

“Are men sexually harassed?”

Enacting the discourse of hegemonic masculinity in the evaluation of stories of male sexual harassment on Kenyan talk radio

Joy Mueni and Jonathan Clifton

Riara University / Université de Valenciennes

Since MacKinnon's (1979) ground-breaking work in which she coined the term sexual harassment, there has been very little consensus as to what it actually is. Using callers' stories of male sexual harassment taken from Kenyan talk radio, the purpose of this paper is to analyse the in situ production of an emic definition of (male) sexual harassment. Further, using positioning theory as a methodology, this paper aims (1) to make visible the gendered identity work that defining, or not defining, an event as male sexual harassment occasions and (2) to show how hegemonic masculinity is achieved through stories and their evaluation by the radio host and other callers who talk certain masculinities into being as normative and others as deviant.

Keywords: hegemonic masculinity, radio talk, small stories, sexual harassment, assessments, Kenya

1. Introduction

Catherine Mackinnon (1979) coined the term 'sexual harassment' (henceforth SH) in her ground-breaking book '*Sexual harassment of working women*'. Prior to this, despite the fact that SH in the USA at that time affected seven out of ten women (MacKinnon 1979: 3), it was deemed to be sufficiently prevalent in society as to be invisible. Following the noticing of the intimate violation of women by men and the labelling of it as SH, there followed a flurry of legislation that made such activity unlawful. However, despite attempts to make SH unlawful, it still is a pervasive and toxic influence in contemporary society. One of the problems in combating SH is that there is no one definition of what it is, or is not. Rather, there are a plethora of situated definitions of SH that are culturally bound and locally occasioned in legal,

lay, and academic environments across the world. This paper therefore looks at the struggle for the meaning of SH, and more specifically of male SH by women. Using small stories (Bamberg and Georgakopoulou 2008; De Fina and Georgakopoulou 2008; Georgakopoulou 2007) taken from Kenyan talk radio, in which the host asks the question “are men sexually harassed”, the present paper analyses the discursive construction of (male) SH. Further, using positioning theory (henceforth PT [Bamberg 1997]), the paper analyses the identity work that these stories entail and looks at the way in which certain masculinities are treated as normative and others as deviant. Findings indicate that it is thus through stories of male SH, *inter alia*, that a hegemonic (and thus normative) version of masculinity is talked into being and other versions of masculinity are marginalised.

2. Literature review

In its broadest terms, MacKinnon (1979: 2) defined SH as “the unwanted imposition of sexual requirements in the context of a relationship of unequal power”. MacKinnon (1979) further postulated that there were two forms of SH, namely: a *quid pro quo* in which the perpetrator threatens to make employment related decisions on the basis of compliance to requests for sexual favours; and a hostile work environment in which sex-related conduct leads to an intimidating, offensive, and hostile work environment which unreasonably interferes with the victim’s work performance. In their overview of the literature on SH, Pina, Gannon, and Saunders (2009) point out that there is still debate as to what constitutes SH. Whilst most people would agree that explicit demands for sexual favours would constitute SH, behaviours such as staring, whistling, or sexual joking and innuendo are often not considered harassing and are often normalised, especially by men. In 1980, legislation was adopted in the USA, prohibiting SH; and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission now defines and criminalises SH,¹ as does legislation in many other countries. In Kenya, SH is legally defined as:

Any person, who being in a position of authority, or holding a public office, who persistently makes any sexual advances or requests which he or she knows, or has reasonable grounds to know, are unwelcome, is guilty of the offence of sexual harassment.²

1. http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/sexual_harassment.cfm

2. <http://www.kenyalaw.org:8181/exist/kenyalex/actview.xql?actid=CAP.%2062A>

Whilst there is a proliferation of academic and legal definitions, the focus in this paper is on how lay or folk definitions of SH emerge in interaction. As some researchers (e.g. Fitzgerald 1996; Mahugu et al. 2013; Vohlídálová 2011) argue, such lay understandings of SH can vary considerably between each other and can be very different from legal and academic definitions. For example, Vohlídálová's research into the attitudes of students in a Czech university revealed that according to the legal definition of sexual harassment, 67% of students had suffered SH, yet only 2–3% considered themselves to be victims of SH; her research therefore points to the existence of a huge gap between legal definitions of SH and 'common understandings'. This, Vohlídálová explains, is because the respondents only considered 'extreme forms' of SH to be SH. So-called 'less extreme' forms of SH such as flirting and ogling were considered to be 'normal' behaviours. Similarly, as various researchers (e.g., Dougherty 1999; Grauerholz 1994; Scarduzio and Geist-Martin 2010) note, what men and women consider SH to be seems to vary considerably. Men, for example, not only consider fewer behaviours to be harassing, but they also have a tendency to normalize harassing behaviours. Further, it is noticeable that most of the literature cited above deals with the SH of women by men. Consequently, other forms of SH such as homosexual harassment of men and women, male harassment of men who are seen as not fitting masculine norms, or harassment of men by women, are largely ignored by the literature (Berdahl 2007; Lee 2000).

More specifically, as regards Kenya, the situation is similar to that stated above. The somewhat limited academic literature on SH in Kenya reports that the SH of women by men is widespread in the workplace (Hale and Opondo 2005: 310) and in universities and schools (Osongo 2006; Sifuna 2006). Research also suggests that women are more likely to be sexually harassed than their male counterparts (Muasya 2014; Kameri-Mbote 2000). A literature search revealed only one article (Mahugu et al. 2013) which dealt explicitly with male SH by females; significantly, its authors note that they found “no study that explicitly focuses on the sexual harassment of the male by the female in Kenyan institutions” (Mahugu et al. 2013: 29). Interestingly, the same, small scale (30 respondents) interview-based study found that interviewees provided varying definitions of SH, in which they mainly defined SH as “coerced sexual intercourse”. Moreover, the interviewees also ignored other forms of SH such as making sexual jokes, gestures or comments, displaying sexual pictures or messages on web pages, and making obnoxious sexual comments (Mahugu et al. 2013: 34). Thus, commensurate with Vohlídálová (2011), popular concepts of what is, and is not, SH in Kenya appear vague, and concentrate more on so-called extreme cases of SH. Consequently, they stand in stark contrast to accepted academic and legal definitions of SH.

Taking these relatively unique data as a starting point, the present paper seeks to add to existing research on the discursive construction of SH (see for example,

Bingham 1994; Eyre 2000; Kitzinger and Thomas 1995). Most discursive research on SH uses specifically elicited interview data (e.g., Lee 2000; Scarduzio and Geist-Martin 2010; Quin 2002) and thus constitutes ‘big stories’ (i.e. narratives obtained from interviews, clinical talk, autobiographies and so on) that entail a significant measure of reflection; Freeman 2006). Conversely, the current paper uses ‘small stories’ as data, such stories being underrepresented in research on narratives of SH (though see, for example, Muir and Mangus 1994). Small stories, in contrast to big stories, are stories that are told as part of everyday social activity rather than specifically elicited in research or therapeutic settings. They are characterized by the fact that they are: short; told in interaction; not necessarily about the speaker; told in everyday settings; and are designed for an interactional purpose (Bamberg and Georgakopoulou 2008; De Fina and Georgakopoulou 2008; Georgakopoulou 2007). Moreover, from a small story perspective, researchers focus less on what narratives tell us about constructions of self; rather, they place the emphasis on how story tellers ‘do’ self and other as an emergent interactional accomplishment. Consequently, this paper aims to fill this research niche by making visible the gendered identity work that defines, or does not define, an event as sexual harassment occasions.

3. Method: Positioning theory

This paper uses positioning theory (PT) to analyse the way in which stories of personal experience of male SH are constructed in talk and how the callers to, and the host of, a talk radio show negotiate and evaluate what is, and what is not, male sexual harassment, thereby talking into being certain (gendered) identities. PT can be defined as referring “broadly to the close inspection of how speakers describe people and their actions in one way, rather than another and, by doing so, perform discursive actions that result in acts of identity” (Bamberg, De Fina and Schiffrin 2011: 182). Further, following Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008: 385), these acts of identity exist at three different levels, summed up as follows:

- level one: how characters are positioned within the storyworld
- level two: how the speaker/narrator positions himself/herself and others within the here-and-now of the interactive situation;
- level three: how the speaker/narrator positions a sense of self/identity with regard to dominant discourses.

First, within the storyworld, characters in the story are positioned relative to other characters in the story, words are put into their mouths via reported speech, events are (re)constructed, the characters in the storyworld take up stances relative to each

other, and so on. Thus, the story (of male SH) itself becomes a site of identity work in which (gendered) identities are talked into being. Further, following Bamberg's (2011) taxonomy for analysing narratives, we analyse the stories according to how the characters in the storyworld world navigate the dilemmas of: constancy and change across time; sameness and difference; and agency. Agency is particularly pertinent to this study of SH since, returning to MacKinnon's (1979: 2) seminal definition of SH, asymmetrical power relations are a fundamental constituent of SH; power in this respect being defined in classic terms of person A having power over person B to the extent that A can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do (Lukes 1974: 16). Furthermore, whereas PT's focus on sameness and difference can point to the construction of (gendered) in-groups and out-groups, constancy in change is not a dimension that is raised in this data and so will not be discussed.

At the second level of analysis, considering narratives to be a form of social practice, PT pays close attention to the relation between the participants in the here and now of the talk. More specifically, the present paper deals with asymmetric access to rights to speak and the way in which the stories are assessed as SH or not. Here, we draw on the notions of turn type pre-allocation (Atkinson 1982) and assessment. Turn type pre-allocation refers to the phenomenon in which certain turns are attributed to those incumbent of certain identities. And, as regards assessments, we are particularly interested in second assessments which are conditionally relevant action after a first assessment (Pomerantz 1984). Further, we argue that category-bound rights to go second give the radio host a powerful tool with which to assess putative stories of SH as SH, or not. Combined with assessments, we also consider displays of stance since, as Stivers (2008: 32), citing Sacks (1974) and Jefferson (1978), points out, storytelling is "an activity that both takes a stance toward what is being reported and makes taking a stance by the recipient relevant". Moreover, as Stivers goes on to say (*ibid.*), there is a preference for the recipient of the story to display a stance that mirrors the stance that the teller conveys. Thus, displays of stance are also ways in which an emerging story is affiliated to, or not, and so displays of stance also perform assessments of the story.

Third, PT also takes into account wider societal 'big-D' (Gee 1999) Discourses, such as those of masculinity, which reflexively are constrained and permitted by the talk and which constrain and permit the talk. This is because, as De Fina (2000: 134) points out:

telling narratives allows people to present themselves and others in certain roles by placing themselves and others as characters in storyworlds, by negotiating social relationships and images, and by expressing, transmitting or debating social values and belief systems to which they adhere or are opposed.

This makes relevant Gee's (1999) distinction between discourse (little-d) and Discourse (big-D). Little-d discourse refers to the micro-practices of talk and the processes through which, inter alia, identities are talked into being. Big-D Discourse, on the other hand, can be defined as "the entire interlocking web of practices, structures, and ideologies: a system of understanding and exploration that prefigures which practices and interpretations are available, and how practices and structures are understood" (Kiesling 2006: 262). Thus PT, as developed by Bamberg et al. (op. cit.), pays attention to the way in which Discourses are enacted and made relevant in talk (discourse) and the way in which discourse (little-d) and Discourse (big-D) are intertwined and can be made visible through fine-grained linguistic analyses of the talk. Further, as Clifton and Van De Mieroop (2016: 2) argue, such Discourses can be seen to occur in master and counter narratives. Master narratives are "'frames' according to which courses of events can be easily plotted, simply because one's audience is taken to 'know' and accept those courses" (Bamberg 2004: 360). By contrast, counter narratives are narratives that subvert these frames in some way. Moreover, through subverting these culturally shared frames of the dominant in-group, counter narratives make them visible. For example, Munsch's story of *the Paper Bag Princess* (quoted in Bamberg 2004: 357), in which the plotline of the traditional fairy tale is left intact, but in which the male and female roles are reversed – the princess saves the prince – is an example of a counter narrative. Thus, through positioning the (gendered) characters in the story differently and juxtaposing them with culturally accepted identities, a counter narrative emerges in talk. The importance then of the master/counter narrative at the third level of positioning is that it allows the participants to talk into being particular moral versions of the world (i.e., how the world was, is, or should be, and what counts as deviant and normal).

4. The data

4.1 Talk radio as institutional interaction

As Hutchby (2006) points out, talk radio is a form of institutional interaction which, compared to conversation, is marked by epistemological and other forms of asymmetry, in some ways constraining turn taking and turn design (Heritage 1997: 164). In the case of radio talk, the participants orient to the identities of host and caller and the pre-allocation of turn types commensurate with these identities. Thus, normatively, it is the caller who orients to his/her right to take the first turn and set out his/her position on a particular issue. This leaves the second turn to the host, who can use his/her turn to display his/her stance and to evaluate the talk of the caller.

As Hutchby (1996) has shown, this second position in talk radio is often used to oppose the stance of the caller and so produce argument, which contributes to the entertainment value of the show. Further, as Hutchby (1996) has also pointed out, going second in an argument is powerful since it allows the host to evaluate the caller’s stance, whereas the caller cannot easily argue back.³ Quoting Sacks (1992, vol. 2: 348–353), Hutchby (1996: 487) argues that:

those who go first are in a weaker position than those who get to go second, since the latter can argue with the former’s position simply by taking it apart. Going first means having to set your opinion on the line, whereas going second means being able to argue merely by challenging your opponent to expand on, or account for his or her claims.

This second position evaluation, combined with other discursive resources that are pre-allocated to the host, such as the ability to close a topic simply by taking the caller off the air, places the host in a more powerful position vis-à-vis the caller – power in this instance being defined as “a discursive phenomenon in terms of participants’ differential potential to enable and constrain one another’s action” (Hutchby 1996: 483). And, as will be argued, it is this power which enables the host to talk into being a hegemonic version of masculinity and to marginalize other versions of masculinity.

4.2 The radio show

The data for this paper comes from Kenyan talk radio, more specifically Classic 105, which is an urban FM station that has been broadcasting in major urban centres since its inception in 2000. Drawing on newspaper reports and issues trending in social media, the station mainly covers entertainment, relationship, and lifestyle issues. The radio station is very popular among the urban youth and middle aged Kenyans, and its breakfast show, dubbed “Maina and Kingangi in the morning”, from which this data is taken, is arguably the number one breakfast show in Kenya. The show has two male hosts, Maina Kageni and Churchill Ndambuki, who have been running the show since it was first broadcast in 2000. Maina Kageni is a renowned media personality in Kenya, who is among the most listened to contemporary Kenyan radio presenters. Churchill Ndambuki is a leading local comedian, who goes by the studio name Mwalimu Kingangi. As hosts, Maina takes the role of the urban educated liberal Kenyan male while Mwalimu (Swahili for teacher)

3. Though, of course, the caller does have discursive resources available with which he/she can reverse the situation, but, as Hutchby (1996) argues, the host is generally in a much more powerful position.

takes the role of the uneducated rural, traditional, and backward male chauvinist. In the tradition of talk-radio and what Hutchby (2006: 65) calls the “spectacle of confrontation”, the show uses controversy and argument to provide entertainment. Indeed, the show excels in this format of courting controversy, especially of a sexual nature. It has been regularly criticised for its provocative content (Bonuke 2016), while The Media Council of Kenya, the statutory regulator of media outlets in Kenya, has often reprimanded Classic 105 over the nature of its content.

The data we analyse here consist of a series of stories and their evaluation by the hosts and subsequent callers.⁴ The data were selected for analysis simple because we happened to have them. In other words, the audio recording was analysed using a process of unmotivated looking (Psathas 1995: 45) whereby the researcher has no well-defined a priori research agenda, other than, in this case, to analyse how identities are constructed in narratives in which the participants topicalise (male) SH. The data was transcribed and through the close analysis of the talk-in-interaction, which comes about through focusing on the text as the transcription is done, a fine-grained data-driven analysis of the participants’ stories of SH and their identity work that talks gendered identities into being is achieved.

In lines 1–4, the main host, Maina Kageni, introduces the subject of the programme:

1 H eh, .hhh we were talking about that chick (.) who was fired
 2 by the Juja MP, allegedly because of turning down his sexual
 3 advances .hhh and something happened yesterday cause everything
 4 turned on its head when this guy called in=and the reaction!

The subject of the show is thus the reaction to this call from the previous day’s programme, which is further topicalised by the host playing an extract of the ‘reaction’, namely a man phoning in to say that he too had been sexually harassed (Extract 1 discussed below). Following this brief story, an assessment of this story by a second caller is then played (Extract 2, also discussed below). This story and evaluation from the previous day’s show is played several times through the discussion and is used as a springboard for the theme of the phone-in: “are men sexually harassed?” For reasons of space (the topic discussion lasts 20 minutes), it is impossible to provide a full analysis. Thus, we have chosen to analyse the ‘original story’ and its evaluation, which are used to launch the debate, and two stories in which male callers recount their experiences of SH by females. In all cases, the men are drivers and the women are the bosses’ wives. In corporate Kenya, most high ranking officials are men and most of them are entitled to cars and drivers. Once the boss has been dropped off at work, the driver is at the disposition of the boss’s wife and

4. Where necessary the talk has been translated from Kiswahili and Kikuyu into English.

children. Often, as described in the programme, the duties extend to running personal errands and this eventually leads to over-familiarization, which might lead to sexual relations between the bosses’ wives and drivers, watchmen, or even male domestic workers such as gardeners. As will be shown in the data, the bosses’ wives, associated with the power and status of their husbands, have the power to hire and fire the drivers and thus place them in a precarious and subordinate position.

5. Analysis

5.1 Story one

Story one is the narrative from the previous day’s show, which is replayed at the beginning of programme to stimulate debate and introduce the topic.

Extract 1

5 C1 Don’t think that its ladies only who go through those
6 problems. I was employed as a driver by one of the
7 bosses here in town. Chaos in the car↑.hh If you don’t
8 give me, I will fire you=
9 H =WHAT↑=
10 C1 =Oh↑ #We must do it#. My husband doesn’t even know
11 anything. Let me tell you Maina, the problems we undergo
12 as men↑ Now, what can we do↑ And I need that money.
13 #The husband# was to be paying me fifteen thousand, but
14 then I was started at ten thousand more because of that work.
15 I don’t have an option. I had to do that. I am broke. I am
16 the one who looked for a job (0.2) and I got it. But now, she
17 wants the other side too. Imagine that Maina↑
18 H Are you married?
19 C1 No↑

In line 5, the male caller begins with an assessment that it is not only ladies who “go through those problems”, which, given the story’s juxtaposition with the prior talk about the SH of women, is hearable as referring to SH. In line 6, the caller introduces himself as the protagonist who is a driver for a boss. He then moves to the complicating action⁵ which is that there was “chaos in the car” and “if you don’t give me, I will fire you” (line 8) which places him in a subordinate position vis-à-vis the boss’s wife. This talks into being an identity of the powerless man vis-à-vis the powerful woman and so the talk invokes a Discourse of male powerlessness. As

5. Whilst not arguing that stories have to be made up of certain constituent parts, we find it useful to use Labov’s (Labov and Waletzky 1967) terminology to describe certain elements of the stories.

Stivers (2008: 40) points out, reported speech is one way in which the teller provides access to the events and so provides “a way of allowing the recipient a greater opportunity to assess the situation as well as providing more insight into the teller’s likely stance”. In using reported speech, the caller thus sets up a slot for a possible display of affiliation by the host. However, in this case, the host says =WHAT↑=, which moves the story forward by asking for more information, but which also displays a stance of disbelief rather than affiliation. In the next turn, the caller orients to this as being a continuer and continues the story. He gives the coda of the story (i.e., its relevance to the here and now) which is the problems that “we undergo as men” and which, in the here and now of the interview, invokes a Discourse of male subservience and lack of agency. The use of the pronoun ‘we’ makes the protagonist a representative of ‘men’ as a generic identity and thus moves from the specific to a general problem that men face. The solution to this problem is not offered (line 12: Now, what can we do↑), and so the caller persists in presenting men as having a lack of agency: the world acts on them, rather than them acting on the world (Bamberg 2011). This, therefore, talks ‘men’ into being as powerless, which is accounted for (lines 14ff), since he “had no option” because he was “broke” and he needed the extra 10,000 shillings. The caller then passes the turn to the host and asks for his opinion (line 15: Imagine that Maina↑) which, as Stivers (2008) argues, can be seen as a pursuit of a display of stance at the end of the story. However, the host’s stance is not forthcoming and he responds by asking if the caller is married, to which the reply is negative. The implications of this question are not developed as further talk from the previous day’s show is then presented. However, the implications of the question “are you married” are taken up later since the issue of marital status reappears on the live show.

In sum, in both the teller’s identity work in the storyworld and the here-and-now of the broadcast, men are talked into being as powerless and lacking in agency; this counters a Discourse of masculinity in which masculinity is equated with dominance, being strong, authoritative and in control (Kiesling 2007: 658). Moreover, through failing to affiliate with this stance, the host displays an implicit lack of empathy with the caller’s predicament and so he orients to the story as a counter narrative. Any further talk has been edited out, since immediately after line 17, a second caller’s talk, also taken from the previous day’s show has been edited in and is juxtaposed with caller one. This talk provides an evaluation of story one, as discussed below.

Extract 2

18 C2 A fully grown man calls Classic 105.2 in the morning to complain
 19 about (getting) ten thousand on top of his five thousand and
 20 getting sexual favours on the side†. What are people doing in
 Mathare,⁶ if this
 21 person is not in Mathare? What is he complaining about?=
 22 H =What do you mean? He is being sexually harassed=
 23 C2 =Being (sexually) harassed my foot† If it was a woman, yes.
 24 But a man calls in. And he is single (.) What is he complaining
 25 about? And he is getting ten thousand on top of his fifteen
 26 thousand. And sex. Crazy person.
 27 H Mad person. Oh! My goodness (.) Are men sexually harassed? That
 28 is the question I want to ask this morning

In line 18, (male) caller two first categorises caller one as “a fully grown man” and categorises his story as “a complaint”. He then evaluates the complainant (caller one) as somebody who should be in a mental hospital because he considers that getting “sexual favours on the side and ten thousand in addition to his salary” is a complainable. Thus, the evaluation of the first story occasions the predicate (i.e. an expectable feature such as action, character trait, way of thinking, motivation, dress code, location and so on that can be inferred from identity work; Eglin and Hester 1992) of enjoying sex with women and attributes this predicate to ‘fully grown men’. The talk therefore instantiates a natural/biological Discourse of men having surplus sexuality and demand for sexual activity. Moreover, this is cast as being normative for a fully grown man, and caller two’s negative evaluation of the first story and his claim that caller one should be in a mental hospital talks caller one into being, *qua* a fully grown man, as deviant and therefore different from the in-group of ‘normal’ men. Through setting up what is normal (enjoying sex) and what is deviant (complaining about having sex with women), caller two sets up a hierarchy of masculinities: fully grown men enjoy sex and therefore cannot be sexually harassed by women, and complaining about having sex makes the complainant in some way not fully grown – an incomplete man. Moreover, through normalising this positioning of men enjoying sex as superior to others a hegemonic version of masculinity, as defined by Connell (1995: 77) as “the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women”, is talked into being. The caller’s identity work in the here and now of the broadcast normalises hegemonic masculinity and sets up an outgroup of deviant men who don’t enjoy sex with women. Such a Discourse is hegemonic because, following Gramsci (1971), the dominance of

6. Mathare is the largest Mental Health hospital in Kenya.

certain types of masculinity is not achieved by coercion; rather, it is a form of power which circulates and is made relevant through the maintenance of dominant social positions through control of the basic ideologies in a society.

In line 22, in pursuit of argument, the host initially challenges this evaluation: “What do you mean? He is being sexually harassed”. In lines 23 following, caller two repeats his evaluation: “Being (sexually) harassed my foot[↑]”. Evoking gendered difference, he then states that a woman could be sexually harassed and then juxtaposes this with a man, implying that men cannot be harassed (line 23: “If it was a woman, yes”). Thus, through this identity work, he claims that SH is gender specific: women can be harassed, but men cannot. This talks into being major elements of masculine hegemony, notably: the dichotomization of gender into the categories men and women; the attribution of difference to these categories in which men enjoy sex and have a surplus of sexual energy; and the establishment of a subservient and weaker identity for women, who can be victims of SH (Kiesling 2007: 658). Thus, caller one’s story is oriented to as a counter narrative because the male protagonist in the storyworld is evaluated as deviant: his actions do not follow the culturally accepted plotline of male dominance to be found in master narratives. As Kiesling (2006: 285) states:

in order to create dominant categories, subservient categories must be created. In fact it is by identifying and creating these subordinate categories that the dominant categories also become invisible and normative; they are ‘erased’ in a sense and the speakers can thus naturalize their power. This is one of the mechanisms of hegemony.

Moreover, marital status (as hinted at in Extract 1) is now made relevant since in the continuation of his turn the caller asks the question: “and he is single (.) What is he complaining about?” This expresses incredulity at caller one’s orientation to categorizing having sex as sexual harassment, and thus talks into being the heteronormative Discourse that ‘real’ men enjoy sex. Moreover, the identity work that this talk accomplishes, denies that for a (single) man having sex is a complainable, especially if he is also getting paid for it. Caller two then finishes his turn with the evaluation “crazy person” (line 26) which reinforces the assessment of deviance. In line 27, the host affiliates with this assessment (“mad person”). This is because, as Pomerantz (1984) points out, assessments make a second assessment a conditionally relevant next action and one way of doing agreement is to upgrade the assessment (as happens here). Following this second assessment, the host then orients to the overhearing audience and asks the question “Are men sexually harassed?” which topicalises the issue of the programme.

Thus, the radio producers through their editing work and putting together a story (caller one) and its evaluation (caller two) set up the theme for the day’s

programme. In doing so, they have used the second position to negatively assess the story which has been placed in a first position and to which, through the editing, no defence can be offered since a third slot is unavailable. Both caller two and the host use the second position to negatively evaluate the story which, on the one hand, provides controversy that makes the programme entertaining, but on the other hand does identity work that normalises hegemonic masculinity.

5.2 Story two

The show continues with some music and the diffusion of the content of text messages that the host has received. These have not been analysed for reasons of space. We pick up the analysis as caller four (the second live caller that morning) calls in and tells his story of SH.

Extract 3

101 C4 Maina.
 102 H Yes!, Good morning
 103 C4 Morning. How are you?
 104 H I am fine thank you sir
 105 C4 No:w (0.2), I was sexually harassed.
 106 H (Where) 107 C4 In twenty ten
 108 H eh
 109 C4 (yes) twenty ten, I got a job (.) and my boss had two wives.
 110 H Your boss had two wives?
 111 C4 Yes, That's right. Now, I used to drive both wives but they
 112 didn't know =didn't know that er: I used to drive both of them
 113 because I was entitled to drive both wives. In the morning, my
 114 boss used to tell me where to go
 115 H yeah
 116 C4 Now, the wives, usually I took them to so many places
 117 maybe in Kisumu or in Naivasha. When we go there,
 118 I was sexually harassed=but I was paid.

In lines 105, (male) caller four announces that he was sexually harassed. The host follows this with a probe for more information (where) and the caller begins a story. First, he sets out the characters in the story, his boss's two wives. Next, in the orientation phase of the story, he sets the scene by saying that he used to drive both wives. The complicating action is that he drove to places such as Kisumu and Naivasha, but (lines 117–118) “when we go there, I was sexually harassed=but I was paid”. The contrastive ‘but’ latched onto the assessment of the event as SH, indexes a reservation about the assessment – a reservation which is topicalised in the following talk.

Extract 4

- 119 H you were sex[ually
 120 C4 [I was well paid
 121 H but (h) when you say you were sexually harassed what
 122 happened
 123 C4 What happened is, when we go there, usually drunk=we
 124 got drunk. Then the wives would tell me, now if you want to
 125 maintain your job, if you want me to tell my husband that you
 126 drive me well (0.3) then I'll give you something
 127 H euh
 128 C4 yeah
 129 H So you did it?
 130 C4 We did it, we usually do it. Then, there was a time, my
 131 boss got suspected=suspected that something was happening.
 132 So when he asked me, I ran (0.3) I ran I could not go=I could
 133 not go=could not go to work the following day.

In line 119, the host begins to repeat the assessment (“you were sexually”). However, before the host can complete his turn, he is overlapped by caller four who upgrades the fact that he was paid (line 118) to the fact that he was “well paid” (line 120), thus accounting for his actions. However, the host does not topicalise the issue of payment and he asks for more information. The request is made with a laughter token, thus partially disaffiliating with the caller. Further, the turn also expresses scepticism since the host says “when you say you were sexually harassed” (not: when you were sexually harassed). The host thus frames his probe for more information as one seeking to confirm disbelief. Caller four continues his story using reported speech, the boss’s wife saying: “now if you want to maintain your job, if you want me to tell my husband that you drive me well (0.3) then I’ll give you something”. Through being coerced into sexual activity, the caller (cf. story one) talks himself into being as powerless in relation to his boss’s wives and thus makes relevant a non-hegemonic male identity. However, the wives, by invoking telling their husband (line 125), point to the power behind the SH – it is not the women themselves, rather it is the husband who ultimately hires and fires and so through him the wives place the driver in a subservient position. As before, the reported speech gives access to the event and makes a display of stance a relevant action (Stivers 2008). However, a display of stance that affiliates with the teller is not forthcoming; instead, the continuer “euh” (line 127) moves the talk forward but does not display any stance. The caller orients to this lack of affiliation as a display of disbelief or lack of understanding and repeats “yeah”, which reaffirms the veracity of his account. However, in the next turn, despite having arrived at the possible end of the story (which makes a display of affiliation a preferred next action; Stivers 2008), the host still fails to affiliate with the teller’s story. Rather (line 129), the host asks if they “did it”, which moves the talk to the core issue of the debate: did they have

sex or not? The caller confirms that they had sex, but then in the resolution of the complicating action, the caller states that the boss found out, so he ran away. Thus, the situation is resolved by flight rather than fight, and so again the caller talks into being a non-hegemonic masculine identity as a man who is afraid of confrontation.

In the continuation of the talk, discussed below, the host seeks to evaluate the story: was it SH or not?

Extract 5

- 134 H So, let me ask you a question.
 135 C4 Yes
 136 H How were you sexually harassed and you enjoyed it?
 137 C4 I enjoyed it
 138 H Then that's not harassment. You enjoyed it↑.
 139 C4 But↑ NO not that but she knew you know at that time,
 140 I was=I was twenty five. The woman was fifty two.
 141 H ((laughter))
 142 H(2) That's a police case
 143 C4 But NOW, I used to get money. I did it because, for what I was
 144 paid, I was getting three times more than I was given by the
 145 H wife okay! ((laugh)) are you buying into that↑ REALLY↑ Hello
 146 C5 Maina. Morning too...

In line 137, the caller confirms that he "enjoyed it" (i.e., the sex). The host then opposes the assessment of the story as SH on the grounds that "that's not harassment. You enjoyed it↑" (line 138). This, in Thornborrow's (2007) terms, is a problematizing observation, which serves to challenge the storyteller's stance and so create argument. Moreover, the host's evaluation of the story invokes a hegemonic Discourse of male sexual proclivity and desire for sex: men enjoy sex, and thus men cannot be harassed. Consequently, the host disaffiliates with the teller's stance. However, in line 139, this assessment is emphatically denied because at the time the caller was 25 and the woman was 52. Thus age is invoked as an account which explains why the activity was harassment. It also implies that had the woman been younger, this may not have constituted SH. In line 141, the first host laughs and so, by treating the prior turn as a laughable, disaffiliates with the assessment of the event as SH. However, the second host uses the second slot available to him to assess this as a 'police matter', thus evaluating it as deviant, by talking into being a 'cougar identity' (i.e. an older woman who assertively pursues younger males as sexual partners) and treating this behaviour as deviant and even criminal. As Montemurro and Siefken (2014: 37) argue, such a cougar identity constructs older women as active agents acting on passive males and so challenges heteronormative discourses of female passivity and male agency. In response to this, the caller prefacing his turn with a contrastive 'but' signals the problematic nature of the assessment and proffers a return to a topic (i.e., payment) which was abandoned by a competing line of talk

(Mazeland and Huiskes 2001). The caller then accounts for his actions in terms of his financial situation, rather than enjoyment, thus persisting with his evaluation of the story as one of SH because of the financial incentive. The first host then begins his turn with ‘okay↓’ which prefaces a move towards closure. This is followed by a laugh which disaffiliates with the caller’s stance and treats his assessment of the story as SH as a laughable. The host then addresses the overhearing audience directly: ‘are you buying into that↑ REALLY↑’. This displays a stance of scepticism towards the caller’s assessment of the story as SH. The second host then moves on to the next caller (“Hello”) and so uses his power to silence caller four by moving to closure; thereby leaving his own assessment of the event unchallenged (Hutchby 1992: 364).

In sum, through the sequential ability to go second and to evaluate the emerging story, the first host enforces a hegemonic version of masculinity in which men enjoy sex and therefore cannot be sexually harassed. This evaluation thus invokes a lay definition of SH that is at odds with accepted academic and legal definitions in which enjoyment, or non-enjoyment, of the sex is not an issue. However, the evaluation of the story is negotiable: the second host evaluates it as a police matter, thus aligning with the caller’s assessment of the event as SH and thereby making relevant an ageist Discourse of SH according to which older women can harass younger men, and which implicitly denies that men can be harassed by women of the same age group. However, this assessment is not fully developed: the caller orients to it as a side sequence and the second host takes the floor to disaffiliate with the assessment and to close down the talk. Thus, the host’s ability to cut off callers effectively leaves him with the last word and the final evaluation which is one of derision. Consequently, as with story one, this story is oriented to as a counter narrative in which the normative gender ‘roles’ of men and women in the plotline are reversed and it is assessed as a laughable.

5.3 Story three

In story three, in contrast to the previous story, the host minimally affiliates with the teller and shares the same stance, thus co-constructing an emergent hegemonic version of masculinity.

Extract 6

146 C5 Maina. Morning too
 147 H Yes↑
 148 C5 eh↑ The thing that has made me very angry with that guy who
 149 has called in
 150 H euh

151 C5 The one saying that a single man should not complain
 152 about having sex (.) he has annoyed me very much
 153 because I have gone through that. I was employed by a
 154 certain lady. I used to drive her around. But that
 155 lady, on the way to somewhere, she used to start undressing
 156 saying that I am feeling hot, my man (0.3) I would say, that
 157 having sex with her is impossible. She would complain
 158 bitterly until eventually, she fired me in an inhumane way=
 159 =she told her husband that I was interested in her. But, I did
 160 not tell her husband the truth.
 161 H okay
 162 C5 By the way, this work is very dangerous. The second job I ...

In line 148, the (male) caller occasions his call-relevant identity (Fitzgerald and Housley 2002) as one who is against the argument that men can be sexually harassed; he does this by displaying a stance of anger (line 148) and annoyance (line 152). The caller then launches into a story. In the orientation phase, he presents the protagonist, himself as the driver, and the antagonist as “a certain lady”. The complicating action is that “she used to start undressing saying that I am feeling hot, my man” (line 155). However, unlike the previous story, the resolution is that the driver refuses to have sex and as a result he is fired. In the storyworld, this talks into being a man who can resist the temptations of a woman, thus invoking a discourse of male power over women since men can retain power over them. Significantly, in the next turn, the host does not explicitly evaluate this story, but provides an acknowledgment token ‘okay’ which, following Beach (1993:329), is a short-hand way of displaying acknowledgment and/or understanding of, and affiliation/alignment with, the prior turn. Thus, in this case, rather than seeking controversy by opposing the emerging story, treating it as a laughable, or displaying disbelief, the host minimally affiliates with it. This is somewhat unusual in talk show radio since, as Hutchby (1996, 2006) has shown, hosts often take up a confrontational stance in order to create argument and so provide a spectacle of confrontation for the audience. (In line 162, the caller then continues with a second story of resisting temptation, which is not discussed here for reasons of space).

In sum, in this storyworld, the caller’s version of masculinity that is talked into being is one of empowerment and having the strength to resist the temptation of women. In the here and now of the radio programme, this evaluation is not derided or contradicted by the host. In this story, men are not subservient to women’s use of their sexual capital (Hakim 2010) and so at a Discursive level a form of hegemonic masculinity is talked into being in which men are able to resist ‘feminine charms’ and therefore have power over women. As Landis-Schriff (1996: 16; quoted in Dougherty 1999: 447) argues:

our ability to control is inextricably connected with our self-worth and to the true measure of our masculinity. This includes our sexuality. Much of traditional male sexuality is embedded in a 'power over' world view. This means exerting dominance and mastery over others whilst maintaining self-control and composure in sexual relationships and in sex itself.

6. Discussions and conclusion

As pointed out in the introduction, there are many perspectives on what is, and is not, (male) SH. Contextually bound and locally situated common sense lay definitions may be at odds with more refined academic and legal definitions, and indeed some people might argue that (male) SH does not exist. The purpose of this paper was to analyse from an emic perspective how callers to a radio talk show and the hosts negotiate the answer to the question of what is SH through stories and evaluations of the stories, and to analyse the identity work that such stories and evaluations perform. In sum, the evaluations of the stories by the host and other callers to the show normalise a hegemonic version of masculinity which is "about power and dominance, about being at the top of some perceived social hierarchy, even if that hierarchy is composed only of men" (Kiesling 2006: 269). Thus, as the present paper shows, the male identity that is normalised and not treated with derision is that of the protagonist of the third story, who has agency, resists temptation, and has the power to act on the world rather than being acted on by the world. The caller thus exemplifies a hegemonic version of masculinity that talks men into being as "strong, authoritative, and in control, especially when compared to women" (Kiesling 2007: 658). By contrast, in stories one and two (in which the protagonists in the storyworld are talked into being as powerless and subservient to their boss's wives), the host and subsequent callers evaluate the protagonists as deviant. They thus invoke a hierarchy of masculinities in which 'fully grown' men, especially if they are single, have the predicate of liking sex – which itself can be linked with power. As Dworkin (1987: 63) states, "the normal fuck by a normal man is taken to be an act of invasion and ownership undertaken in a mode of predation: colonializing, forceful (manly) or nearly violent; the sexual act that by its nature makes her his". Sex is about dominance: fully grown men dominate and are not dominated by women and therefore cannot be sexually harassed. The drivers, despite their economic subservience to the women (the boss' wives) who through their husbands can be instrumental in firing the drivers, are still evaluated as in some way deviant (not proper men) if they fail to resist the boss's wives sexual advances.

This hegemonic version of masculinity is talked into being through the hosts' and subsequent callers' ability to go second and evaluate the SH stories. This

evaluation talks the stories of male SH into being as counter narratives, to the extent that the role of the protagonists are reversed and the powerful male, enjoying sexual conquest is replaced by the powerful female, albeit associated with their husband's power, enjoying sexual conquest. These stories, oriented to as counter narratives by the hosts and subsequent callers, are negatively evaluated and their putative assessment as cases of SH is denied. However, the data here also shows that what is, and is not, a counter/master narrative is not clear-cut, since in the case of story two the hosts evaluate the story differently. The second host's assessment makes an ageist element relevant to SH. This, we argue, suggests that what is, or is not, a master narrative is a member's issue rather than a researcher's issue; one possible place for displaying an orientation to a story as a master or counter narrative is in members' evaluations of stories.

Orientation to stories as either counter narratives or master narratives through access to more powerful and institutionally sanctioned discursive resources (i.e. the ability to go second) is important because (as shown in this data) the host's evaluation of stories as counter narratives effectively erases male SH. The consequence of this, as with SH of women prior to the rise of feminism, is that (male) SH is unnoticed, ignored, and left to fester. Through refusing to accept stories on this radio show as SH, the host and subsequent callers enforce a form of hegemonic masculinity which refuses to see men as being powerless in the face of more powerful women. The consequences of this go beyond the storyworld because, as De Fina (2015: 363) points out, the identities that people make relevant in the storyworld reproduce and confirm normative behaviours that are expected in the 'real' world, and so:

they may also reproduce and recirculate generally shared representations about self and others, and indexical associations between categories and characteristics or behaviours that are dictated by habitus – "the set of dispositions" or implicit views that, according to Bourdieu (1979: 72), underlies common sense constructions about social relationships and identities.

The hosts' evaluations thus endorse models of behaviour that should be followed in the real world and are thus moral evaluations. The moral of these stories is that if men are powerful, they can resist temptation, and if they are coerced into sexual relations because they enjoy sex, this cannot be classed as SH. Thus the locally situated identity work that the hosts and callers carry out in this data is a far cry from accepted academic and legal definitions. The effect of this identity work and the evaluation of these stories is that the victims of SH are silenced: what happened to them was not SH. As Clair (1994: 59) notes, "this silence is indicative of oppression grounded in cultural assumptions about sexuality and sex roles and in the power relationships of formal organisations". The silencing of (male) victims of SH

through the operation of hegemonic masculinity in the public sphere means that they cannot receive support, because their plight is hidden: thus, lacking a term to describe it, male harassment becomes literally unspeakable. With this observation in mind, it is hoped that the present paper has gone some way to making the machinery of talk with which stories of male SH are derided and suppressed, visible. Consequently, we also hope to go some way to lifting the taboo on male SH so that it is recognised and made available for change.

However, we also recognise that this paper is a single case analysis, albeit from an extremely popular and influential talk radio show, which may, or may not, be representative of views on male SH in Kenya. Further studies of talk regarding male SH in Kenya would be needed to make any claims relating to the extent that this data represents 'a typical (Kenyan) view' of what is, and is not, male SH. Nevertheless, the influence of Kenya's number one breakfast talk radio show should not be underestimated. As the Media Council for Kenya (2014: 8) points out, in Kenya, radio "is considered powerful because of its wide reach, and because it's relatively affordable compared to other media such as television". Moreover, the report goes on to argue that radio has the ability to affect community behaviour because it provides "an open mike forum where individuals within a society can express opinions, legitimize actions, and mobilize fellow listeners" (2014: 14). The extent of such influence is beyond the scope of the present paper. However, this paper does show a mechanism by which heteronormative views of male SH are enforced and disseminated on talk radio and as such, in the spirit of cumulative qualitative investigation, the paper adds to existing work on the doing of male hegemony. Moreover, following Peräkylä's (2011: 376) observations concerning the validity of fine-grained analyses of naturally-occurring talk, such a single case qualitative analysis has generalisability because it makes visible the seen but unnoticed resources that radio hosts or others with access to asymmetric discursive resources *can* use to evaluate stories of SH. Thus, the discursive resources described in this paper and their use to enforce a heteronormative master narrative of SH may be evident in other situations. Yet, in order to have a fuller picture, further research is to be encouraged into how hegemonic masculinity is achieved in radio-talk and in other venues.

References

- Atkinson, J. Maxwell. 1982. "Understanding formality: the categorization and production of 'formal' interaction." *British Journal of Sociology* 33: 86–117.
- Bamberg, Michael. 1997. "Positioning between structure and performance". *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7: 335–342.

- Bamberg, Michael. 2004. "Considering counter narrative". In *Considering counter-narratives: Narrating, resisting, making sense*, ed. by Michael Bamberg and Molly Andrews, 351–372. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bamberg, Michael. 2011. "Narrative practice and identity navigation". In *Varieties of narrative analysis* ed. by James Holstein and Jaber Gubrium, 99–124. London: Sage.
- Bamberg, Michael, and Alexandra Georgakopoulou. 2008. "Small stories as a new perspective in narrative and identity analysis". *Text & Talk* 28(3): 377–396.
- Bamberg, Michael, Anna De Fina, and Deborah Schiffrin. 2011. "Discourse and identity construction". In *Handbook of identity theory and research* ed. by Seth Schwartz, Koen Luyckx and Vivian Vignoles, 177–199. Berlin & New York: Springer.
- Beach, Wayne. 1993. "Transitional regularities for 'casual' 'okay' usages". *Journal of Pragmatics* 19(4): 325–352.
- Berdahl, Jennifer. 2007. "Harassment based on sex: Protecting social status in the context of gender hierarchy". *Academy of Management Review* 32(2): 641–658.
- Bingham, Shereen. 1994. "Introduction: Framing sexual harassment – defining a discursive focus of study". In *Conceptualizing sexual harassment as discursive practice* ed. by Shereen Bingham, 1–16. Westport, Conn.: Praeger Publishers.
- Bonuke, Paul. 2016. End of Maina Kageni and Mwalimu King'ang'i. *Business Today* (June 25th). Available at: <http://www.businesstoday.co.ke/end-of-maina-kageni-and-mwalimu-kingangi/>
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1979. *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clair, Robin. 1994. "Hegemony and harassment: A discursive practice". In *Conceptualizing sexual harassment as discursive practice* ed. by Shereen Bingham, 59–70. Westport, Conn.: Praeger Publishers.
- Clifton, Jonathan and Dorien Van De Mieroop. 2016. *Master narratives, identities, and the stories of former slaves*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Connell, R. W. [Raewyn] 1995. *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- De Fina, Anna. 2015. "Narrative and identities". In *The Handbook of Narrative Analysis* ed. by Anna De Fina and Alexandra Georgakopoulou, 351–368. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell,
- De Fina, Anna and Alexandra Georgakopoulou. 2008. "Analysing narratives as practices". *Qualitative Research* 8(3): 379–387.
- Dougherty, Debbie. 1999. "Dialogue through standpoint understanding women's and men's standpoints of sexual harassment". *Management Communication Quarterly* 12(3): 436–468.
- Dworkin, Andrea. 1987. *Intercourse*. New York: Free Press.
- Eglin, Peter, and Stephen Hester. 1992. "Category, predicate and task: The pragmatics of practical action." *Semiotica* 88: 243–68.
- Eyre, Linda. 2000. "The discursive framing of sexual harassment in a university community". *Gender and Education* 12(3): 293–307.
- Fitzgerald, Louise. 1996. "Sexual harassment: the definition and measurement of a construct". In *Sexual Harassment on College Campuses: Abusing the Ivory Power* (2nd edition) ed. by Michele Paludi, 25–47. New York: SUNY Press.
- Fitzgerald, Richard, and William Housley. 2002. "Identity, categorization and sequential organization: the sequential and categorial flow of identity in a radio phone-in". *Discourse & Society* 13(5): 579–602.
- Freeman, Mark. 2006. "Life on holiday? In defense of big stories". *Narrative Inquiry* 16(1): 131–138.
- Gee, James. 1999. *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. London & New York: Routledge.

- Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. 2007. *Small stories, interaction and identities*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. London: Lawrence Wishart.
- Grauerholz, Elizabeth. 1994. "Gender socialization and communication: The inscription of sexual harassment in social life". In *Conceptualizing sexual harassment as discursive practice* ed. by Shereen Bingham, 33–42. Westport, Conn.: Praeger Publishers.
- Hakim, Catherine. 2010. "Erotic capital". *European Sociological Review* 2(5): 499–518.
- Hale, Angela, and Maggie Opondo. 2005. "Humanising the cut flower chain: Confronting the realities of flower production for workers in Kenya." *Antipode* 37(2): 301–323.
- Heritage, John. 1997. "Conversation analysis and institutional talk: analysing data". In *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* ed. by David Silverman, 161–182. London: Sage.
- Hutchby, Ian. 1992. "Confrontation talk: Aspects of 'interruption' in argument sequences on talk radio". *Text and Talk* 12(3): 343–372.
- Hutchby, Ian. 1996. "Power in discourse: The case of arguments on a British talk radio show". *Discourse & Society* 7(4): 481–497.
- Hutchby, Ian. 2006. *Media talk: Conversation analysis and the study of broadcasting*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1978. "Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation". In *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* ed. by Jim Schenkein, 219–248. New York: Academic.
- Kameri-Mbote, Patricia. 2000. "Violence against women in Kenya: an analysis of law, policy and institutions". *International Environmental Law Research Centre (IELRC) Working Paper*.
- Kiesling, Scott. 2006. "Hegemonic identity making in narrative". In *Discourse and identity* ed. by Anna De Fina, Deborah Schiffrin, and Michael Bamberg, 261–297. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kiesling, Scott. 2007. "Men, masculinities, and language". *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1(6): 653–673.
- Kitzinger, Celia, and Alison Thomas. 1995. "Sexual harassment: A discursive approach". In *Feminism and discourse: Psychological perspectives* ed. by Sue Wilkinson and Celia Kitzinger, 32–48. London: Sage.
- Labov, William, and Joshua Waletzky. 1967. "Narrative Analysis". In *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts* ed. by June Helm, 12–44. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Landis-Schiff, Tom. 1996. "Sexual harassment: Why men don't understand it". *Initiatives* 57(2): 15–25.
- Lee, Deborah. 2000. "Hegemonic masculinity and male feminisation: The sexual harassment of men at work". *Journal of Gender Studies* 9(2): 141–155.
- Lukes, Steven. 1974. *Power: A radical view*. Vol. 1. Macmillan, London.
- MacKinnon, Catharine. 1979. *Sexual harassment of working women: A case of sex discrimination*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Mahugu, Mary, Wanjiku Jennifer Khamasi, Kisilu Kitainge, G. Were, Rachel Karei, Fatuma Karei and Hosea Kiplagat. 2013. "Reversed roles? Sexual harassment of male students by female colleagues". *Journal of African Studies in Educational Management and Leadership* 2: 23–38.
- Mazeland, Harrie, and Huiskes, Mike. 2001. "Dutch 'BUT' as a sequential conjunction: Its use as a resumption marker". In *Studies in Interactional Linguistics* ed. by Margret Selting and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 141–169. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Media Council of Kenya. 2014. *Free Speech or Cheap Talk. Assessing the application of ethical standards and professionalism in talk radio*. Media Council of Kenya. Nairobi, Kenya. Available at: http://www.mediacouncil.or.ke/en/mck/jdownloads/MEDIA%20MONITORING%20REPORTS/media_monitoring_report_on_radiotalk_shows_19_may_2014.pdf.
- Montemurro, Beth, and Jenna Marie Siefken. 2014. "Cougars on the prowl? New perceptions of older women's sexuality". *Journal of Aging Studies* 28: 35–43.
- Muasya, Juliet. 2014. "Effects of sexual harassment on women student's access to opportunities and facilities: a case study of the University of Nairobi, Kenya". *Global Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences* 3: 83–90.
- Muir, Janette and Kathryn Mangus. 1994. "Talk about sexual harassment: women's stories on a woman's story". In *Conceptualizing sexual harassment as discursive practice* ed. by Shereen Bingham, 91–106. Westport, Conn.: Praeger Publishers.
- Onsongo, Jane. 2006. "Gender inequalities in universities in Kenya." In *Gender inequalities in Kenya* eds. by Colin Creighton and Felicia Yieke, 31–48. UNESCO.
- Pomerantz, Anita. 1984. "Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes." In *Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* ed. by J. M. Atkinson and John Heritage, 57–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Psathas, George. 1995. *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction*. London: Sage.
- Peräkylä, Anssi. 2011. "Validity in research on naturally occurring social interaction." In *Qualitative research* ed. by David Silverman (Third Edition), 365–382. London: Sage.
- Pina, Afroditi, Theresa Gannon, and, Benjamin Saunders. 2009. "An overview of the literature on sexual harassment: Perpetrator, theory, and treatment issues". *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 14(2): 126–138.
- Quinn, Beth. 2002. "Sexual harassment and masculinity. The power and meaning of "girl watching". *Gender & Society* 16(3): 386–402.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1974. "An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation". In *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking* ed. by Richard Bauman & Joel Sherzer, 337–353. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures on conversation*. Oxford & Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Scarduzio, Jennifer, and Patricia Geist-Martin. 2010. "Accounting for victimization: Male professors' ideological positioning in stories of sexual harassment". *Management Communication Quarterly* 24(3): 419–445.
- Sifuna, Daniel N. 2006. "A review of major obstacles to women's participation in higher education in Kenya." *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* 11(1): 85–105.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2008. "Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is token of affiliation." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41(1): 31–57.
- Thornborrow, Joanna. 2007. "Narrative, opinion and situated argument in talk show discourse." *Journal of Pragmatics* 39(8): 1436–1453.
- Vohlidalová, Marta. 2011. "The perception and construction of sexual harassment by Czech university students". *Sociologický časopis/Czech Sociological Review* 6: 1119–1147.

About the authors

Dr. Joy Mueni is a senior lecturer at Riara University, Kenya, where she is also the chair of the Multimedia Journalism department. She holds a PhD in Communication and Information Studies from the University of Nairobi. Her PhD was a comparative study concerning the representation of women in soap operas from the North and the South of Kenya. Her research interests focus on media representation, popular media culture, gender mainstreaming, and promoting media freedom and excellence. Her mission in life is to work towards the achievement of an empowered society by the provision of information to all classes of people. Also, through mass media and education, she aims to promote a society that is sensitive to the dynamics of development and diversity.

Jonathan Clifton has a PhD in applied linguistics from Antwerp University, Belgium. He is now teaching business communication at the University of Valenciennes, France. Using naturally-occurring talk as data, his research interests are focussed on the discursive construction of identity in various venues. He has a particular interest in leader identity and the doing of leadership in workplace interaction.

Authors' addresses

Joy Mueni
Multimedia Journalism Department
Riara University
P. O. Box 49940 – 00100
Nairobi
Kenya
jmueni@riarauniversity.ac.ke

Jonathan Clifton
University of Valenciennes
Rue des Cent Têtes
59300 Valenciennes
France
jonathan.clifton@univ-valenciennes.fr