand what I'm saying? Then she will feel angry but me, I don't know I still have a long
- Elvis: [yes
but if you have an abortion then there is no life but the child that's born there is life]
- Afro: [look here
how long does it take for a baby]
- Elvis: [but if you, if you have an abortion it is just as good as
murder]
- Afro: [mm, the Bible says]
- Elvis: [it's murder]
- Greg: and she will be thrown with it he = will, he will say that to her "you committed murder"
- T: mm
- Afro: and he will become angry
- Greg: yes, he will = he will it will, it will become a (quarrel) and that will pull them apart and I = it will I think it will = it's a wound that you set for any person

(Appendix 4, MG 3)

In extract 59 above, Afro, who was one of the few co-researchers who would consider abortion, reasoned that if the man were young like him, he would probably be relieved about the TOP. This has been cited as a response amongst some younger men (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998; Nyanzi et al., 2005). The taken for granted assumption that all women want to be mothers was again reiterated when Afro assumed that because I am older than him, I would want a child: "but if it was someone like you, older than me, sorry, then you are going to feel dissatisfied..." The extract ends in an argument amongst the rest of the group ending in the statement that the abortion would actually cause friction between the woman and the man.

Therefore, it was also felt that should the man find out later about the pregnancy and abortion, as in the case of Patricia, he may feel relief (extracts 60 and 61) or even indifference towards

Patricia and the situation. The third woman's group felt that he may feel happy about the abortion as this would relieve him from paying maintenance or from marrying her (extract 62).

Extract 60:

Popeye: can I (say) something about the uh conscience, conscience = I I = because not one of us has had an abortion we don't really know what the woman that fell pregnant and considered an abortion (thought) but I say now is if I I am now sorry to (stir) everyone up now but if I didn't foresee or plan or want a child, then that child is for me like a growth in my leg if I don't want to play sport* or a blister on my foot that came and I don't want it there, that's how I feel. I then I will also feel feathers for him (2) then I will actually feel good because then I can play sport* properly because then I am healthy again.
(Appendix 4, MG 1)
* the name of the sport was omitted to protect the co-researcher

In extract 60 above, Popeye is basically stating that he would be pleased with the abortion because the "baby" would be a hindrance in his life because it was unplanned.

Extract 61:

T: ok say now the boyfriend only finds out now that she was pregnant and that she had an abortion, how will the boyfriend feel? (2)
Zizo: relieved
All: heh heh heh
?: (xxx) there's a (xxx) opinion
Zizo: (xxx) he will be relieved, afterwards he can say what he wants but his first feeling will be that he is relieved
Popeye: what if he hoped for a child?
Zizo: then it is another story, then they must first be married
Popeye: (something about surprise) heh heh heh
Moonstar: what did Popeye say now?
Popeye: no because if the the boyfriend (xxx)
? [yes]
Zizo: then he should have said to her that the bind between them must be = then he says to her but he is ready for a baby
T: ok, what do you all think (1), do you think he will be relieved?
Fito: from my point of view I would say yes because he = why = make an example; he's at school and he maybe now he didn't leave school to go and work and then the parents must look after (xxx) and provide (xxx) for the baby
(Appendix 4, MG 2)

In extract 61 above, both Zizo and Fito argue that the man would probably be relieved because if he is still at school, the abortion releases him to avoid "fatherly" duties and he can therefore continue his education. It is interesting that Fito implies that the expectation would be that the man would have to leave school to work in order to provide for his child financially, a documented traditional role determined for men, as indicated in the literature review. This position of a "father" as a "responsible caretaker" is discussed below. Interestingly, it has been

reported that men identify finances as one of the primary deciding factors when considering abortion (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998; Reich, 2008).

The following extract, from one of the women's groups, closely mirrors the previous men's group's response regarding financial responsibilities of a potential father:

Extract 62:

T: mm, yes. Ok and the man co-responsible for the pregnancy, he only hears now, only now about the pregnancy and the abortion. What will he now think? (2)
 Anna: he can now perhaps think it's not his child, why did she do it and she said nothing to me about it. He can become furious
 [footsteps, Delores returning to us]
 T: ok, we just saying, um, the man that is the father that's responsible for the pregnancy, what will his reaction be (2) then we said he would probably be furious (2)
 Delores: if I think about it, he could also feel glad, it's not necessary for him to pay support
 Anna: [heh heh]
 Delores: or it's not necessary for him to marry Patricia (3)
 T: is that what normally happens? Do people marry marry if the girl is pregnant?
 Delores: not always
 Anna: [not always]
 Delores: but that was now in our time.
 (Appendix 4, WG 3)

Extract 62 echoes the relief (referred to in extract 61) that an abortion may bring to a man who may not want to be financially responsible for a child nor desire to marry the woman. Both these expectations again mirror traditional expectations regarding a man's role as the primary breadwinner, as well the conjugal nature of reproduction, in the traditional heterosexual family. The literature (Marsiglio & Diekow, 1998) refers to instances in which men have supported abortion because it relieves them of financial obligations towards the child.

Many of the co-researchers indicated two scenarios that they thought may have occurred to result in Patricia's circumstances. The first thought was that perhaps the pregnancy was caused by a "hit and run" encounter (extract 63). The second was that perhaps Patricia and the man had been involved in a long-term relationship. The following extract was in response to the question regarding what advice the co-researchers would give Patricia following on from the suggestion by the group that she should talk to her parents:

Extract 63:

Pat: Maybe in light that she is pregnant; who says it was her fixed boyfriend or was it maybe a hit and run? That she doesn't want to now go and tell him, so actually one can almost say it's a decision that she must make on her own, she must, that's now if she doesn't have a permanent boyfriend, a permanent boyfriend

T: mm

Anna: uh

Pat: and if there now was someone maybe discuss it with him and with her parents and his parents, but they are already adults

(Appendix 4, WG 3)

For Pat, in extract 63, the fact that Patricia makes the decision alone implies that the man co-responsible for the pregnancy is not her permanent boyfriend. In other words, it seems logical to Pat that if there was a permanent boyfriend Patricia would not have made the decision to abort by herself. The question to be asked here is what entitles a man to know about a pregnancy that he is co-responsible for? In other words, does the nature of relationship dictate whether the woman informs the man about the pregnancy? Perhaps Pat assumed that if it were a hit and run the man would not be interested in the pregnancy. The term "hit and run" correlates with the discussion in the literature review (Shefer et al., 2000) regarding "violent" language used to describe the sexual act. Another example in this study was referred to earlier and again below in extract 58 when Reuben referred to the sexual act as what "he did to her". Added to the above assumption was that if they had been in a long-term relationship the man would have been upset and would have resented Patricia.

It is evident here that abortion is predominantly constructed as a "solution" to "problems" where people have behaved "irresponsibly" such as is implied by the term "hit and run". In other words, the co-researchers did not consider it reasonable or "normal" for a couple to decide to have an abortion due to an unplanned pregnancy.

6.6.3. The man as a responsible caretaker of the woman and "baby"

In Patricia's story where she is unmarried, the man is considered a "good" man if he decides to support her throughout and after the pregnancy (extracts 64 and 65). In this way, he will be owning up to his responsibility of being co-responsible for the pregnancy. This notion of supporting Patricia financially feeds the construction of the traditional role of the man as the breadwinner (Reich, 2008). Furthermore, as mentioned in the literature review, competent

fatherhood has been associated with providing considerable social and financial support for their children (Reich, 2008).

Extract 64:

- Moonstar: [maybe to that point the factors and the influence thereof for the lady now that finds she is pregnant or she's expecting and she's the only breadwinner and the boyfriend is not aware that she is expecting it can, it depends on whether the boyfriend plays along, or if the boyfriend doesn't co-operate then it's a bigger influence on those circumstances so if the boyfriend cooperates and he agrees he can perhaps be a good boyfriend that says "ok I come forward to the lady's parents, ok I will take responsibility for everything that happened", he will support hundred percent then an abortion doesn't and um occur because he will now fully accept the lady's fate and will look after everything = you often get, you get boyfriends that to to an extent come forward and say "fine" but there are many guys, many guys I know of, many guys who sometimes will say but then the boyfriend will maybe come in and say no um it's my child so
- T: [mm]
- Moonstar: he'll be a father and everything will come out even if it means he must pay (maintenance) for the woman as well and then we'll in a measure that something good happens
- T: [mm]
- Moonstar: that the abortion doesn't happen look uh abortion in our community traditionally
- T: [mm]
- Moonstar: is not acceptable for us.
- (Appendix 4, MG 2)

The extract above also refers to the notion that some men will "abandon" the pregnant woman once they hear that she is pregnant, this is discussed below with regard to the construction of the man as irresponsible.

Extract 65 below supports the belief that the woman may not cope on her own if the man co-responsible for the pregnancy decided to not support her if she decided to carry the pregnancy to term. The important factor for Greg and Afro was whether the man was going to support the woman as this was understood to have a direct bearing on what advice they would give Patricia regarding her unplanned pregnancy.

Extract 65:

- T: ok hhh um what factors would influence your advice uh in the first place what would your advice be, now ok we have um, I think many of us thought about abortion first because that is now what it is about but what other options are there
- Greg: adoption (3)
- T: ok
- Greg: definitely adoption (2), to get the dad or the father of the child involved now, is he, will he and will he be able to support the child
- Afro: and say now he is not prepared to
- Greg: is he prepared, that is why I say it is = there are so many options that you must (.) look at before you can make a decision
- (Appendix 4, MG 3)

The man co-responsible for the pregnancy is sometimes expected to take charge of the situation. The construction of the man as the head of the home or the person with authority was illustrated numerous times throughout the analysis and has been referred to in the section of the Familial-moral discourse. Another instance of this construction can be seen below:

Extract 66:

Julie: now my brother says “listen here, does that doctor think I am going to watch my seed being discarded over and over to them. He says no (2). He says says to them I said there won’t be an abortion done and he stuck then to the thought he went = she is not going for the abortion and now the hospital phones her but she must come then she said “no but my husband said I am not coming” and at that stage he takes her to a private doctor. They don’t have (money) he doesn’t work because he must, must look after her (1) and now he carried on and on like this and the pregnancy became more and more. And at the end of the day I was so amazed that she gave a normal = a normal birth to the child and there’s Annie now, so healthy and strong. So so what it says to me sometimes I think if the father also takes a stand and decides ok fine [mm]

Voorsitter:

Julie: until here and no further = look it’s a two man job, it’s not just one person dead. I won’t allow for there to be an abortion but it also depends on whether the mom and the dad (are working)

?? [yes that’s true]

Julie: because they made the child, the child is born then, ok ok fine, I left my seed with you, so you just cope and he works and he is gone

(Appendix 4, WG 2)

In the extract above the idea that the man has decision-making capacity above the woman is clearly illustrated. What is interesting here is the metaphor referring to the man’s seed. In a study conducted with men whose partners had had abortions one of the findings was that men associated fatherhood with reproducing themselves in that “a part of yourself goes on to live in the future” (Reich, 2008, p. 10). This could be significant in the above context where the husband was tired of seeing his seed “wasted”. Furthermore the ability to conceive was associated with a sign of virility and pride (Reich, 2008). Perhaps abortion is also contested by some men because they feel it robs them of their masculinity. In other words, procreation defines what it means to be a man, a man is considered to be a “real” man if he is virile. The phrase “two man job” refers to the fact that two babies had already been aborted. Therefore, the first abortion was considered acceptable, the second was tolerable but a third would be unacceptable.

With regard to marrying the pregnant woman, some women (Shefer et al., 2000) feel that the man will leave the pregnant woman anyway as he wants to marry a virgin. This idea was also referred to by Cat in the reproductive rights discourse section. In another study (Reich, 2008) argues that a cultural view exists which proposes that women who engage in non-marital sex, especially when they conceive or become infected with a sexually transmitted disease, are

“morally tainted and are as such no longer motherly” (p. 16). In other words, some men feel that they are entitled to make decisions around their sexuality and reproductive capacity in order to secure their future plans and family ideals. In addition, some men also want decision-making capacity over women to achieve these ends, for example by suggesting that a woman has an abortion.

The following extract illustrates the politics between the man and the woman in the decision-making process:

Extract 67:

- Mitchy: you get many men that would have been upset but many would agree. Because there are many especially if they are young and they are busy maybe to study and see then they are not going to be too happy but the package is now handled he can just carry on with his life and there will be some that won't agree (2)
- T: ok (2) and um Cat, you you this age, 21, if if what do you think your guy would have thought about it (.) if he found out now?
- Cat: I don't think he would have ag-agreed but for me I also think it's not for him to say because he is not the one who is going to be left with the child. Tomorrow he'll take another woman and then I must battle with the child and most of the men don't pay for the child so its difficult to raise a child on your own.

(Appendix 4, WG 1)

In the above section on the positioning of the man co-responsible for the pregnancy it was shown that both male and female co-researchers felt that the man would be either upset about the abortion, relieved or responsible in assuming his role as a caretaker of the woman or at least the “baby”. On the other hand, the man could also act irresponsibly by not being prepared to accept the role of “fatherhood”. In the cases where it was assumed that the man would be upset, the woman was constructed as promiscuous and a murderer who took a “child” away from the “father”. In the cases where the man was said to be relieved the woman was not constructed as anything and TOP was perceived to be a solution to a problem.

6.7. Conclusion

As previously mentioned, the anti-abortion argument which has previously been based on religious rationale has transformed into a discourse of fetal rights. This was found to be the case in this research where all the rights discourses barring the reproductive rights discourse were anti-abortion. Where the reproductive rights discourse was referred to, it was in a distant manner

and therefore not a pure reproductive rights discourse where the co-researchers felt strongly that the woman should decide.

Within the fetal rights discourse, the fetus is constructed as a life from conception and this discourse was prevalent in all the groups. Abortion is thus constructed as murder and consequently the woman who has had an abortion as a murderer. Abortion is thus criminalised, despite its legal status, and women seeking abortion or those who have had an abortion are stigmatised and pathologised. In this community, in order to avoid these consequences of having an abortion, many women may decide against it for fear of rejection and the public's general response.

The reproductive rights discourse positions women as entitled to making their own reproductive choices without hindrance. This discourse was referred to by a few co-researchers but was done so more "out of duty" than conviction. In other words, when this discourse was referred to it was in a distant manner, as if the co-researchers were saying what they thought they should say in such a situation as opposed to what they advocate. Five themes emerged here. The first was that it is the woman's body that is affected by pregnancy and therefore she should decide whether to abort. The second theme was that it is the woman's future that is affected most by the pregnancy. The third theme was that it is the woman's potential child's future that needs to be considered. The fourth theme was that pregnancy means different things to different people, and the fifth and last theme was that ultimately the woman should decide, as she needs to carry the consequences of her decision.

The woman-centred discourse, although pro-life, focuses on the woman. Women who have abortions are considered vulnerable and in need of support after the TOP. Three aspects were discussed. The first aspect is that women are incapable of making decisions alone and should therefore consult with others in order to avoid the "mistake" of having an abortion. However, once they have made this "mistake", they are incorporated into a nexus of care, in this way the woman is supported. Lastly, TOP is constructed as a dangerous procedure with physical and psychological consequences.

The discourse of TOP as taboo and stigmatised was included in this chapter as it feeds the anti-reproductive rights discourses. Within this discourse, it emerged that many co-researchers did not consider abortion to be a topic of everyday conversation which would be spoken about openly. Rather, abortion is presented as a private matter and yet the irony is that if a woman has an abortion, it is very likely that the community will find out and discuss it. This results in the woman being judged.

The positioning of the man co-responsible for the pregnancy was included in this chapter as it pertains to the rights of the man with regard to the pregnancy and abortion. As previously mentioned, abortion has traditionally been regarded as a woman's issue. Interestingly the male co-researchers stated that they enjoyed discussing abortion and wished that they had more opportunities to do so. Three positions were identified. The first was of the man as an upset future father who would be distressed after learning about the abortion. The second position was of the man as an uncaring and relieved boyfriend or "fling". Lastly, the man was positioned as a responsible caretaker of the woman and baby, or conversely, as an irresponsible man.

These discourses thus highlight the tendency in this community to oppose abortion. Although women's rights are referred to, the reproductive rights discourse is not prominent.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

7.1. Introduction

In this final chapter I summarise the key aspects of this thesis. The rationale for the study is restated as well as the theoretical and methodological approach that was used. I then review the primary findings of the eight discourses which include the anti-abortion God's will discourse, the Familial-moral discourse, the selfless mother discourse, the fetal rights discourse, the reproductive rights discourse and the woman-centred discourse. I then discuss the findings regarding the discourse of TOP as taboo and stigmatised as well as the positioning of the man co-responsible for the pregnancy. Throughout the analysis, it emerged that certain circumstances justify abortion or that people will consider abortion in specific situations. This finding has been substantiated by the literature. I did not include a separate section on this topic as it emerged throughout the analysis in the discussion of other discourses. However, I have, in this chapter, spoken briefly to this point as a summary.

I then present the main thesis of this study which is that the protection of the life of the fetus is in fact not the primary objective of religious conservative anti-abortion groups, rather the preservation of the traditional nuclear family is the priority. This is evident in instances where some co-researchers sanctioned Patricia and her husband's decision to abort because they had decided together. In other words, her husband's presence normalised the abortion. In this way, the pro-choice discourse can also be used to control women's reproduction and secure the model of the nuclear family. Lastly, I offer suggestions for further research in this area and state the limitations of this study.

7.2. Rationale for the study

This research project sought to examine the public discourses of abortion in the community of Dorpie, in order to gain insight into how the public construct abortion and position women who seek or have had abortions. The implications for women, because of these constructions and positionings, were of particular significance.

As mentioned before, previous international research has primarily focused on the perceived negative effects of abortion on women. South African research has also for the most part addressed “psychological effects” of induced abortion, particularly on teen-aged women, as well as issues of accessibility and availability of TOP. The emphasis on the negative “post-abortion psychological effects” has resulted in a lack of understanding of the woman’s social context. More specifically, this has resulted in a lack of insight into how the woman’s social context influences women’s experience and response to abortion (Boyle & McEvoy, 1998). This study thus seeks to explore the ways in which the public, which forms part of the woman’s social context, construct abortion and the subsequent positionings of the woman who has the TOP.

Recent research (Patel & Myeni, 2008) confirms that the majority of the South African public still opposes abortion and that religion is the primary source of discontentment. This supports Suffla (1997) who stated, soon after the implementation of the CTOP Act, that changes in the law do not guarantee that the public’s perception of abortion will change. However, despite the public’s conservative views towards abortion, it appears that they are trying to make sense of its new legal status. For example, researchers are becoming more aware of the complex nature of abortion and simply to divide the debate into pro-life and pro-choice is unfruitful (Patel & Myeni, 2008). The public has also begun to question the ways in which abortion has affected the traditional role of motherhood as the increased availability of contraception and legal abortion has enabled women to have increased reproductive decision-making capacity. However, their choices are still being criticised by the public (Hadfield et al., 2007). Some sectors of the public therefore consider the traditional notion of “motherhood” to be threatened and this has been found internationally (Hadfield et al., 2007) as well as in South Africa (Shefer et al., 2008).

7.3. The research

The aim of this research was to address four questions: (1) What are the constructions of abortion in this community? (2) How are women who have had (or considered) abortions positioned in this community? (3) How do these constructions of abortion and women impact on women? (4) How do these discourses refer to or contradict each other? As mentioned before, the literature (Mitchell et al., 2006) suggests “pervasive” public discourses can influence the experience of

individuals (p. 516). Thus, this research was interested in the public's understanding of abortion as opposed to the individual woman's experience.

7.4. The theoretical approach

Social constructionism and the work of post-structuralist theorist Michel Foucault informed the theoretical approach for this study. This approach discounts the notion of an absolute reality as well as internal mental states such as attitudes. Rather people create meaning as they interact with each other. Meaning is therefore created by language through descriptions of the world.

According to Parker (2005a), as a community organises their actions, they naturally produce a language that is woven into their practices and which forms a code of conduct. This code of conduct refers to what is considered to be "good" behaviour in the community. A good example of this is the Familial-moral-discourse which clearly stipulates certain norms around reproduction.

The application of SC in this study highlighted how "attitudes" towards abortion are not stable. Rather people's "attitudes" are constantly evolving according to circumstances and the strategy of the speaker, in order to achieve certain ends with the audience (Parker, 1992). In this way, it has been demonstrated that at times the pro-life argument as well as the pro-choice argument are used strategically in this community, to protect the structure of the nuclear family, as opposed to primarily defending the "life" of a fetus. The power of the church, as an institution, has also been used to enforce the code of conduct around reproduction and thus also abortion.

7.5. The methodology

The design of the study was comprised of two vignettes of different women who face crisis pregnancies, as well as a list of general questions. The snowball sample included three men's and three women's focus groups. The discussions were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, coded and analysed using Parker's method of discourse analysis. The extracts that were used in the thesis were translated by an Afrikaans first language speaker.

7.6. The findings

One of the main threads running through this thesis has been that constructions of women and abortion are historically and culturally specific and that as the community of Dorpie live together, they create and negotiate meanings of life. These meanings are represented by discourses which circulate in the community. One could argue that religion has had the most impact on the discourses as religious constructions, such as sin and guilt, emerge throughout the analysis. One could also argue that the constructions of the fetus, abortion and the woman are strongly rooted in the fetal rights discourse. Within this discourse, the fetus is viewed as a life from conception and abortion is therefore understood to be murder and, consequently, the woman as a murderer. Granted, these constructs of the fetus as a baby or life, the woman as a murderer and abortion as murder, were present in most instances. However, I would like to suggest that in fact, the underlying idea that feeds the other constructions is that the institution of the heterosexual nuclear family needs to be revered and maintained and its future needs to be protected. This idea permeates the other discourses in an attempt to achieve the result of maintaining the nuclear family. As the analysis suggests, this strategy has implications for women which will be summarised below.

In the anti-abortion God's will discourse, abortion was constructed as murder and as a sin and subsequently the woman was regarded as a murderer and a sinner. Abortion was also said to result in baggage. In the case of the first vignette, where Patricia wasn't married, she was considered irresponsible for falling pregnant and wanting an abortion. The implications for Patricia included being judged and rebuked by the community. Two co-researchers even mentioned that she should be crucified or stoned. According to Varga (2002), the conceptualisation of the woman as a sinner and a murderer limits her access to safe and legal abortion. The religious discourse also informs the conjugalisation of sex and therefore reproduction. Within this community, sex, reproduction and abortion are therefore moderated by the institution of marriage, headed by the husband.

The Familial-moral discourse serves the family. Within this discourse, strong importance is placed on a "good" upbringing culminating from a "good" home. The literature suggests that

anything that threatens the institution of the nuclear family is considered inherently evil and needs to be challenged (Ackermann & Armour, 1989). The marital alliance (C Macleod, 2003), more specifically the husband, possesses the authority and decision-making power. Furthermore, reproduction and the sexual act are confined to marriage, therefore the institution of the family controls reproduction and sexuality. The woman who has an abortion is constructed as irresponsible, promiscuous, a failure and pathologised, for example by being described as “another kind of person”. She is also considered incapable of raising children on her own. The analysis indicated that abortion was considered a threat to parents’ authority, as displayed by the anger and resentment towards the new legislation. The implications for women within this discourse is that, firstly, a young women’s sexuality and reproductive capacity is controlled by her parents, more specifically her father. She is seen to be an extension of the family and can therefore not act autonomously. For example, Patricia is expected to ask for forgiveness from her parents for having the abortion. Similarly, I would like to suggest that a husband possesses the same power over his wife as he does over his daughter. This was displayed by the respect, by most of the groups, given to the married couple when they made the decision to have an abortion. Secondly, a young woman is afraid to seek advice from her parents regarding the pregnancy and TOP for fear of their reaction, as indicated by the co-researchers’ response that they would feel disappointed, angered and betrayed by the pregnancy and the abortion. Thirdly, the young woman is under pressure to conform to her “good” upbringing and not disappoint her parents. Fourthly, as mentioned above, an unmarried woman has a greater chance of being judged by the community; however, two groups did feel that the couple would be equally responsible for the “murder”. Fifthly, the woman is expected to have the baby as TOP is regarded as cowardly. But, the presence of the husband in the decision-making process normalises TOP.

The analysis illustrated that the selfless mother discourse is prevalent in this community. A number of assumptions were relayed. Firstly, a woman’s natural role is to be a mother. Secondly, a woman has motherly instincts. Thirdly, motherhood is a privilege ordained by God and TOP is therefore a sin. Fourthly, it is irresponsible to become pregnant because of failure to use contraception. The pregnancy is also indicative of promiscuity and abortion is constructed as a contraceptive method as well as cowardly. Within this discourse, sex outside of marriage is also

condemned and this is a link to the Familial-moral discourse. The co-researchers also regarded raising the child as a suitable act of penance or punishment. This expectation places enormous pressure on a woman to conform to a particular social script, regardless of her circumstances. In other words, the woman is expected to be a selfless mother. It is taken for granted that the woman will experience regret, loss and guilt after an abortion. This assumption creates confusion for women who don't have these feelings, as explained in the analysis chapter when "contradictory definitions of abortion" were referred to (Wasielewski as cited in Boyle & McEvoy, 1998, p. 299). The assumption expressed that women will not be able to have children after an abortion would also create fear for women who presently are not ready to have children but would like to in the future. This follows Jones et al. (2008) who maintains that "the woman who gets the abortion and the woman who gives birth are the same women at different stages of life" (p. 80). TOP is therefore constructed as denying a women's true calling and abortion is thus regarded as not only terminating a pregnancy but also terminating one's womanhood (L. Walker, 1996). This discourse thus supports the nuclear family model and the division of labour by limiting women's options to motherhood. If one were to deny motherhood by having a TOP, one would be challenging the norm of the nuclear family as well as the marital alliance were the male partner to be excluded from the decision-making process.

The fetal rights discourse, as presented in most of the focus group discussions, maintained that the fetus is a viable life from conception. All the co-researchers except for Jumbo and Afro, who held the moderate view, maintained this argument. As a result, abortion was constructed as murder and the woman as a murderer. These constructions overlapped in the anti-abortion God's will discourse. The implications for the woman are that she is criminalised and labelled as a murderer, sinner and backstabber leading to stigmatisation and pathologisation. This is linked to Familial-moral discourse in which the woman was accused of betraying her parents by not informing them about the pregnancy and abortion. The implications for women are similar to those already mentioned. A women in need of making decisions about a crisis pregnancy is isolated and limited in exercising her decision-making capacity. However, the value of the fetus's life was superseded by the marital alliance's decision to abort. Perhaps sometimes the argument that the fetus is a life is a strategy to discourage abortion because people realise that

were TOP to be accepted by the rest of the public, the nuclear family structure and thus men's control over women's sexuality and reproduction would be challenged.

The reproductive rights discourse was hardly prevalent in the focus group discussions which were dominated by the pro-life discourses. However, where it did emerge, it was argued that the woman should make the decision about the abortion because her body, future and potential child's future was most affected by the decision. Furthermore, one of the co-researchers, Rene, stated that pregnancy means different things to different people. This idea also represents the social constructionist understanding. Lastly, many of the co-researchers came to the conclusion that the woman needs to carry the consequences of the decision and that therefore she should make the decision. This notion is significant in that the woman is positioned as alone in the situation, an observation that other co-researchers made when stating that often the man will leave the woman when he finds out that she is pregnant or that she has had an abortion. The argument for women to be able to make the decision of whether to abort or not is often made against the backdrop that single mothering is difficult and undesirable.

The woman-centred discourse, strongly linked to the fetal rights discourse, constructs the woman who has had an abortion as a vulnerable victim who is incapable of making her own decisions. In other words, the abortion was the wrong decision. This idea implies that the woman needs the counsel of a man, either in the form of her father or her partner. This idea perpetuates the nuclear family ideal which resists single-female headed family structures. Furthermore, it constructs women as lacking agency. The abortion is constructed as a traumatic event which results in negative physical and psychological effects. Abortion is therefore stigmatised as well as the woman. The woman is however incorporated into a network of care following the "mistake".

Throughout the analysis, abortion was presented as a stigmatised and taboo practice, inhibiting the opportunity for the reproductive rights discourse to emerge. The section on abortion as taboo was essentially dedicated to isolating examples although this construction had been referred to previously. Within this discourse, it was clear that Patricia and Patience would have received judgement and condemnation from the community, including their families (except in instances where the couple's decision was respected). The literature suggests that the stigma and secrecy,

or taboo nature of abortion, could be said to act as a type of self-surveillance in that women expect that they should feel guilt and shame, regardless of whether they actually do, and that the community will respond negatively to them. The result is a sense of loneliness as women often feel that they cannot talk to anyone about the abortion for fear of a negative response. For the single woman who is faced with a crisis pregnancy, the situation is very perplexing; if she has the baby, as a single mother she will be stigmatised, if she has an abortion she will be stigmatised. This is a double bind for women. Although both kinds of women represented in the vignettes may fear judgement and negative responses, the threat is less for married women, as indicated by the first women's group who stated that they would judge the married women less. As mentioned in the analysis chapter, the presence of a man normalises abortion. This is significant as it refers to patriarchal ideals of a nuclear family, headed by a male decision-maker.

The man was positioned in three ways. Firstly, it was proposed that he would have wanted to be a father and that he would be upset about the abortion. He was thus positioned as an upset future father. In this case, the woman was constructed as a backstabber, a murderer and as promiscuous. Furthermore, it was suggested that the abortion would cause conflict in the relationship and that the man would perhaps even leave her. The second position was that he would have been an uncaring and relieved boyfriend or fling as he was not yet ready to be a father. Within this context the abortion was constructed as a "dependable saviour" (Nyanzi et al., 2005). Although the woman was not really referred to much in this context, the literature (Reich, 2008) suggests that in such instances, often the man does not consider the woman to be a worthy life partner or mother of his children and therefore the abortion secures his future plans for his ideal family and "perfect wife", still to be found. The third position is of the man as a responsible caretaker of the woman and the "baby". This is considered a fit description if he decides to support the woman through the pregnancy and thus own his responsibility in the situation. He is also expected to contribute financially to the care of the "child" which reinforces the traditional ideal of the male breadwinner. Conversely, the man was positioned in contrast to the latter point, as an irresponsible man. If the man decides to decline his "role as a father", he is considered irresponsible, in the same way that a woman who declines her "calling" to be a mother has been described in the study as irresponsible, selfish and promiscuous. Thus, the roles of mothering and fathering are prioritised yet again above the man and woman's decision around the pregnancy.

Most of the co-researchers, male and female, felt that the man should be informed about the pregnancy and that he should be involved in the decision-making process. This suggests that men should have equal power in controlling women's reproduction.

The fact that certain circumstances justify TOP was illustrated throughout the analysis and is well documented by the literature. Depending on the circumstances, abortion can be regarded either as a "get out of jail free card" (extract 8) and cowardly act or a solution to a pregnancy which was out of the woman's control, such as rape. Interestingly the literature also refers to abortion as a symbol of the woman's lack of control (L. Walker, 1996). In the latter case, the woman is constructed as a victim who needs to be saved. However, in other circumstances women were mostly not considered entitled to exercise their rights, rather they are positioned as promiscuous or as backstabbers etc.

The above discourses, barring the reproductive rights discourse, each display strategies for upholding the nuclear family and male power. The grand finale is the instance in which the life of the fetus was superseded by marital authority. The second women's group and all three men's groups maintained that if a married couple decides to have an abortion, the decision should be respected. For example, Moonstar said "But as I said one must respect their feelings their decisions that they have made, respect because if as husband and wife they have decided then the decision prevails and if the husband and wife come to an agreement and they decide together ok they going for an abortion, fine why must we interfere?" (extract 10). Even Popeye noticed the contradiction and challenged the group. What is evident here is that abortion was normalised by the presence of the husband. I would like to conclude by suggesting that the central thesis of this study is that the life of the fetus is secondary to the task of preserving and maintaining the nuclear family structure in which the man is superior to women in this community. In this way, in some instances, despite the new legislation, women's sexuality and reproduction in this community continues to be governed by males. As mentioned previously, Daniels (1997) maintains that the anti-abortion argument, previously predominantly based on the religion, has evolved into a discourse of fetal rights. I suggest that the anti-abortion discourses have developed a new strategy in the wake of "decreasing morals" and that the fetal rights discourse has been

used and often integrated into the Familial-moral discourse which presently forms the dominant script in this community. In other words, the life of the fetus is not the focus, rather the preservation of the family is. According to Tan (2004) some abortion laws facilitate male honour and power over the woman and the family and do not actually defend the life of the fetus. In the context of this study, where abortion is legalised, co-researchers opposed the law in order to restrict the women's access to abortion. However, as mentioned before, legal abortion was considered when a man was present.

7.7. Suggestions for further research and limitations of this study

I would like to suggest that more research is conducted specifically around whether TOP is considered a threat to patriarchy and the traditional nuclear family. Although this research has indicated that it is, it would be useful to use a research design specifically orientated to exploring this question further.

This study only included six focus groups. Given the qualitative nature of the study as well as the objective and question, this sample was sufficient. However, the results cannot be generalised to other populations, although it does provide interesting information that could inform further research, as mentioned above. Furthermore, social constructionist research is not intended to provide universal truths.

Another limitation is that the analysis was actually conducted in my second language. I tried to minimise misinterpreting the texts by only translating the actual extracts that I used, after the analysis. In this way I hoped to read the text as "fresh" as possible.

In conclusion, Greene (2006) asserts that spaces need to be created for discussing and creating alternate discourses about young motherhood and responsibility for women. Furthermore, women's experience is:

often one of treading a precarious path through multiple and competing constructions of abortion, at times in situations where they have little power to impose definitions of their

own. In the case of women in Northern Ireland, this process appears to be intensified, through the dominance of a particular public definition of abortion with its related social practices, and through a corresponding decrease in the women's power to choose and impose their own definitions (Boyle & McEvoy, 1998, p. 301).

This study has shown that the dominant public discourses are still anti-abortion and this restricts possibilities for women to exercise their reproductive rights.

8. References

- Ackermann, D., & Armour, M. (1989). Differing Theories, Same Old Praxis: Some Feminist Thoughts on Right Wing Religion. *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa*(69), 53-59.
- Althaus, F. A. (2000). Work in Progress: The Expansion of Access to Abortion Services in South Africa Following Legalization. *International Family Planning Perspectives*, 26(2), 7p.
- Andersen, M. L. (2000). Women and Families. In *Thinking about Women: Sociological Perspectives on Sex and Gender* (5th ed., pp. 153-194). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Babbie, E., & Mouton, J. (1998). *The Practice of Social Research* (South African ed.). Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Banister, P., Burman, E., Parker, I., Taylor, M., & Tindall, C. (1994). *Qualitative Methods in Psychology*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bateman, C. (2002). Department to take up GP Abortion offer. *SAMJ*, 92(6), 406-407.
- Bernas, R. S., & Stein, N. L. (2001). Changing Stances on Abortion During Case-Based Reasoning Tasks: Who Changes and Under What Conditions. *Discourse Processes*, 32(2&3), 177-190.
- Billig, M. (1990). Rhetoric of Social Psychology. In I. Parker & J. Shotter (Eds.), *Deconstructing Social Psychology* (pp. 47-60). London: Routledge.
- Billig, M. (2001). Discursive, Rhetorical and Ideological Messages. In M. Wetherwell, S. Taylor & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader* (pp. 210-221). London: Sage Publications.
- Bolks, S. M., Evans, D., Polinard, J. L., & Wrinkle, R. D. (2000). Core Beliefs and Abortion Attitudes: A look at Latinos. *Social Science Quarterly*, 81(1), 253-260.
- Bolzendahl, C. I., & Myers, D. J. (2004). Feminist Attitudes and Support for Gender Equality: Opinion Change in Women and Men, 1974-1998. *Social Forces*, 83(2), 759-790.
- Bowes, T., & Macleod, C. (2006). The Characteristics of Women Seeking Termination of Pregnancy at an Urban Based Government Hospital in the Eastern Cape. *Curationis*, 29(4), 8-12.
- Boyle, M., & McEvoy, J. (1998). Putting Abortion in its Social Context: Northern Irish Women's Experiences of Abortion in England. *Health*, 2(3), 283-304.
- Brown, B. B. (1987). Facing the 'Black Peril': The Politics of Population Control in South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 13(3), 256-273.
- Brown, R. S. (1993). The Ministry of a Crisis Pregnancy Center. In P. T. Stallsworth (Ed.), *The Church and Abortion: In Search of New Ground for Response* (pp. 67-82). Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Burr, V. (1995). *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*. London: Routledge.
- Caldas da Costa, P., & Donald, F. (2003). The experience of person-role conflict in doctors expected to terminate pregnancies in the South African Public Sector. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 33(1), 10-18.
- Calvès, A.-E. (2002). Abortion Risk and Decisionmaking among Young People in Urban Cameroon. *Studies in Family Planning*, 33(3), 249-260.
- Cameron, N. (2000). Abortion - Ethical Obligations. *SAMJ*, 90(3), 206-207.
- Cannold, L. (2002). Understanding and Responding to Anti-choice Women-centred Strategies. *Reproductive Health Matters*, 10(19), 171-179.
- Caputo, V. (2007). She's from a 'Good Family': Performing Childhood and Motherhood in a Canadian Private School Setting. *Childhood*, 14(2), 173-192.

- da Costa, P., & Donald, F. (2003). The experience of person-role conflict in doctors expected to terminate pregnancies in the South African Public Sector. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 33(1), 10-18.
- Daniels, C. R. (1997). Between Fathers and Fetuses: The Social Construction of Male Reproduction and the Politics of Fetal Harm. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 22(3), 579-616.
- Davies, B., & Harré, R. (2001). Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader* (pp. 261-271). London: Sage Publications.
- de Nobrega, C. (2006). *Abortion: The Glorification of Choice*. Paper presented at the South Eastern Workshop for Southern Africa (SEWSA), June-July 2006 and Building Capacity for Feminist Research in Africa: Gender, Sexuality and Politics
- Dickson, K. E., Jewkes, R. K., Brown, H., Levin, J., Rees, H., & Mavuya, L. (2003). Abortion Service Provision in South Africa Three Years After Liberalization of the Law. *Studies in Family Planning*, 34(4), 277-284.
- Dyer, M. (1996). The MASA and Abortion. *SAMJ*, 86(4), 382-384.
- Edley, N. (2001). Analysing Masculinity: Interpretive Repertoires, Ideological Dilemmas and Subject Positions. In S. T. S. J. Y. M. Wetherwell (Ed.), (pp. 189-228). London: Sage Publications.
- Ehlers, V. J. (2003). Adolescent mothers' utilization of contraception services in South Africa. *International Nursing Review*, 50, 229-241.
- Emerson, M. O. (1996). Through Tinted Glasses: Religion, Worldviews, and Abortion Attitudes. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 35(1), 41-55.
- Evans, J. H. (2002). Polarization in Abortion Attitudes in U.S. Religious Traditions, 1972-1998. *Sociological Forum*, 17(3), 397-422.
- Fontana, A., & Pasquino, P. (1980). Truth and Power. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977. Michel Foucault: Professor of the History of Systems of Thought, College de France* (pp. 109-133). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Foucault, M. (1976). *The Will to Knowledge: The History of Sexuality Volume 1*. London: Penguin Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). Michel Foucault: Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and other writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault. In C. Gordon (Ed.). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Foucault, M. (1985). *The Use Of Pleasure: Volume 2 of the History of Sexuality*. New York: Pantheon.
- Frank, A. G. (1996). Abortion - Some Further Considerations. *South African Medical Journal*, 86(4), 384.
- Gergen, K. J. (1985). The Social Constructionist Movement in Modern Psychology. *American Psychologist*, 40(3), 266-275.
- Gergen, K. J., & McNamee, S. (2000). From Disordering Discourse to Transformative Dialogue. In R. A. Neimeyer & J. D. Raskin (Eds.), *Constructions of Disorder* (pp. 333-349). Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Gibson, S. (2004). The Problem of Abortion: Essentially Contested Concepts and Moral Autonomy. *Bioethics*, 18(3), 221-233.

- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Greene, S. (2006). Becoming Responsible: Young Mothers' Decision Making Regarding Motherhood and Abortion. *Journal of Progressive Human Sciences*, 17(1), 25-43.
- Hadfield, L., Rudoe, N., & Sanderson-Mann, J. (2007). Motherhood, Choice and the British Media: a Time to Reflect. *Gender and Education*, 19(2), 255-263.
- Hall, S. (2001a). Foucault: Power, Knowledge and Discourse. In M. Wetherwell, S. Taylor & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader* (pp. 72-81). London: Sage Publications.
- Hall, S. (2001b). The Spectacle of the 'Other'. In M. Wetherwell, S. Taylor & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader* (pp. 324-344). London: Sages Publications.
- Hertel, B. R., & Russell, M. C. (1999). Examining the Absence of a Gender Effect on Abortion Attitudes: Is There Really No difference? *Sociological Inquiry*, 69(3), 364-381.
- Hochfeld, T. (2007). Missed Opportunities: Conservative discourses in the draft National Family Policy of South Africa. *International Social Work*, 50(1), 79-91.
- Hoffman, J. P., & Mills Johnson, S. (2005). Attitudes Toward Abortion Among Religious Traditions in the United States: Change or Continuity. *Sociology of Religion*, 66(2), 161-182.
- Hopkins, N., Reicher, S., & Saleem, J. (1996). Constructing women's psychological health in anti-abortion rhetoric. *Sociological Review*, 44(3), 539-564.
- Isaacs, D. (2002). Viewpoint: What is the Value of a Human Baby? *Journal for Paediatrics and Child Health*, 38, 608-609.
- Izugbara, C., & Undie, C. (2008). Who Owns the Body? Indigenous African Discourses of the Body and Contemporary Sexual Rights Rhetoric. *Reproductive Health Matters*, 16(31), 159-167.
- Jali, M. N., & Phil, M. (2001). Abortion - A Philosophical Perspective. *Curationis*, 25-31.
- Jewkes, R. K., Wood, K., & Maforah, N. F. (1997). Backstreet abortion in South Africa. *SAMJ*, 87(4), 417-418.
- Jones, R. K., Frohwirth, L. F., & Moore, A. M. (2008). "I Would Want to Give My Child, Like, Everything in the World": How Issues of Motherhood Influence Women Who have Abortions. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29(1), 79-99.
- Kelly, K. (1999). From Encounter to Text: Collecting Qualitative Data for Interpretive Research. In M. Terre Blanche & K. Durrheim (Eds.), *Research in Practice: Applied Methods for the Social Sciences* (pp. 379-398). Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.
- Kruger, L. (2003). Narrating Motherhood: The Transformative Potential of Individual Stories. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 33(4), 198-204.
- Lamas, M. (1997). The Feminist Movement and the Development of Political Discourse on Voluntary Motherhood in Mexico. *Reproductive Health Matters*, 10, 58-67.
- Larsson, M., Aneblom, G., Odland, V., & Tyden, T. (2002). Reasons for Pregnancy Termination, Contraceptive habits and Contraceptive Failure among Swedish Women requesting an early Pregnancy Termination. *Acta Obstetrica et Gynecologica Scandinavica*, 81, 64-71.
- Layne, L. L. (1997). Breaking the Silence: An Agenda for a Feminist Discourse of Pregnancy Loss. *Feminist Studies*, 23(2), 289-315.
- Lesch, E., & Kruger, L. M. (2004). Reflections on the sexual agency of young women in a low-income rural South African community. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 34(3), 464-486.

- Louw, J. (2002). Psychology, History and Society. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 32(1), 1-8.
- Luker, K. (1984). *Abortion and the Politics of Motherhood*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Macleod, C. (2002). Deconstructive Discourse Analysis: Extending the methodological conversation. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 32(1), 17-25.
- Macleod, C. (2003). The Conjugalisation of Reproduction in South African Teenage Pregnancy Literature. *PINS*, 29, 23-37.
- Marks, D. (1993). Case-conference Analysis and Action Research. In E. Burman & I. Parker (Eds.), *"Discourse Analytic Research: Repertoires and Readings of Texts in Action"* (pp. 135-154). London: Routledge.
- Marsiglio, W., & Diekow, D. (1998). Men and Abortion: The Gender Politics of Pregnancy Resolution. In L. J. Beckman & S. M. Harvey (Eds.), *The New Civil War: The Psychology, Culture and Politics of Abortion* (pp. 269-284). Washington: American Psychological Association.
- McNamara, P. H. (1985). The New Christian Right's View of the Family and Its Social Science Critics: A Study in Differing Presuppositions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 47, 449-458.
- Mdleleni-Bookholane, T. (2007). Factors Related to and the Consequences of the Termination of Pregnancy at the Umtata General Hospital, Eastern Cape. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 37(2), 245-259.
- Mitchell, E. M. H., Tucker Halpern, C., Muthuuri Kamathi, E., & Owino, S. (2006). Social Scripts and Stark Realities: Kenyan Adolescents' Abortion Discourse. *Culture, Health and Sexuality*, 8(6), 515-528.
- Mojapelo-Batka, E. M., & Schoeman, J. B. (2003). Voluntary termination of pregnancy: Moral concerns and emotional experiences among black South African adolescents. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 33(3), 144 -153.
- Nyanzi, S., Nyanzi, B., & Bessie, K. (2005). "Abortion? That's for Women". Narratives and Experiences of Commercial Motorbike Riders in South-Western Uganda. *African Journal of Reproductive Health*, 9(1), 142-161.
- Oaks, L. (2002). "Abortion is part of the Irish experience, it is part of what we are": The transformation of public discourses on Irish abortion policy. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 25(3), 315-333.
- Olivier, M. A. J., & Bloem, S. (2004). Teachers Speak their Minds about Abortion during Adolescence. *South African Journal of Education*, 24(3), 177-182.
- Parker, I. (1992). Discovering Discourses, tackling texts. In *Discourse Dynamics: Critical Analysis for Social and Individual Psychology* London: Routledge.
- Parker, I. (2002). Real Things: Discourse, Context and Practice. In I. Parker (Ed.), *Critical Discursive Psychology* (pp. 180-186). Basingstoke: MacMillan.
- Parker, I. (2004). Discursive Practice: Analysis, Context and Action in Critical Research. *Critical Psychology*, 10, 150-173.
- Parker, I. (2005a). Discourse. In I. Parker (Ed.), *Qualitative Psychology: Introducing Radical Research* (pp. 88-104). Berkshire, England: Open University Press.
- Parker, I. (2005b). *Qualitative Psychology: Introducing Radical Research*. New York: Open University Press.

- Parker, I., & Burman, E. (1993). Against Discursive Imperialism, Empiricism and Constructionism: Thirty-two Problems with Discourse Analysis. In E. Burman & I. Parker (Eds.), *Discourse Analytic Research: Repertoires and Readings of Texts in Action* (pp. 155-172). London: Routledge.
- Patel, C. J., & Myeni, M. C. (2008). Attitudes Towards Abortion in a Sample of South African Female University Students. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38(3), 736-750.
- Penna, D. R., & Campbell, P. J. (1998). Human Rights and Culture: Beyond Universality and Relativism. *Third World Quarterly*, 19(1), 7-27.
- Poggenpoel, M., & Myburgh, C. P. H. (2002). The Developmental implications of a termination of Pregnancy on Adolescents with Reference to the girl and her partner. *Education*, 122(4), 731 (711p).
- Potter, J. (1996). Attitudes, Social Representations and Discursive Psychology. In M. Wetherell (Ed.), *Identities, Groups and Social Issues* (pp. 119 -174). London: Sage.
- Potter, J. (1996). *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*. London: Sage Publications.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Preston-Whyte, E., & Zondi, M. (1989). To Control their own Reproduction: The Agenda of Black Teenage Mothers in Durban. *Agenda*, 4, 47-68.
- Puchta, C., & Potter, J. (2004). *Focus Group Practice*. London: Sage Publications.
- Rance, S. (1999). Safe Motherhood, Unsafe Abortion: A Reflection on the Impact of Discourse. In M. B. T. K. Ravindran (Ed.), *Safe Motherhood Initiates: Critical Issues* (pp. 73-84). Oxford: Blackwell Science.
- Rance, S. (2005). Abortion Discourse in Bolivian Hospital Contexts: Doctor's Repertoire Conflicts and the Saving Women Device. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 27(2), 188-214.
- Reich, J. A. (2008). Not Ready to Fill His Father's Shoes: A Masculinist Discourse of Abortion. *Men and Masculinities*, 11(3), 3-21.
- Remennick, L. I., & Hestroni, A. (2001). Public Attitudes Toward Abortion in Israel: A Research Note. *Social Science Quarterly*, 82(2), 420-431.
- Robson, F. (2002). "Yes! - A Chance to Tell my Side of the Story": A Case Study of a Male Partner of a Woman Undergoing Termination of Pregnancy for Foetal Abnormality. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 7, 183-193.
- Roth, S., & Epston, D. (1994). Consulting the Problem about the Problematic Relationship: An Exercise for Experiencing a Relationship with an Externalised Problem. In M. Hoyt (Ed.), *Constructive Therapies* (pp. 148-162). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Sahar, G., & Karasawa, K. (2005). Is the Personal Always Political? A Cross-Cultural Analysis of Abortion Attitudes. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 27(4), 285-296.
- Sawicki, J. (1991). *Disciplining Foucault: Feminism, Power, and the Body*. New York: Routledge.
- Schnell, F., & McConatha, J. T. (1996). Value Differences and Abortion Attitudes: A Generational Analysis. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality* 11(5), 289-306.
- Shefer, T., Crawford, M., Strebel, A., Simbayi, L. C., Dwadwa-Henda, N., Cloete, A., et al. (2008). Gender, Power and Resistance to Change among Two Communities in the Western Cape, South Africa. *Feminism & Psychology*, 18(2), 157-182.

- Shefer, T., Strebel, A., & Foster, D. (2000). "So Women Have to Submit to That...". Discourses of Power and Violence in Student's Talk on Heterosexual Negotiation. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 20(2), 11-19.
- Shepard, B. (2000). The "Double Discourse" on Sexual and Reproductive Rights in Latin America: The Chasm between Public Policy and Private Actions. *Health and Human Rights*, 4(2), 111-143.
- Sherrard, C. (1991). Developing Discourse Analysis. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 118(2), 171-179.
- Shi-xu. (2002). The Discourse of Cultural Psychology: Transforming the Discourses of Self, Memory, Narrative and Culture. *Culture & Psychology*, 8(1), 65-78.
- Sleed, M., Durrheim, K., Kriel, A., Solomon, V., & Baxter, V. (2002). The Effectiveness of the Vignette Methodology: A Comparison of Written and Video Vignettes in Eliciting Responses about Date Rape. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 32(3), 21-28.
- Smyth, L. (2002). Feminism and Abortion Politics: Choice, Rights and Reproductive Freedom. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 25(3), 335-345.
- Stenner, P. (1993). Discoursing Jealousy. In E. Burman & I. Parker (Eds.), *"Discourse Analytic Research: Repertoires and Readings of Texts in Action"* (pp. 114-132). London: Routledge.
- Strachan, K. (2000). From policy to action - a review of the progress made in legal abortion services [Electronic Version], (2p). Retrieved 23/01/2004 from <http://www.hst.org.za/update/49/policy12.htm>.
- Strebel, A. (1997). Putting Discourse Analysis to Work in AIDS Prevention. In A. Levett, A. Kottler, E. Burman & I. Parker (Eds.), *Culture, Power and Difference: Discourse Analysis in South Africa* (pp. 109-121). Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.
- Strickler, J., & Danigelis, N. L. (2002). Changing Frameworks in Attitudes Toward Abortion. *Sociological Forum*, 17(2), 187-201.
- Suffla, S. (1997). Experiences of Induced Abortion among a Group of South African Women. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 27(4), 214-223.
- Tan, M. L. (2004). Fetal Discourses and the Politics of the Womb. *Reproductive Health Matters*, 12(24), 157-166.
- Teklehaimanot, K. I. (2002). Using the Right to Life to Confront Unsafe Abortion in Africa. *Reproductive Health Matters*, 10(19), 143-150.
- van der Waal, C. S. (2005). Spatial and organisational complexity in the Dwars River Valley, Western Cape. *Anthropology Southern Africa*, 28(1 & 2), 8-21.
- van der Westhuizen, C. (2001). *Midwives' roles in expanding access to and the management of safe abortion care: South African Country Report*. Paper presented at the Advancing the Roles of Midlevel Providers in Menstrual Regulation and Elective Abortion Care. from <http://www.qweb.kvinnoforum.se/Archive/expacc/reports/SAfricaCR.html>.
- Van Rooyen, M., & Smith, S. (2004). The prevalence of post-abortion syndrome in patients presenting at Kalafong hospital's family medicine clinic after having a termination of pregnancy. *South African Family Practice*, 46(5), 21-24.
- Varga, C. A. (2003). How Gender Roles Influence Sexual and Reproductive Health Among South African Adolescents. *Studies in Family Planning*, 34(3), 160-172.
- Walker, C. (1995). Conceptualising Motherhood in Twentieth Century South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 21(3), 417-437.

- Walker, L. (1995). The Practice of Primary Health Care: A Case Study. *Social Science and Medicine*, 40(6), 815-824.
- Walker, L. (1996). 'My work is to help the woman who wants to have a child, not the woman who wants to have an abortion': Discourses of Patriarchy and Power among African Nurses in South Africa. *African Studies*, 55(2), 43-67.
- Walker, L., & Mckenzie, P. (1995). It's Safer on the Streets. *Agenda*, 27, 55-61.
- Walzer, S. (1994). The Role of Gender in Determining Abortion Attitudes. *Social Science Quarterly*, 75(3), 687-693.
- Warner, S. (1996). Constructing femininity: Models of Child Sexual abuse and the Production of 'woman'. In E. Burman (Ed.), *Challenging Women: Psychology's Exclusions, feminist possibilities*. (pp. 36-53). Buckingham: Open Univeristy Press.
- White, M. (2000). *Reflections on Narrative Practice: Essays and Interviews*. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.
- Whittaker, A. (2002). 'The truth of our day by day lives': abortion decision making in rural Thailand. *Culture, Health and Sexuality*, 4(1), 1-20.
- Widdicombe, S. (1993). Autobiography and Change: Rhetoric and Authenticity of 'Gothic' Style. In E. Burman & I. Parker (Eds.), *"Discourse Analytic Research: Repertoires and Readings of Texts in Action"* (pp. 94-113). London: Routledge.
- Ziehl, S. C. (1994). Single Parent Families. *Agenda*, 22, 42-47.

Appendix 1: Vignette 1 – Patricia’s story

English version

Patricia is a 21 year old woman who is unemployed. She lives with her parents and four siblings who are all younger than her. She realises that she is late in her menstrual cycle and suspects that she may be pregnant. She decides to go to the nearest clinic to find out. Her suspicion is confirmed by the sister. She goes home very upset and considers her options.

1. If Patricia approached you for advice, what you would you say to her?
2. What kinds of things would influence the advice you would give?
3. What should she then do?

She decided to go to the nearest hospital for an abortion.

4. What would she experience?
5. What do you think her feelings would be about having an abortion?

It is not quite clear how it happened but the fact that Patricia had an abortion became known in the community.

6. What do you think people’s response would be?
7. What do you think her parents’ response would be?
8. What do you think the man responsible for the pregnancy’s response would be?

Afrikaans version

Patricia bly in jou gemeenskap. Sy is ’n 21 jarige vrou wat werkloos is. Sy bly saam met haar ouers en 4 ander gesinslede, almal jonger as sy. Sy is bewus daarvan dat haar maandstonde laat is en vermoed dat sy dalk swanger is. Sy besluit om die naaste kliniek te besoek om uit te vind of sy wel swanger is. Die suster bevestig haar vermoede. Sy gaan huis toe, baie onsteld en oorweeg haar opsies.

1. As Patricia na jou toe gekom het vir advies, wat sou jy vir haar sê?
2. Watter faktore sou jou advies beïnvloed?
3. Wat sal sy volgende moet doen?

Sy besluit om na die naaste hospitaal toe te gaan vir ’n aborsie.

4. Wat sal sy daar ervaar?
5. Wat dink jy sal haar gevoelens wees na die aborsie? (*maak seker dat die konteks reg verstaan word.*)

Niemand weet hoe dit gebeur het nie, maar die gemeenskap het uitgevind dat Patricia ’n aborsie gehad het.

6. Wat dink jy sal die gemeenskap se reaksie wees?
7. Wat dink jy sal haar ouers se reaksie wees? Hulle het nie van die aborsie of swangerskap geweet nie
8. Wat dink jy sal die man, verantwoordelik vir die swangerskap, se reaksie wees? Hy het nie van die aborsie of swangerskap geweet nie

Appendix 2: Vignette 2 – Patience’s story

English version

Patience a 35-year-old woman who has been married for 12 years. She has a 7-year-old daughter and a 5-year-old son. Both children are at school. She has a successful part time job and her husband has his own business. She discovers that she is pregnant despite consistent use of contraceptives. Patience and her husband decide together that she should have an abortion.

1. How do you feel about Patience having an abortion?
2. Please explain your response to the above question.
3. Which details in the vignette are important to you, regarding your feelings towards her?
4. If the response is that she is killing a child:
Is her husband equally responsible?
5. Which words would you use to indicate:
 - a) An abortion
 - b) The fetus
 - c) The woman
 - d) The Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act

Afrikaans version

Patience bly in jou gemeenskap. Sy is ’n 35 jarige vrou wat al 12 jaar getroud is. Sy het ’n 7 jarige meisiekind en ’n 5 jarige seun. Altwee kinders is op skool. Sy het ’n suksesvolle deeltydse werk en haar man het sy eie besigheid. Sy ontdek dat sy swanger is, hoewel sy onophoudelik gebruik gemaak het van voorbehoedmiddels. Patience en haar man besluit saam dat sy ’n aborsie moet kry.

1. Hoe voel jy oor Patience se aborsie?
2. Verduidelik asseblief.
3. Watter faktore is vir jou belangrik, omtrent jou gevoelens aangaande haar?
4. Indien jy voel dat sy haar kind vermoor/doodmaak:
Is die man in ’n gelyke mate verantwoordelik?
5. Watter ander woorde sou jy gebruik vir die volgende:
 - a) Aborsie
 - b) Die fetus
 - c) Die vrou
 - d) Wet op Keuse van Beeëindiging van Swangerskap

Appendix 3: General questions

English version

General questions:

1. What knowledge do you have about abortion? [Give some information if participant's response is inaccurate]
2. Should more information be made available to the public? If yes, please explain.
3. Do you think women think differently about abortion now that it is legal?
3. Have things changed in the community since abortion has been made legal? If yes, please explain.
4. Do people speak about abortion in the community?
5. Is abortion spoken about differently with regard to adults and teenagers?
6. Do certain circumstances allow for abortion to be considered as an option?
7. People differ in their understandings of when a fetus can be regarded as a person. Does this distinction make a difference as to whether or not abortion can be considered as an option?
8. Is teenage mothering a better alternative to abortion? Please explain your answer.

Afrikaans version

1. Wat is jou kennis van aborsie (gee die korrekte inligting indien die inligting vanaf mede-navorsers foutief is.)
2. Moet meer informasie beskikbaar wees vir die publiek? Verduidelik asb.
3. Dink jy vrouens dink anders oor aborsie nou dat dit wettig is?
4. Praat mense oor aborsie in die gemeenskap?
5. Praat mense anders van aborsie met betrekking tot tieners en volwassenes?
6. Maak sekere omstandighede aborsie 'n oorweegbare opsie?
7. Mense verskil in hul opinie, omtrent wanneer 'n fetus 'n persoon is. Maak hierdie onderskeiding 'n verskil wanneer aborsie as 'n opsie oorweeg word? (Does this distinction make a difference as to whether or not abortion can be considered as an option)
8. Is tiener moederskap 'n beter opsie as aborsie? Verduidelik asb.

Appendix 4: Original Afrikaans extracts

Extract 1:

Sonskyn: ja elk een moet sy opinie oor aborsie maak. Vir my persoonlik is dit dat dit eers „n keuse by my hele persoonlikheid en my leef wyse en dit wat ek kan verstaan wat sê die Bybel want Jeramiah sê van voordat jy gevorm was en voordat jy in jou moeder se skoot was het ek jou geken en as ons kyk na hoe hulle hier links en regs aborsie gedoen wat is die wet se doel? Wat het God miskien bepaal vir daai kind en dat hier nou net besluit word vir ekonomiese redes en baie keer is daar nie eers „n rede nie, dit is net ek het gelê en nou wil ek nie die kind hê nie so in my persoonlike oogpunt is dit = dis heeltemal nie wat ek sal ooit vir enige mens sal wil dan hê of aan (.) = al moet ek iemand help om „n kind groot te maak of vir iemand te gee wat na daai kind kan kyk sal dit in my hele lewe = aborsie is teen my beginsels (WG 1)

Extract 2:

Moonstar: dat die aborsie nie plaasvind nie kyk uh aborsie in ons gemeenskap tradisioneel

T: [mm]

Moonstar: is vir ons nie aanvaarbaar nie. die Bybel sê dis nie aanvaarbaar nie, die Bybel sê dis verkeerd al sê die uh regering, al sê die regering = dan kom daar „n wet deur die kabinet aborsie is van toepassing in die land, bly die Bybel altyd

(MG 1)

Extract 3:

T: ok, niemand weet hoe dit gebeur het nie maar die gemeenskap het uitgevind (1) dat Patricia „n aborsie gehad het, ok so nou weet die gemeenskap wat dink jy sal

Lindsman: [oh no]

T: die gemeenskap se reaksie wees

Simon: murderer

Wolbek: [mm, ja]

Reuben: sondaar! Sy't moord gepleeg

Simon: sy moet gekruisig word steen-

Reuben: [steenig haar]

T: ok reg, really? Um soos in die werklikheid of um

All: [mumbling]

T: heh heh heh

Lindsman: nee ons sal nou nie

(MG 2)

Extract 4:

Mitchy: ek dink nie so nie want ek gaan vir Sonskyn gaan ek dieselfde oor praat as wat ek oor die tiener gepraat want Sonskyn is in „n posisie om nog „n kind groot maak en sy kies „n aborsie (.) so ek gaan die dieselfde ek gaan vir haar ook benakom so en ek gaan vir = jy't gepraat nou van die tiener =

T: [°ok°]

Mitchy: want dit was nie reg nie. Want in my oë is dit nie reg nie want hulle het „n groot huis hulle't alles waarvoor soek sy aborsie want sy kan die kindjie mos groot maak. So daars nie „n verskil nie, ek dink nie daars „n verskil nie in in dit nie (.) of jy nou jonk is of jy nou ouer is of getroud dissie = die aborsie bly die aborsie

Cat: Die een wat nou getroud is

Mitchy: [gaan ons mense die meeste veroordeel]

Jane: Want ek gaan sê sy „n groot vrou en kan sy kan nie gedink het nie en ons praat van die kinders en maar kyk wat maak die groot mense. Ons het nog daai soort van ons kyk altyd op na ouer persone hierso en ek gaan sê jinne maar Leentjie ek het dan allie tyd gedink hulle sukke goeie mense sien

Others: [muttering in agreement]

Jane: die eerste ding

Sonskyn: Ja ja rolmodel wees

Jane: so ons gaan so ons gaan meer vir haar veroordeel die ouer persoon as wat ons die jonger die°tiner gaan veroordeel°
(WG 1)

Extract 5:

Greg: [in die eerste plek as jy „n kind van God is, met alle respek as jy „n kind van God is, en jy ken jou Bybel, en jy lewe volgens dit wat daar gesê is en gestel is en so dan behoort jy in die eerste plek nie dit gedoen het nie
Afro: omdat seks vir die huwelik is
Elvis: hy's reg
Greg: want dis sonde
Elvis: luister wat ek wou sê (2). Dan gaan jy dit mos nie doen nie (1) maar (2) nou sê = kyk hier die goed gebeur mos dit gebeur. Jy's mos, jy's mos „n mens
Afro: [heh heh]
(MG 3)

Extract 6:

Popeye: en nou wat as julle getroud is en julle was nie reg vir „n baba en julle was sonder „n kondoom gebruik and sy raak swanger en sy kry „n aborsie uh
Zizo: nee ek stem nie daarmee saam nie. As jy (getroud is) en jy raak swanger dan is dit in die huwelik wat mooier is
Popeye: aborsie is mos relatief
Zizo: [Kyk ek is nie vir aborsie nie klaar]
Popeye: [ek verstaan wat jy sê; jy moet die gevolge dra]
T: ons gaan netnou daaroor praat = in die huwelik
(MG 1)

Extract 7:

Wolbek: of jy kan ook gesê het uh kyk as sy nou een van die kwaai ouers gewees het sal dit nou maar op ja (.) sal ek gesê het uh jy kan mos agter jou gekyk get, jy't gewet die ding sal met jou gebeur
Reuben: [wanneer jy geseks het]
Wolbek: as daai „n veilige opsie gewees het nie nou moet jy die teenoorgestelde gebruik (.) en nou sit sy so (.) so gaat maar aan met jou dag
Reuben: aanvaar maar jou pakkie
(MG 2)

Extract 8:

Zizo: maar nie net dit nie, aborsie is amper soos in (.) jy jy doen iets wat jy weet (.) wat jy doen = nou gebeur dit en jy raak swanger so dan sê jy “nee ek kan vir „n aborsie gaan”, dit is amper soos „n “get out of jail free” card wat jy eintlik moet weet jy moet verantwoordelikheid vat vir jou dade
Max: [dit is so]
Zizo: daar is so baie goed deesdae op die TV; kondome vir mans en voorbehoed - voorbehoedmiddels daar's alles alles is deesdae gebied so hoekom moet jy dan nog
T: [mm]
Zizo: kanse vat
(MG 1)

Extract 9:

T: ok so Patience is getroud, sy't twee kinders, sy't „n suksesvolle besigheid, haar man het „n werk um en hulle het saam besluit dat sy „n aborsie moet kry (1). Hoe voel jy oor Patience se aborsie? (2)
Moonstar: (hulle is „n) getroude paar uh (ek vermoed daar is iets) verkeerd so as hulle saam besluit het (moet ek hulle) besluit respekteer. Daar is niks wat „n mens daaraan kan doen nie al gaan sy vir „n Bybel voorlê of wat maar dit is man en vrou se besluit en ja as hulle so besluit het kan = ek is nou „n derde party ek kan niks daaraan doen nie.

T: ok (1)
(MG 1)

Extract 10:

Zizo: dit maak nie saak as jou meisie op voorbehoedmiddels is, sy kan antibiotika gebruik en dit cut die voorbehoedmiddels uit -onthou dit. In daai geval ek stem saam met die tweetjies, hulle't 'n suksesvolle besgiheid, hulle't twee kinders, hulle's in, hulle weet wat hulle wil hê. Dit was nie beplan nie, dit was 'n glipsie so ek stem saam honderd persent saam met hulle. Sy's ook al in haar najare so ek stem saam met die aborsie

T: ok

Popeye: wat? Sê julle nou ja omdat dit 'n huwelik is sê julle ja omdat sy ouer is, meer volwasse, volgens jou, dat sy so kan besluit, sê julle ja omdat sy = daar's 'n betrokke ondersteunende man daar's klaar twee kinders, dat hulle suksesvol is dink jy dit is vir haar makliker om vir haar saam te leef met die aborsie?

Zizo: ek dink nie dit gaan makliker wees nie

Moonstar: dit gaan nie makliker wees nie

Popeye: ok, kyk ons nou na die ma wat die aborsie moet uitvoer of kyk ons na die lewetjie wat geneem word volgens julle want hy word nogsteeds uitgeneem (behalwe die) omstandighede word hy nog steeds geneem so maak die omstandighede (vir jou aborsie reg?)

Zizo: aborsie is aborsie bly aborsie

Popeye: ok so dis verkeerd?

Moonstar: aborsie is verkeerd in my oog

Popeye: [ok, ek verstaan]

Moonstar: maar soos ek gesê 'n mens moet hulle gevoelens respekteer hulle besluite wat hulle geneem het, respekteer want as man en vrou saam besluit het dan bly dit van krag, dit bly (x) en as die man en vrou ooreenkoms op een punt en hulle't saam besluit ok hulle gaan vir 'n aborsie, fine hoekom moet ons nou inmeng?

(MG 1)

Extract 11:

T: um watter ander woord sou jy gebruik vir die vrou wat die aborsie gehad het of sou jy haar net die vrou noem, dis die vrou wat die aborsie gehad het (3)

Grootman: ek sal = ek kyk uit 'n ander oogpunt want ek het nou twee stories hier

Klaas: [mm]

Grootman: gedingesse die een storie is 'n getroude paartjie en die ander storie is nou 'n

Klaas: [mm]

Grootman: meisie wat nou (xxx) die getroude paartjie sou ek nou sê dat niemand sal weet nie, hulle twee het saam

Reuben: [xxx]

Grootman: besluit en die jong meisie uh sy't met niemand [anders] besluit nie sy't self

Klaas: [mm]

Grootman: besluit en die gemeenskap sal haar uitkyk as 'n moordenaar, 'n kinder moordenaar

Lindsman: [kinder moordenaar]

Bobby: is so ja

T: ok

Grootman: maar die getroude paartjie se geval sal niemand vir hulle uitkyk nie

Klaas: [mm]

T: ok, ok

Reuben: want hulle het die huwelik

Grootman: want hulle het die huwelik en hulle't die besluit geneem

T: ok, ok dankie

(MG 2)

Extract 12:

T: ok, hoe voel jy oor Patience se aborsie?

Piepa: [cough]

T: in die omstandighede?

Reuben: Patience is onnodig (2)

T: ok, hoekom sê jy so?
 Reuben: sy is bevoorreg
 T: [ok]
 Reuben: om nog „n kind groot te maak (2)
 Piepa: ek wil net daarso inkom Reuben [cough]. Luister wat Piepa gelees het Reuben uh Patience het nie alleen die besluit geneem nie
 Lindsman: [hulle altwee]
 Piepa: Patience was saam met haar man en hulle altwee het hierdie ding uh uh
 Klaas: [beplan]
 Lindsman: beplan
 Piepa: nee dit was nie „n beplanning nie
 Klaas: O verskoon my Piepa
 Piepa: dit was nie „n beplanning nie, hulle’t saam besluit oor wat nou gedoen moet
 Klaas: [mm]
 Piepa: word omdat die ding nie beplan was. So Reuben stadig net „n bietjie
 Lindsman: [ok]
 Klaas: Reuben
 All: heh heh heh
 (MG 2)

Extract 13:

Grootman: ek weet ek praat seker baie. As ek die storie lees die storie wat ek gelees
 Klaas: [uh]
 Grootman: dan as eerstens, sy het kliniek toe gegaan. Toe vind sy uit sy’s swanger en toe was sy ontsteld. So dis miskien „n one night stand gewees as ek die ding (aflei),
 Klaas: [mm]
 Grootman: daar’s nie „n boyfriend betrokke nie want as hier „n boyfriend betrokke
 Klaas: [mm]
 Grootman: was sou sy nie daai aborsie oorweeg het nie
 (MG 2)

Extract 14:

T: um, ok, so daar is drie opsies, um (.) so wat watsse advies sou jy vir haar gee? (2) na haar ouers toe gaan?
 Rita: ja en dit met hulle bespreek. Kyk somtyds dink „n mens jy is bang vir jou ouers maar jy is ook bewus dat hulle moonltik die beste raad vir jou sal gee en vir jou bystaan. Ek dink dis seker die eerste ding om „n mens te doen om na jou ouers toe te gaan
 T: mm, ok, (2) stem ons almal saam?
 (WG 3)

Extract 15:

Elize: maar as ek nou kan sê, dit hang eintlik van die ouers self af hoe sy die kind grootmaak (1) want as jy jou kind reg grootmaak (2) dan sal hy die lewe reg ingaan
 Greg: [mm]
 (MG 3)

Extract 16:

Allan: aborsie is eintlik verkeerd
 Grootman: dit gaan eintlik oor die huisgesin self. As ek in „n goeie huisgesin opgrooi
 Klaas: [mm]
 Grootman: skep ek vir my meisiekind „n goeie huisgesin waar alles die waardes goeie
 Bobby: [mm]
 Grootman: waardes het dan (xxx)
 Bobby: is so ja (xxx) besluite neem
 Grootman: so (xxx) „n goeie huisgesins
 T: uhmm

Grootman: so dis oor waardes eintlik dink ek
(MG 2)

Extract 17:

Popeye: ek is is is (ek sal) teleurgesteld wees eers um (jy sal dink) watter waardes jy haar grootgemaak en dan kan jy moontlik ook seer voel want as pa, as ouer dink jy hoekom kon sy nie na my toe gekom het en met jou gepraat het daaroor en vir raad gegee het en = maar ek sal eers haar gat skop
All: heh heh heh
T: haar gat?
All: heh heh heh
T: wil net seker maak
T: nee nee nee ek wil net seker maak as ek die band luister sal ek weet
Popeye: eers haar gat en dan gaan ek die knol –

(MG 1)

Extract 18:

T: mm, ok, wat dink julle sal haar ouers se reaksie wees, hulle't nie, hulle't nie tevore geweet van die swangerskap of die aborsie, nou vind hulle uit
Sarah: teleurgesteld
Rita: ja hulle gaan diep teleurgesteld wees (2)
T: ok, stem almal saam?
Anna: mm baie teleurgesteld
Pat: hulle sal ook miskien voel "haai jinne, wa't ek verkeerd gegaan dat my kind nie vertrou in my gehad nie so of um miskien is ek nie „n toekomende ouer en die kind
Anna: [mm]
Pat: is bang om met my = dit is mos „n confidential gesprek. Patricia's (xxx)
Anna: [mm] [heh heh]
Pat: Elke ouer gaan mos anders reageer
All: [heh heh heh]
Anna: [mm]
Pat: maar ek dink hulle sal meer voel "O jinne waar het ek rerig verkeerd gegaan?"

(WG 3)

Extract 19:

T: wat is julle kennis van aborsie, um ons het al daaroor gepraat, dat dit nou wettig is = dat jy nou hospitaal toe kan gaan en um mense (.) die maatskapliker werker of die sielkundige gaan met jou praat (.hhh) wat nog weet julle daarvan?
Reuben: dit bring wel wrywing tussen gemeenskappe en (ouerhuise) en so op maar dit doen ook die staat „n beginsel vir oorbevolking (.) om te keer daarteen (xxx)
Piepa: so jy sal sê jou punt is reg

(MG 2)

Extract 20:

Pat: ja sy hoefie te vra vir „n aborsie
Delores: ek praat van „n aborsie
? [mm]
Pat: jy het nie ouers se toestemming nodig nie
Delores: maar jy moet sestien wees as jy in die openbaar soen dan is „n boete op gelê as jong mense soen en hulle is sestien en dan = maar as jy aborsie wil hê, laat doen dan kan jy twelf jaar oud op jou eie gaan sonder laat jou ma weet, sonder laat jou pa weet, sonder dat jou boyfriend weet, niemand weet
Pat: jy kan net opgaan agt uur en as die skole uitkom dan's jy reg

Anna: [en gesond]

(WG 3)

Extract 21:

Jacky: dis nou wettig

Julie: Hulle het dit wettig gemaak

Voorsitter: hulle het dit wettig gemaak so ek het eintlik nie nou „n sê nie as my kind nou sê gaan vir „n aborsie wat kan ek maak?. Dit is wetsbepaling

Jacky: [wetsbepaling]

Elzane: want die kinders kan nou sonder („n ouer se toestemming)

V: [op twelfjarige ouderdom, verbeel jou op twaalfjarige ouderdom het „n kind „n sê oor of jy wil „n aborsie ondergaan of nie

(WG 2)

Extract 22:

T: mm °ok ° en Afro wat wou jy gesê (.) haar ouderdom is vir jou belangrik?

Afro: ja en die feit dat dat sy nog die dinges onderkant =daai = jy =die oudste kind in die huis altyd is „n voorbeeld vir die jongeris wat agterna kom, is dit nie so nie?

T: mm

Afro: so as sy vier ander dinges het agter haar (dan moet sy) as die kind nou gebore word dat sy nou (dinges) dan gaan hulle mos nou (dink dis kwaai) om op daai ouderdom kinders te kry, verstaan jy?

(MG 3)

Extract 23:

T: mm

Julie: ek dink die ouers moet die kind bystaan

Voorsitter: as dit nou ek is, my dogter het swanger geraak sonder om vir my te kom sê en sy het „n aborsie geondergaan en kom sê dan vir my. Jo! Dan gaan ek

All: [heh heh heh & talking together, unclear]

Voorsitter: regte in die land. Ek sal haar sommer dood druk.

(WG 2)

Extract 24:

Voorsitter: Kyk vir my, ek het „n dogter wat vyftien word Junie maand en al die inligting is vir hulle gegee; moenie dit doen nie, dit word van dit, dit word van dit. Daar sit sy, sy het nie die guts gehad om te sê “jinne mammie ek is swanger”. Sy het weg gehardloop as om vir my te sê “ek is swanger”. Ek as moeder was diep teleurgesteld wat kon ek doen?

(WG 2)

Extract 25:

Rita: die kinders dink nou ons kan maar dink want ons wil

Anna: [mm]

Rita: dis erg dat ons kinders maar kan doen wat ons wil en dan weet hulle maar hulle kan net gaan; my ma en pa sal nie weet nie, jinne dis

Anna: [xxx]

Rita: dis te veel

(WG 3)

Extract 26:

Greg: dis iets wat jy vroeër gesê het, om terug te kom na jou (2) ons gemeenskappe, hulle sal kans sien om daai kind eerder groot te maak as om die kind te (steur) en met dit gaan vir „n aborsie

(MG 3)

Extract 27:

Jumbo: Ek het ,n vriendin wat ,n kind gekry het en dis die enigste kind wat sy gekry het (.) wat nie weet waarvan hy gekom het. Sy was verkrag, maar sy't die swangerskap ontstaan en ons almal het net geredeneer hoe kan ,n swangerskap deur verkragting kom, nee sy's mal, swangerskap kom mos nie van verkragting

Voorsitter: [mm]

Jumbo: nie dit moet mos honderd persent wees van die man en die vrou se kant hoe kon sy dan = hulle sê in daai verkragting kom jy tot gevoelens wat jy het, wat jy nou ook begin

Voorsitter: [mm]

Jumbo: uh opkom en uh verstaan, ek ook, ok fine, vandag is sy so gelukking met daai kind. Vandag is dit haar skaduwee haar (xx) nou sê jy som kere werk verkragting sy sit met daai kind en vandag beteken daai kind so baie. Sy sê nou eendag vir my "Ooh Jumbo, ek is so trots op my kind", sy sê "daar is my skaduwee boom. Never mind ek gee nie om waarvan af hy kom of hy deur verkragting gekom het nie want vandag kan ek onder die koelte boom lekker sit en my kind gee soveel keer vir my om. En sy sê

T: [Sjoe!]

Jumbo: as sy vir hom kyk dan wil die trane uitborrel by haar en sy sê "Here ek gee nie om nie, waar Jy die omstandighede = hoe ek die kind gekry het, U het toegelaat dat dit my gebeur sodat ek net ,n beter mens miskien daar kan uit maak en vandag is (hy) my skaduwee boom, ek seker gemaak, hy is hier en ek kan onder hom sit. So dis nie altyd so erg as jy deur swangerskap gaan nie, is dit nie so erg om daai lewetjie wat ,n kind is (gevorm) met liefde. God het die lewe daar ingeblaas nie jy nie. Maar maar uh uh daai bolletjie liefde nevermind jy wil hulle opeet as jy hulle daar is. Ek en die ma en die pa was al hoeka al kwaai gewees, toe's ek bang gewees vir my ouma, toe's al die = toe is hy al die familie se vreugde en almal wil hom net opeet so uh die kinders, ja en presies dit sal nie lank vat nie.

(WG 2)

Extract 28:

T: ok, en die laaste eenitjie, is tienermoederskap ,n beter opsie as aborsie?

Elvis: as jy ,n babatjie het dan lewe hy, as jy ,n aborsie het dan het jy niks. Kyk vandag leer ons jy moet ,n botteltjie so insteek, môre leer ek jy moet die windjie daar uitvryf maar elke dag leer jy ,n bietjie meer

(MG 3)

Extract 29:

Jumbo: Jy weet dis iets wat (xxx) dis all in jou mind. Jy loop vir jare loop jy met dit en dit is nie iets wat maklik uit jou mind uitgaan nie

Voorsitter: ek bedoel jy kan dink "Here wat kon van daai kind geword het, Here hoe = ek sal mos al daai klomp dinge

Jumbo: [miskien het die Here jou net geseën, God het jou geseen met die een swangerskap (all talking at once – unclear). Nou daar is nie ,n kind miskien na dit. As ek ,n kind nog wil hê na dit moet ek baie geld hê om ,n kind te kry moet jy betaal om ,n kind te hê].

(WG 2)

Extract 30:

T: so ons het en um Sonskyn het nou ,n bietjie daarvan gepraat wat sy haar haar ge- gevoelens sal wees. Maar na die aborsie ok kyk nou dis nou voor die tyd as sy nou by die hospital aankom het ons nou gepraat um wat sy daar sal ervaar mense sal met haar daaroor praat en als um maar na die aborsie wat sal haar gevoelens wees?

(3)

Mitchy: ek dink sekerlik ,n gevoel wees want die = of jy nou = dit = aborsie = dit was ,n lewe wat jy gehad het wat jy gevoel het bygedra al was dit net vir twee maande dis ,n lewe maar jy sal altyd daaran dink al is dit ,n jaar daarna ok soos sy gesê het sal jy altyd dink maar het ek = hoe sal ek nou gemaak het as my kind so groot was want as jy ,n ma was bly jy ,n ma. Dit is die ander ding.

T: ok, ok wat sê Cat?

All: heh heh heh

Cat: sy sal miskien spyt voel dit wat sy gedoen het en seer, teleurgesteld in haarself

(WG 1)

Extract 31:

T: ok, [clear throat], wat dink jy sal haar gevoelens wees na die aborsie? (3)
 Delores: sy kan voel sy het ,n vermisting, miskien iets wat sy sal, soos Pat gesê het, sy sal wonder as dit nou ,n = hoe ek wonder watse soort baba sou dit gewees het
 Anna: [mm]
 Delores: ek wonder hoe sal hy of sy gelyk het? daar =
 Anna: [sy gaan haarself so afvra en wonder]
 Delores: dit kan miskien wees
 Anna: En antwoorde by haarself ook soek (2)
 Pat: en skuld gevoelens
 Few: [mm]
 Anna: [mm, skuld gevoelens]
 (WG 3)

Extract 32:

Voorsitter: Sy kom in, sy sit, sy praat nou as of sy my nou jare ken en sy sê “weet jy, ek wil nou ,n aborsie laat doen. Dis nie my eerste nie en ek sê “wat? Dink jy kind kry is lekker kry? Ek sê kind = aborsie, dis asof ,n deel van my persoonlik van my afweg gevat word, dis soos ,n deel van =
 Jumbo: [mm]
 Voorsitter: ek voel dit is moord moord wat ek pleeg.
 (WG 2)

Extract 33:

Sarah: En as Patience ,n probleem met die kind.
 Anna: As die kind nou ,n probleem is het sy geweet wat vir haar wag voorentoe. Iemand wat die kind kan oppas vir Patience, dis
 Rita: [mm]
 Anna: nie dat Patience nie geld het nie. Patience het geld (2)
 Griet: en ek glo die sissie en die boetie sal bly wees om (nog ,n boetie of sissie te hê)
 (WG 3)

Extract 34:

T: ok. (.) ok. En die vrou wat die aborsie laat doen?
 Elvis: murderer
 T: is dit?
 George: (xxx) moordenaar
 T: ok
 Afro: moord
 Elvis: koud moordenaar
 ?: Siek
 Afro: koudbloedig moord
 T: ok
 Afro: wys maar net waar is ons heen in ons gemeenskap want ek glo dat in die (wye) wêreld is hulle twee = daar is mos altyd redes soos die man sê, vir alles soos in (2)
 Elvis: wil jy nou sê aborsie = aborsie sal net moord bly maar jy kan nou weer anderste
 Afro: [die Bybel ja]
 Elvis: jy kom hom nie anderste beskryf nie want dis ,n lewe wat jy neem
 George: [xxx]
 Elvis: alle aborsie – dis ,n lewe wat jy neem (.) jy kan nou sê, jy kan nou watse naam gee, die naam wat jy hom gee, dis maar net ,n naam
 Greg: [dis dieselfde maar dit bly ,n lewe]
 Elvis: dit bly ,n lewe
 T: ok (.) en die die wet op keuse van beeindiging van swangerskap, die wet wat nou ingekom het,
 Elvis: as ek, as ek nou moet eerlik sê
 T: [mm]
 Elvis: dat die wet wat hulle ingebring het (2) is hoe kan ek sê, (3) is ontoelaatbaar

Greg: [mhmm]
 Elvis: because why – as jy die Bybel nagaan (.) sal jy sien in die Bybel (.) dat moord moord bly, jy kan nie moord iets anders noem nie
 T: mm
 Elvis: dis moord
 T: ok (2)
 Elvis: al het dit drie dae aanmekaar uh uh gedingesse om dood te gaan is dit altyd moord (2) al is dit op „n verskillende manier gedoen, jy’t moord gepleeg
 (MG 3)

Extract 35:

Jane: umm sonskyn het nou gesê van „n swanger-skap is vir ons amper soos „n tweede natuur maar baie van ons jong mense verskil ook oor die swangerskap en baie keer uh is dit juis die een wat ons nie nooit verwag het nie wat swanger is en dan is dit nou weer „n baie groot probleem en nou kom hy na my toe vir raad en wat maak ek nou? Want hy = die persoon kyk op na my. Hoe hoe gaan ek nou die situasie hanteer? Gaan my raad
 T: [mm]
 Jane: vir hom die beste wees of gaan sy moet aan die einde van die dag haar eie kop volg. Verstaan jy? so dit is ook „n groot uh uh ding want by ons (neem alles) ons veralgemeen swangerskap maar almal hanteer dit nie dieselfde nie
 T: mm (1) mm (1) mm (1) ok (5)
 (WG 1)

Extract 36:

T: .hhh, ok, dink julle vrouens dink anders oor aborsie nou dat dit wettig is?
 Piepa: ja
 Grootman: my siening is dat die vrouens dink anderste want ons as mans besef nie watter
 Klaas: [ja]
 Grootman: impak dit op die vrou het
 Klaas: [mm] (.)
 Grootman: so ons kan nie eintlik die antwoord gee vir U nie
 Klaas: [ja]
 Grootman: rondom aborsie = dis net die vrou
 Reuben: [net die vrou ja sy sal alleen weet]
 Grootman: (en „n) ander siening rondom aborsie die vrou het miskien „n ander siening
 Klaas: [ja]
 Grootman: rondom aborsie want sy is die een wat die (stap) moet doen
 Bobby: [is so ja]
 T: ok
 Klaas: ja uh Grootman ek stem nogal saam met jou ek wil ook inkom op daai punt, dis eintlik die vrou se saak daai want die vrou loop vir omtrent nege maande nou ek
 Lindsman: [heh heh]
 Klaas: dink namelik Klaas [surname] ek sal nie eintlik weet (.) dit wat die vrou, die stap wat die vrou stap nie so sy sal beter om om vir U kan toespreek hoe voel sy oor aborsie
 (MG 2)

Extract 37:

Popeye: kyk vir my um as ek soos wat ek gehoor het uit die verskillende monde nou, soos dit vir my geklink het, dat jy die een voor = die ene nie sal toestem dat sy die aborsie ondergaan nie maar met die een sal julle terwyl ek weer net die omkeer sou gesê het want (Zizo) het so gesê hulle kan nie en (die vorige een) sy mag maar maar soos dinge gaan, ek sê nog dit hang af op die vrou self
 T: [mm]
 Popeye: as sy dit nie wou gehad het (en sy) sien nie kans om die kind groottemaak dan (.) so be it maar kyk hulle is nou suksesvol, hulle kan dit bekostig, hulle het die middele om die kind „n lewe te gee, „n goeie lewe, um (xxx) maar vir my nogsteeds hang alles van die vrou af

- T: ok, so watter watter faktore is vir julle belangrik omtrent julle gevoelings daaroor? Is dit die omstandighede, dis wat ek hoor, dis die
- Pop: [vir my hang als van die vrou af]
- T: ok, ok
- Popeye: sy's die een wat swanger is sy's die een wat die kind sal grootmaak. Sy kan of die kind laat aanneem of sy kan die kind grootmaak of sy kan, sy kan kind los om gevind te word deur iemand maar sy gaan met die kind sit. So sy = omstandighede hang alles van haar af (ek is nie die een wat) swanger is nie
- T: ok
- Popeye: so dit hang alles aan haar af
- T: ok
- (MG 1)

Extract 38:

- T: ok (2) en um Cat, jy's jy's hierdie ouderdom, een en twintig, as as wat dink jy sal jou ou nou daarvan gedink het (.) as hy nou uitgevind het?
- Cat: Ek dink nie hy sal saam ges-gestem het nie maar vir my dink ek ook dis nie vir hom om te sê nie want hy's nie die een wat met die kind gaan sit nie. Mōre vat hy „n ander vrou en dan moet ek nog sukkel met die kind en meeste van die manne betaal nie die kind nie so dis moeilik om „n kind op jou eie groot te maak.
- (WG 1)

Extract 39:

- T: ok, wat wat sê jy?
- Afro: aborsie (lei eintlik tot „n beter lewe)
- T: skuus wat sê jy?
- Afro: aborsie lei eintlik tot „n beter lewe
- (MG 3)

Extract 40:

- T: °Dankie°, hhh ok, so a-s Patricia uh na-a jou toe gekom het, um..(1) vir advies wat so--u vir haar sê? Enig-enige iemand? daar is nie „n regte antwoord, daar is nie „n verkeerde antwoord nie (2) ons gesels net daaroor
- All: (muffled noises, acknowledging they understand what I'm saying)
- (5)
- Mitchy: Ek sal seker na haar moet luister. Maar ek = die besluit lê ook by haar want ek kan nie vir haar dit besluit nie dis moeilik. Jy kan nie vir iemand anders besluit nie want mōre draai daai g –dinges teen jou, daai
- T: [mm]
- Mitchy: besluite teen jou (3) Ek sal vir haar wys alle opsigte behalwe dit (2)
- T: mmmm (4)
- T: as jy nou sê behalwe dit, behalwe om vir haar te (sê wat om te doen). ok
- Mitchy: (<sê wat om te doen>)
- (WG 1)

Extract 41:

- Piepa: ek het nou geluister aandagtig maar daar's net gou een ding wat ek onder ons aandag wil aandra (.) niemand vra (.) vir „n mislukking in jou lewe nie (.) niemand vra vir iets negatief in jou lewe nie
- Klaas: [mm]
- Piepa: niemand wil iets negatief doen nie en um as ek my indink in die sit = die moeilike omstandighede
- Klaas: [mm] [mm]
- Piepa: wat hierdie jong dame omsit (.) en um dit is „n moeilike keuse wat jy moet maak
- Klaas: [mm]
- Piepa: (.) >maar voordat sy die keuse< kan maak = dit gaan nie net oor haarself nie, dit gaan oor haar toekoms
- Klaas: [mm]

Piepa: ook en hierso het die ding nou reeds uitgekom en die ding is nou oor die gemeenskap (.) maar die gemeenskap moet nou onthou dat ons is nie volmaak nie ons maak foute so wat gaan dit nou doen aan Patricia as ons as gemeenskap vir haar nou gaan uh (veruider)

(MG 2)

Extract 42:

Delores: jy gaan kry mense wat sal sê dis nogal jammer dat dit nou met Patricia gebeur het want miskien as Patricia met my kom praat dan as ek miskien

Anna: [mm]

Delores: daar was = sou Patricia nie ,n aborsie gehad het nie dan kon ons miskien na ander oplossings gekyk het (2) en ook luister aan Patricia, seker daar sal mense wees, daar sal mense wees

(WG 3)

Extract 43:

Piepa: oor die gemeenskap (.) maar die gemeenskap moet nou onthou dat ons is nie volmaak nie ons maak foute so wat gaan dit nou doen aan Patricia as ons as gemeenskap vir haar nou gaan uh (veruider)

Klaas: [mm]

Reuben: [ons

rugte teen haar draai]

Piepa: ons ons rug teen haar draai, wat gaan dit nou aan haar doen = vir watse mens gaan gaan dit nou vir haar maak = is dit nie ons plig nou om vir haar te ondersteun nie =

T: [mm]

Piepa: want die daad wat gedoen is (.) is tussen haar en en die Here want hierdie vrug = die Here het haar geskape as ,n vrugbare (winneskap/wingerd) en syt nou op die pad lanks kop verloor (.) en daarvoor gaan sy met die Here rekenskap gee want soos uh uh

Klaas: [mm]

Piepa: uh Klaas vir Reuben gesê het; seksueel is vir die huwelik bedoel en Patricia het die pad duister geword deur haar eie begeerlikheid het sy die pad duister geword en so maar

Klaas: [mm] [mm]

Piepa: nou ons as gemeenskap moet nou vir Patricia ondersteun in hierdie situasie (.)

(MG 2)

Extract 44:

Reuben: maar nou sy sal ,n bietjie seer voel want sy't ,n fout begaan (.) mense sal almal wil weet as jy ,n fout begaan het, daar kom klippe na jou toe en dan kom daar rotse na jou toe (sy kon nie) die situasie hanteer (.)

T: ok

(MG2)

Extract 45:

Julie: nou wil ek net sê; goed jy gaan vir ,n aborsie, iets kan mos gebeur in die aborsie. Nou weet die ouers nie en hier gaan die kind dood.

Elzane: dan kom die kind nie huis toe daai aand nie

Julie: wat dan? Enige iets kan mos gebeur, dit is mos nie onmoontlik dat sulke goed kan gebeur

(WG 2)

Extract 46:

Elize: Daai aborsie vat goed uit jou uit, hy

Vooristter: [mm]

Elize: vat automaties want daai dokters gee vir jou goed in (xxx) die aborsie geskep word, is ek reg, en as jy nie ,n aborsie miskraam kry dan kom dit van self, reg genoeg sonder =of

Vooristter: [mm]

Elize: jy (x) of iets maar dan het daar iets seerkry nou wat maak daai goed, ek meen wat die dokters vir jou ingee om ,n aborsie = wat doen dit? Dit beskadig jou lewe, dit beskadig beslis want as ,n mens mooi kyk

hoe swanger = waar jou baba (xx) ek meen daar moet „n baba uitkom, as daai maag seer is, as sy infeksie kan daai baba ook mos uitkom as jy „n sterk infeksie het; daai baba en die infeksie kom deur waar die baba moet kom, is ek reg? En daar is die punt en as daar nou nie meer kan gekeer word nie, wat gebeur dan? Dan verloor jy „n baba. En volgende keer gaan jy nie maklik nie want daai baba is siek, is ek reg? Daai baba is automaties siek, daar kan nie so maklik „n baba weer gevas het nie en sommige mammies kry hakke in. Hoekom om „n baba te hou sommige kere = nou hoe gaan hy aborsie? Hy moet hom deur. Hy is deur dwelms deurgedruk om uit te kan kom, hy kom nie uit jou derm uit nie. „n aborsie kom uit, hy kom onder uit, daar waar „n baba moet kom, dis daarom ek sê altyd vir mense; “as jy swanger is maak „n voorsorg van vooraf as ek weet nou swanger of whatever maak dit want otherwise eendag (xxx) aborsie. Elke dag in jou mind. Elke dag. Want as ek daai man sien, Here, ek het dan sy kind weggemaak. Ek het aan daai mense (xxx).

Julie: (xxx)

Elize: Maar als rerig erg
(WG 2)

Extract 47:

T: ok, ok (.). Praat mense oor aborsie in die gemeenskap?

Max: (In ons) ons gemeenskap, ons eie gemeenskap (xxx) mense praat nie juis oor aborsie omdat dit verkeerd is (xxx).

(MG 1)

Extract 48:

T: dit is my eerste groep wat nou nie vir mekaar ken nie (.) het dit um beïnvloed uh het dit julle beïnvloed hoe julle nou die vra beantwoord en so (2)

Greg: nee vir my is dit, ongeag (.) in watter omstandighede of met wie, dit is net hoe in die algemeen wat ek sal my opinies wat ek sal gedeel het met enige groep

T: [mhmm]

Afro: so topiek is dit eintlik beter om met „n onbekende groep

Greg: [ek dink ja ja dit is ok, ja ja om want om met vriende (.) ek sal sê met my vriende kan ons dit bespreek ons het dit al bespreek siende my werk, die werk wat ek doen (.hhh) het ons al so iets bespreek (.) maar dis nie iets wat enige vriende somer

Elvis: [mm]

Greg: gemaklik voel om oor te praat. Jy sal nie op „n aand kom sit (klomp mans) kom sit en hulle sal nie somer praat daaroor nie

T: [mm]

Greg: en dis nie „n gesprek wat hulle voel, ons gemeenskap voel as mans voel, om oor te

T: [mm]

Greg: praat nie

(MG 3)

Extract 49:

Piepa: ek ek sal = ek wil net die Grootman daar ondersteun dit sal so = met ander

Klaas: [mm]

Piepa: woorde (.) uh ons mense het nie die vrymoedigheid om te praat nie en dit is

Klaas: [mm]

Piepa: hoekom ons mense sukke baie dinge doen (.) om somer koerant water te vat en sê “ok reg laat dit verby gaan” nou Piepa wil nou voorstel, my naam Piepa, wil nou

Bobby: [yes, ja]

Piepa: voorstel want as daar nie = om vrymoedigheid te hê voor die tyd um, „n maatskaplike werker te gaan sien wat moet ek doen in hierdie geval of wat moet ek doen om voordat ek in hierdie geval is moet ek weet wat = waar ek my inlaat

(MG 2)

Extract 50:

- T: °ok° (2) °ok° (1) um (.) nou praat mense oor aborsie in die gemeenskap hier in Dorpie? Praat mense daaroor? (4) of is dit iets waaroor „n mens nie
- Mitchy: [Jy gaan mos nie nou sê as ek „n aborsie gaan doen nie want ek gaan dit nie doen nie (3) ek gaan net my eie dingetjie doen. Mense praat nie daaroor nie] (1)
- T: um U het gese u gaan u u eie dingintjie doen
- Mitchy: Ek meen ek gaan ek gaan ek kan na die hospitaal toe gaan ek dan niemand hoef te weet
- T: Ja?
- Mitchy: want
- T: [dis privaat]
- Mitchy: Dis privaat
- (WG 1)

Extract 51:

- Pat: een of ander tyd kom dit uit, jy weet nie
- Rita: [ja want ek meen dis erg]
- Anna: maar jy moet vertroulik wees nê. Dis wonderlik hoe dit gebeur ek moet vertroulik wees maar dit kom tog weer uit kom
- (WG 3)

Extract 52:

- T: Ok, wat dink julle sal die gemeenskap se reaksie wees teenoor teenoor Patricia?
- Jane: eerste ons gemeenskap veroordeel, ons luister nooit nie
- Mitchy: [heh heh heh]
- Jane: As ek gehoor het sonskyn of Cat het „n aborsie gehad “Ja so en so en so” maar ons weet nie wat is die situasie agter dit nie. Dit is dat eerste ding gebeur in ons gemeenskap, ons veroordeel
- (WG 3)

Extract 53:

- T: ja natuurlik. Niemand weet hoe dit gebeur het nie maar die gemeenskap het uitgevind dat Patricia „n aborsie gehad het so nou weet die gemeenskap, wat dink jy sal die
- Klaas: [mm]
- T: gemeenskap se reaksie wees?
- Wolbek: hulle gat haar hulle gat haar net kyk met „n negatiewe gedagte
- Klaas: [mm]
- T: dis wat dis wat Lindsman sê nê?
- Reuben: as hulle almal miskien, sy’s een-en-twintig jaar oud, sy’s nog baie jonk in die lewe (as almal op haar skel). Kyk sy’s „n ordentlike meisie miskien gewees of sy was glad nie geworried oor haarself nie
- Klaas: [mm]
- Reuben: en nou daar gaan verskillende soorte stories na haar gegooi word niemand
- Klaas: [ja]
- Reuben: sal die waarheid dra as wat sy dra nie
- (MG 2)

Extract 54:

- T: wat dink jy sal die man uh verantwoordelik vir die swangerskap se reaksie wees (.) hy het ook nie van die swangerskap of van die aborsie geweet nie (.) nou hoor hy (.) dieselfde manier dat die
- Greg: [daar gaan „n betwis ontstaan definitief want hy voel hy het „n reg op dit op die baba gehad om ook te besluit sy moes hom betrek het by haar besluite en ek dink hy hy gaan begin „n]
- Afro: [mm]
- Greg: (twis) tussen hulle twee ontstaan want sy het nie erken in die eerste plek dat sy swanger is en erken nie dat sy vir „n aborsie gegaan het nie
- T: [mm]
- (MG 3)

Extract 55:

- George: In baie gevalle dan spreek sy en die boyfriend miskien dan wil die boyfriend dit hê en sy wil dit nie hê nie dan gaan hulle hospitaal toe en laat doen die aborsie en die boyfriend = um die dokter doen niks daaraan nie dan word daar vir die boyfriend vertel maar sy't die kind vermoor ek dink dis nou
- Afro: [mm]
- T: [mm]
- George: verkeerd om die baba wegtevat van daai kind se pa, te vat, die ongebore baba
(MG 3)

Extract 56:

- Wolbek: So wat as dit nou my as dit nou my kind was (.) in so geval uh Piepa ek sou bietjie ontsteld word, ek sal nie lekker wees voel daarvoor nie want dit kan moontlik my eerste "baby" wees
- Klaas: [mm]
- Wolbek: en almal sien mos daaruit Reuben as dit jou eerste kind is sien jy mos uit vir jou eerste kind
- Reuben: [°eerste kind°]
- Klaas: [mm]
- Wolbek: en hier hoor jy nou Reuben dat daar gat niks meer aan nie. So hoe sal, hoe sal jou reaksie wees?
- Klaas: [mm]
- Wolbek: en jy wou graag ,n kind gehad het
(MG 2)

Extract 57:

- Reuben: dit break ook = vir my dis ,n gees wanneer ,n vroumens aborsie ondergaan
- Allan: hy't dit nie bedoel nie
- Reuben: want daar's baie manne wat dit nie ondersteun (hulle sien uit om ,n) seuntjie of dogtertjie in die lewe te bring
- Allan: al is die familie lede (nie so bly daarvoor nie) hulle moet ook = dis ,n moord eintlik wat sy maak, ,n sonde
- Reuben: mm
- T: ok (.) ok
(MG 2)

Extract 58:

- T: hy het nie van die aborsie geweet nie, hy het nie, hy het nie van die swangerskap geweet nie. Wat sal hy nou dink as hy nou deur die gemeenskap hoor?
- Klaas: mm
- Reuben: ek sal skrik (.) na haar gaan, en vir haar sê dit (weet nie wat doen ek) nou met jou. Jy's ,n moordenaar en ,n groot sonde en ,n rug steker (.) met ander woorde (.) wat ek aan jou gedoen het (.) aanvaar jy nie (.) alhoewel ek sê wat volgende gaan kom doen na dit (.) gaan jy aanvaar (.) so ek dink (jy is ,n) volle moordenaar
(MG 2)

Extract 59:

- Afro: dit hang ook af watter ouderdom die (dinges van haar) is = as dit ,n jong soos ek is of die selle ouderdom wat sy is, ek jo! ek sal excited voel om te sê dis ooraait jy moes al lankal die baba afgemaak of so want ek het nog ,n lang lewe voor maar as dit nou iemand soos jy is, ouer as ek, sorry, dan gaan jy miskien ontevrede wees omdat dit jou eerste (poppie) is, verstaan jy wat ek sê? Dan gaan sy mos kwaad voel maar ekke, ek weet nie ek het nog ,n lang
- Elvis: [ja maar as jy nou ,n aborsie neem dan is daar mos nie ,n lewemaar die kind wat gebore word is daar lewe]
- Afro: [kyk hier hoe lank vat dit vir ,n baba]
- Elvis: [maar as jy, as jy ,n aborsie neem is dit net so goed as moord]
- Afro: [mm, die Bybel sê]
- Elvis: [dis moord]

Greg: en sy gaan gegooi word daarmee hy = gaan dit, hy gaan dit vir haar sê “jy”t moord gepleeg”
 T: mm
 Afro: en hy gaan kwaad word
 Greg: ja, hy gaan = hy gaan dit gaan, dit gaan ,n (betwis) wees en dit gaan hulle uit mekaar uit dryf en dit sal =
 ek dink dit sal = dis ,n letsel wat jy stel vir enige mens

(MG 3)

Extract 60:

Popeye: kan ek iets (sê) oor die uh gewete, gewetenis = ek ek = omdat nie een van ons ,n aborsie gekry het weet ons nie regtig wat die vrou wat swanger geraak en ,n aborsie oorweeg het (dink) maar ek sê nou is as ek ek is nou jammer om almal op te (steur) maar as ek nie ,n kind voorsien of beplan of wil hê nie, dan is daai kind vir my voel soos ,n uitgroei in my been as ek nie rugby wil speel nie of ,n blaas op my voet wat gekom het en ek soek hom nie daar nie, dis hoe ek voel. En dan gaan ek ook vere voel vir hom (2) dan gaan ek actually lekker voel want dan kan ek reg rugby speel want dan is ek weer gesond

(MG 1)

Extract 61:

T: ok sê nou die boyfriend vind nou eers uit dat sy swanger was en dat sy ,n aborsie gekry het, hoe gaan die boyfriend voel? (2)
 Zizo: verlig
 All: heh heh heh
 ?: (xxx) daar’s ,n (xxx) opinie
 Zizo: x hy gaan verlig wees, na die tyd kan hy sê wat hy wil maar sy eerste gevoel gaan wees hy’s verlig
 Popeye: wat as hy gehoop het vir ,n kind?
 Zizo: dan is dit ,n ander saak, dan moet hulle eers getroud wees
 Popeye: (something about surprise) heh heh heh
 Moonstar: wat sê Popeye nou?
 Popeye: nee want as die die boyfriend (xxx)
 ? [ja]
 Zizo: dan moes hy vir haar gesê het die bind tussen hulle twee moes wees dat = dan sê hy vir haar maar hy’s gereed vir ,n babatjie
 T: ok, wat dink julle (1), dink julle hy sal verlig wees?
 Fito: uit my oogpunt uit ek sal sê ja want hy = hoekom = maak ,n voorbeeld; hy’s op die skool en hy miskien nou nie om die skool los om te gaan werk nie en dan moet die ouers daarvoor sorg en (xxx) saak (xxx) vir die babatjie

(MG 2)

Extract 62:

T: mm, ja. Ok en die man wat nou verantwoordelik is vir die swangerskap, hy hoor nou eers, nou eers oor die swangerskap en die aborsie. Wat gaan hy nou dink? (2)
 Anna: hy kan nou miskien dink dis nie sy kind nie, hoekom het sy dit gedoen en sy niks vir my daarvan gesê nie. Hy kan woedend word
 [footsteps, Delores returning to us]
 T: ok, ons sê net, um, die man wat nou die pa is vir verantwoordelik vir die swangerskap, wat gaan sy reaksie wees (2) toe het ons gesê hy gaan seker woedend wees (2)
 Delores: Dink ek nou vir my in; hy kan bly ook voel, hy’t nie nodig om onderhoud te betaal
 Anna: [heh heh]
 Delores: nie of hy’t nie nodig om met Patricia te trou nie (3)
 T: is dit wat gewoonlik gebeur? Trou trou mense as die meisie swanger is?
 Delores: nie altyd nie
 Anna: [nie altyd nie]
 Delores: maar dit is nou in ons tyd.

(WG 3)

Extract 63:

Pat: Miskien in die lig dat sy swanger is; wie sê nou dit was haar vaste kêrel of was dit miskien „n hit en run gewees? Dat sy nou nie vir hom wil gaan sê nie, so eintlik kan „n mens nou amper sê dis „n besluit wat sy op haar eie moet maak, sy moet, dis nou as sy nou nie „n kêrel gehad, „n vaste kêrel

T: mm

Anna: uh

Pat: en as daar nou iemand was miskien hom bespreek en saam met haar ouers en sy ouers miskien, maar hulle is nou al volwassenes

(WG 3)

Extract 64:

Moonstar: [miskien nou tot daai punt die faktore en die invloed daarvan vir die dametjie nou wat vind sy's pregnant of sy's verwagtend en sy's die enigste broodwinner en die boyfriend is nie bewus dat sy verwagtend is dit kan, dit hang af of die boyfriend saamspeel, of as die boyfriend nie saam speel nie dan is dit „n groter invloed op daai omstandighede so as die boyfriend saam speel en hy stem in hy kan dalk „n goeie boyfriend wees wat sê “ok ek kom navore na die dame se ouers, ok ek sal aanstaan vir alles wat gebeur het”, hy sal honderd persent uitkom dan word daar nie „n aborsie en um plaasgevind nie want hy gaan nou honderd persent nou die dame se se lot aanvaar en sal kyk om vir alles = jy kry baie keur, jy kry boyfriends wat in in „n mate na voorkom wat sê “fine” maar daar's baie ouens, baie ouens ek weet van, baie ouens wat soms sal sê maar dan sal die boyfriend miskien inkom en sê nee uh um dis sy kind so

T: [mm]

Moonstar: hy sal pa staan en sal alles uitkom en hy sal al moet dit beteken hy sal (onderhoud) betaal vir die dame ook en dan sal ons in „n mate dat iets goedsgaan

T: [mm]

Moonstar: dat die aborsie nie plaasvind nie kyk uh aborsie in ons gemeenskap tradisioneel

T: [mm]

Moonstar: is vir ons nie aanvaarbaar nie

(MG 2)

Extract 65:

T: ok (hhh) um watter faktore sou jou advies beïnvloed uh in die eerste plek wat sou jou advies wees, ok ons het nou um, ek dink baie van ons het um eerstens aan aborsie gedink want dit is nou waaroor dit gaan maar watse ander opsies is daar vir haar?

Greg: aanneming (3)

T: ok

Greg: definitief aanneming (2), om die pa of die vader van die kind nou betrokke te kry, is hy, gaan hy en sal hy die kind kan onderhou

Afro: en sê nou hy is nou nie bereid

Greg: is hy bereid, dis hoekom ek sê dit is = daar is soveel opsies wat jy moet (.) na kyk voor jy „n besluit kan neem

(MG 3)

Extract 66:

Julie: nou sê my broer “luister hier, dink daai dokter ek gaan kyk dat my saad so oor en weer afgewerk word aan hulle. Hy sê nee (2). Hy sê sê vir hulle ek sê daar word nie „n aborsie gedoen nie en hy't toe gestick met die gedagte hy gaan = sy gaan nie vir die aborsie nie en nou bel die hospitaal vir haar maar sy moet nou kom toe sê sy “nee maar my man het gesê ek gaan nie” en op daardie stadium neem hy vir haar na „n private dokter toe. Hulle het nie (geld nie) hy werk nie want hy moet vir haar, vir haar versorg (1) en nou het hy maar so aangegaan en aangegaan en die swangerskap word alhoemeer. En aan die einde van die dag ek was so verstom dat sy die kind normaal = „n normale geboorte het sy gegee aan die kind en daar's Annie nou, so fris en sterk. So so wat vir my sê soms ek dink as die pa ook standpunt inneem en

Voorsitter: [mm]

Julie: besluit ok, fine tot hier toe en nie verder nie = kyk dis mos „n twee man job, dis mos nie net een mens dood. Ek gaan nie toelaat dat daar „n aborsie (is nie) maar hang ook af as die pa of ma (meel haal)

?? [dis waar ja]

Julie: want hulle het die kind gemaak, die kind is gebore dan, ok ok fine, ek het mos my saad by jou gelos, so cope jy maar en hy gaan haal meel en hy is weg.

(WG 2)

Extract: 67

Mitchy: jy kry baie mans wat sou onsteld wees maar baie wat daarmee saam stem. Want daar's baie van hulle want veral as hulle nog jonk is en hulles besig miskien om te studeer en sien dan gaan hulle nie te bly wees maar die pakkie is nou afgehandel hy kan maar aangaan met sy lewe en daar sal party wees wat nie daarmee sal saamstem nie (2)

T: ok (2) en um Cat, jy's jy's hierdie ouderdom, een en twintig, as as wat dink jy sal jou ou nou daarvan gedink het (.) as hy nou uitgevind het?

Cat: Ek dink nie hy sal saam ges-gestem het nie maar vir my dink ek ook dis nie vir hom om te sê nie want hy's nie die een wat met die kind gaan sit nie. Môre vat hy ,n ander vrou en dan moet ek nog sukkel met die kind en meeste van die manne betaal nie die kind nie so dis moeilik om ,n kind op jou eie groot te maak.

(WG 1)

Appendix 5: Agreement between researcher and co-researcher

RHODES UNIVERSITEIT
DEPARTEMENT VAN SIELKUNDE

OOREENKOMS TUSSEN STUDENT NAVORSER EN MEDE-NAVORSER

Ek, _____ stem in om deel te neem aan Tanya Bowes se navorsing rakende publieke begrip van aborsie.

Ek verstaan dat:

1. Tanya 'n student is wat die navorsing doen om haar Meesters Graad by Rhodes Universiteit te behaal.
2. Die navorsing is deel van 'n groter studie oor die publiek se begrip van aborsie.
3. Tanya belangstel in die publiek se begrip van aborsie en date ek nie verplig is om oor my persoonlike ervarings met aborsie te praat.
4. My deelneming aan die projek bevat een fokus-groep bespreking wat nie meer as twee ure sal duur nie.
5. Ek kan besluit om nie deel te neem aan die bespreking.
6. Ek is welkom om enige vrae of onduidelikhede met Tanya te bespreek in die studie en dat hierdie onduidelikhede uitgesorteer sal word tot ek tevrede is.
7. Ek kan besluit om die bespreking te verlaat op enige oomblik, alhoewel ek verplig is om deel te neem tensy iets onvoorsienbaar gebeur wat buite my beheer is.
8. Alhoewel die studie-materiaal moontlik informasie sal weergee van my persoonlike ondervindinge, sal die informasie op so 'n manier weergegee word dat ek nie identifiseerbaar sal wees nie. Ek sal ook gerbuik maak van 'n skuilnaam gedurende die sessie.

Gebruik van bandopnames vir die doel van die navorsing

1. Ek gee toestemming dat die fokus-groep besprekings waaraan ek deelneem opgeneem mag word.
2. Die bandopnames sal deur die navorser alleen gebruik word. Na hierdie proses sal „n tweede persoon seker maak dat die vertaling korrek is. Hierdie persoon is verplig om

my naam en ander informasie wat my sal uitken konfidensieel te hou. Tanya se opsiener sal ook die transkripsie lees as dit nodig is.

3. Indien my regte naam voorkom in die opneming sal Tanya dit uitsny.
4. Ek gee toestemming dat die kassette gebêre word in Tanya se opsiener se kantoor in „n gesluite laai vir 5 jaar. Indien „n navorsing assistant daarmee werk sal hy of sy „n konfidensiele ooreenkoms teken. Na die 5 jaar sal die opnemings vernietig word.

Geteken op die:

Mede-navorser:

Navorser:

Getuie:

(Datum)

