

Department of Social Research  
University of Helsinki  
Finland

# **WOMEN AS PERPETRATORS OF VIOLENCE**

MEANINGS OF GENDER AND VIOLENCE IN THE  
TABLOID PRESS AND IN THE NARRATIVES OF WOMEN  
IMPRISONED FOR VIOLENT CRIMES

**Satu Venäläinen**

ACADEMIC DISSERTATION

To be presented, with the permission of the Faculty of Social Sciences of the  
University of Helsinki, for public examination in auditorium XIII,  
University main building, on November 10th, 2017, at 12 noon.

Helsinki 2017

Publications of the Faculty of Social Sciences 62 (2017)  
Social Psychology

Distribution and sales:  
Unigrafia, Helsinki  
<https://shop.unigrafia.fi/>

Cover picture: Satu Venäläinen

ISSN 2343-273X (Print)  
ISSN 2343-2748 (Online)  
ISBN 978-951-51-3279-6 (Paperback)  
ISBN 978-951-51-3280-2 (PDF)

Unigrafia  
Helsinki 2017

# ABSTRACT

Public discourse tends to position women who have committed crimes of violence as deviant 'others' who transgress gendered expectations about proper womanhood. Moreover, it has been claimed in academic discussions that women's use of violence is recurrently made sense of in stereotypical and reductionist terms that reproduce gendered, binary categorizations and hierarchical differences among different groups of women. This doctoral dissertation is based on an interest in the possibilities for making sense of women's use of violence and of their identities related to it in a contemporary Finnish context. It analyses discursive constructions of women and the violence perpetrated by them in both crime news in the tabloid press and the narratives of women imprisoned for violent crimes. Theoretically and methodologically the dissertation draws primarily upon feminist poststructural theorizations and critical discursive psychology, the aim being to integrate a variety of perspectives and analytical approaches. The focus is on gender, approached through concepts of identity, subjectification, agency and affects. Critical engagement with these concepts in the dissertation opens up new ways of approaching the gendered dynamics of violence.

The dissertation comprises four sub-studies, two of which focus on analyses of tabloid news reports and the other two on the narratives of women serving a prison sentence. Sub-study I investigates how relations between gender categories and violence are constructed, and how notions about gender are drawn upon in making sense of lethal intimate partner violence in tabloid news reports. Sub-study II explores the ways in which women's violent action is made sense of in terms of agency and the constitution of identities in the reports. The narratives of women serving a prison sentence for violent crimes are analysed in sub-study III, focusing on how otherness is negotiated in the context of gendered identity enactments. Finally, sub-study IV analyses the ways in which meanings are attached to violent action in the imprisoned women's narratives in combination with discursive and affective enactments of selves.

The analyses show how both the tabloid news reports and the imprisoned women's narratives about violence lay emphasis on women's individual agency. However, unlike the news reports, many of the imprisoned women's narratives also include descriptions of obstructed agency and interlinkages between victimhood and the perpetration of violence. The analyses of the news reports also illustrate how newsworthy stories that emphasize the deviance of women suspected of violent crimes are constructed through various discursive processes that draw upon prevalent notions of femininity. The positionings enacted in relation to gendered meanings in the imprisoned women's narratives, in turn, often appear ambivalent, including both alignments and

dis-alignments in relation to attributes attached to womanhood in an effort to grapple with the threat of being perceived as a deviant 'other'.

The dissertation contributes to the development of methodological and theoretical approaches to exploring relations between gender, womanhood and violence that accommodate complexity and thus work against reductionism. Furthermore, it charts theoretical and methodological experimentation that combines an interest in discourse and affects, and facilitates the viewing of social-psychological practices of gendered identification as both adaptive and patterned.

# TIIVISTELMÄ

Julkisessa keskustelussa väkivaltaa tehneet naiset asemoidaan usein poikkeuksellisiksi 'toisiksi', joiden nähdään rikkovan sukupuolistuneita odotuksia 'oikeanlaisesta' naiseudesta. Akateemisissa keskusteluissa on tuotu esiin näkemys, jonka mukaan naisten väkivallasta tehdään usein selkoa pelkistävillä, stereotypisoivilla tavoilla, jotka ylläpitävät ja tuottavat sukupuolistuneita kategorisointeja ja hierarkisoivia eroja eri tavoin feminiinisyyteen suhteessa olevien naisten välille. Tässä väitöskirjassa kiinnostus kohdistuu suomalaisessa kontekstissa vallitseviin mahdollisuuksiin luoda käsityksiä naisten tekemästä väkivallasta ja naisten identiteeteistä suhteessa väkivaltaan. Tutkimuksessa analysoidaan naisten ja väkivallan diskursiivista rakentumista iltapäivälehtien rikosuutisoinnissa ja väkivaltarikosten vuoksi vankilatuomiota suorittavien naisten kertomuksissa. Tutkimus ammentaa teoreettisesti ja metodologisesti feministisestä poststrukturalismista ja kriittisestä diskursiivisesta psykologiasta, useampia eri lähestymistapoja yhdistellen. Sukupuolen ohella tutkimusta keskeisesti ohjaavia käsitteitä ovat identiteetti, subjektifikaatio, toimijuus ja affektit. Näiden käsitteiden kriittisen tarkastelun kautta väitöskirja avaa uudenlaisia tapoja lähestyä väkivallan sukupuolistunutta dynamiikkaa.

Väitöskirja koostuu neljästä osa-analyysistä, joista kahdessa ensimmäisessä analysoidaan iltapäivälehtien uutisointia ja kahdessa jälkimmäisessä vankilatuomiota suorittavien naisten kertomuksia. Osa-analyysissa I tarkastellaan sukupuolikategorioiden ja väkivallan välille muodostuvia suhteita iltapäivälehdissä, ja näiden linkittymistä ja hyödyntämistä selonteoissa kuolemaan johtaneesta parisuhdeväkivallasta. Osa-analyysi II kohdistuu naisten tekemään väkivaltaan iltapäivälehdissä liitetyn toimijuuden ja identiteettien kuvauksiin. Osa-analyysissa III tarkastellaan vankilatuomiota suorittavien naisten kertomuksia toiseuden neuvottelun ja sukupuolistuneiden identiteettien muodostumisen näkökulmasta. Osa-analyysi IV kohdistuu vankilatuomiota suorittavien naisten tekemäänsä väkivaltaan liittämiin merkityksiin ja niiden sidoksiin suhteessa minuuden tuottamisen tapoihin.

Analyysit tuovat esiin kuinka naisten yksilötoimijuuden kuvaukset korostuvat sekä iltapäivälehtien että vankilatuomiota suorittavien naisten kertomuksissa väkivallasta. Toisin kuin iltapäivälehtien uutisointi, vankilatuomiota suorittavien naisten kertomukset kuitenkin sisälsivät myös kuvauksia estyneestä toimijuudesta ja uhriuden ja väkivallan tekemisen yhteenkietoutumisesta. Iltapäivälehtien uutisointiin kohdistuneet analyysit kuvaavat myös kuinka uutisarvoisia, väkivaltarikoksista epäiltyjen naisten poikkeavuutta korostavia tarinoita tuotetaan erinäisten diskursiivisten prosessien kautta, joissa nojaututaan vallitseviin käsityksiin feminiinisyydestä. Vankilatuomiota suorittavien naisten kertomuksissa

puolestaan toiseuden neuvotteluun ja arvokkaana näyttäytymiseen liittyi sekä naiseuteen yleisesti yhdistettyihin merkityksiin kiinnittymisiä että niistä erkaantumisia.

Tutkimus tekee kontribuution metodologisten ja teoreettisten lähestymistapojen kehittelyyn, joiden avulla on mahdollista hahmottaa sukupuolen, naiseuden ja väkivallan välisten suhteiden monivaihteisuutta. Tämän lisäksi tutkimus pohjautuu teoreettisiin ja metodologisiin kokeiluihin, joiden myötä pyritään yhdistelemään diskursiivisen toiminnan ja affektien tarkastelua, ja löytämään näkökulmia sosiaalipsykologisten ja sukupuolistuneiden tunnistamisen ja tunnistautumisen käytäntöjen liukuvuuteen ja jäähmyyteen.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

About seven years ago, when doing my master's thesis on gender and violence, I started to notice the advertisement bills of tabloids announcing (for example) the failure of a woman suspected of murder to cry in her trial. It was not hard to see how gender was present in those sensational headlines, calling for a closer examination. Furthermore, these headlines and the topic of women as perpetrators of violence as a whole tapped keenly into my longstanding interest in the social dynamics of phenomena describable, for instance, as stereotyping, categorization, and misrecognition, that for a large part had initially moved me towards social psychology and the study of gender, both of which engage with such dynamics in their own ways.

It is impossible to convey here, on paper, the multitude of aspects, sensations (often double-edged), engagements and dis-engagements, and opportunities for learning and gaining insight that doing this PhD study has involved. As always, this has not been an endeavor accomplished by an individual actor (despite the seductiveness of such a mode of accounting), but rather several other actors have played crucial roles in taking the endeavor to its current point. First of all, I am grateful for my supervisors, Docent Päivi Berg and Professor Suvi Ronkainen. Päivi, you have been along since my master's thesis, and your support has been pivotal in starting my PhD journey and throughout it until the end. You were not spared from the difficult, affective aspects of this process, but were able to stay with them, always present with soothing advice and comments. Thank you. Suvi, I have been honored to have you as my supervisor, and continue to be in awe of your insight. When commenting on my work, sometimes one of your sentences, or even a single word, would linger with me for long, significantly helping with the constant interrogation of the directions I headed in. I keep coming back to your writings about gender, subjecthood and violence, as their piercing astuteness reveals itself to me layer by layer.

I wish to thank the pre-examiners of this dissertation, Professor Ann Phoenix and Docent Minna Nikunen, for your thoughtful comments that helped me put the final touches on this work, and Professor Phoenix for agreeing to act as my opponent in the public defense of this dissertation.

About halfway the process I became a student in The Doctoral Programme in Gender, Culture, and Society (SKY) at the University of Helsinki. I was also fortunate in getting a salaried position in the programme, which was instrumental in allowing me to finalize this work. The SKY Meets organized by the programme, along with the SKY courses I participated in, allowed to get valuable feedback from peers and instructors knowledgeable in gender studies, and functioned as important checkpoints along the way. In addition to the salaried position, this work was funded with grants by The Finnish Foundation for Alcohol Studies and Oskar Öflund Foundation.

Besides funding, what made this study possible was the participation of women in prisons. I am grateful for all the women who participated in the study, and the contact persons in prisons who made the research encounters within the prison walls possible.

I am also grateful for Professor Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, the head of the discipline of Social Psychology at the University of Helsinki, for her support within the discipline. Anna-Maija also made available valuable opportunities for gaining experience in teaching, which importantly provided sustenance especially during times without funding. Moreover, I am grateful for Anna-Maija for inviting me to the meetings of Everyday Thinking group, which offered a relaxed and comfortable environment for discussing social psychological research – especially the branch that is concerned with the construction and the workings of common sense – amidst the changes taking place in the research community and the university.

During the six years of doing this PhD study I participated in various seminars, workshops and courses that provided a variety of influences on my thinking and doing. I am particularly grateful for the following Professors for advice and comments in these contexts: Pekka Sulkunen, Jukka Törrönen, Steph Lawler, Don Kulick, Linda McKie, Nico Carpentier, Lisa Blackman, Patricia Clough, Dortha Staunæs, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Eva Bendix Petersen, and Bronwyn Davies.

The network meetings of Critical Criminology Network, led by Professors Päivi Honkatukia and Kristiina Brunila, allowed to delve into the specifics of the subject area and to get a feel of a criminological viewpoint. I am thankful for everyone who commented on my papers in the network meetings. I am also grateful for Vera Virolainen for initiating networking around the topic of women in prison. Other seminars that provided valuable feedback for which I am grateful were the PhD seminar in Social Psychology, the PhD seminar Action, Interaction and Social Relationships, and the Interdisciplinary Gender Studies PhD Seminar led by Professor Marjut Jyrkinen. It was in the last mentioned seminar where I got to know Teija Rantala and Liisa Tuomi, with whom I have shared with joy parts of this process.

The critical reading group, with Jose Cañada, Kamilla Karhunmaa, Johanna Kronstedt, Rusten Menard, Katarina Pettersson and Tuure Tammi, provided for a refreshing break from work in isolation, and allowed for invigorating (and yes, as Katarina described in the acknowledgements of her PhD, animated) discussions around various intriguing theoretical, philosophical and methodological questions. With Jose and Kamilla, accompanied now by Elina Helosvuori and Heta Tarkkala, we continued to reading Barad together, with Haraway's recent work next on the list. Looking forward!

The most memorable of the conferences that I have attended during this process has been the International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry (ICQI) in Urbana-Champaign, which I attended in years 2014 and 2016. The congress and its inspirational programme has given me courage to seek for innovative

ways of doing qualitative research, and has allowed to grasp the inherent multiplicity in the community of qualitative researchers. I am also particularly grateful for the welcoming reception of the special interest group in Critical and Poststructural Qualitative Psychology with its varying assemblies at the congress, and hope to join the working groups organized by the group again in years to come.

I am deeply grateful for my colleague, and former office roommate, Rusten Menard, not only for your help with revising the language of my articles, but for companionship throughout this process. Together we have racked our brains in engaging with the intricacies of socio-semiotic theory and the techniques of discursive analyses, the nature of qualitative research, and of course the ever-present questions of power. I truly value our discussions and the time we have shared.

Others with whom I have had most intriguing and pleasurable conversations (often after hours) about topics ranging from ontologies and epistemologies to the politics in the university and the uncertainties of the PhD process and academic lives, include, in particular, Miira Niska, Antero Olakivi, Jose Cañada, and Johanna Kronstedt. Your company, along with others from the discipline of social psychology, reminded me throughout the process that academic work/life need not only include intra-acting with elements such as texts, ideas, and the computer. I am also thankful for friends outside work for helping me to keep it real, and for the members of my families for support and for enabling a resilient belief in impossible things.

At the last stages of writing this dissertation I was invited by Tuija Virkki to join her and Maija Jäppinen in a project focusing on othering and violence. I am grateful for your supportiveness during the finalization of my dissertation, and for the opportunity to continue to delve into the topic of women and violence, and thus to expand the inquiry that began in this dissertation. Thus the journey does not end here, but will slide into new directions shaped in new assemblages and encounters.

Helsinki, October 2017  
Satu Venäläinen

# CONTENTS

Abstract .....	3
Tiivistelmä .....	5
Acknowledgements .....	7
Contents .....	10
List of original publications.....	13
1 Introduction.....	14
1.1 Women and violence.....	14
1.2 The Finnish context, gender and violence.....	16
1.3 Overarching theoretical and methodological orientations ....	18
1.3.1 A dual approach to gender.....	18
1.3.2 Language and writing .....	20
2 Becoming suspect: womanhood and violence .....	22
2.1 Quantities and notions of change in discussions on women’s use of violence .....	22
2.2 Research on the causes and contexts of women’s use of violence .....	24
2.3 Gendered categorizations and the meanings of women’s use of violence.....	26
2.3.1 Women and violence in the media and the courts .....	26
2.3.2 Criminalized women’s own accounts of violence .....	30
2.4 Doing and narrating violence.....	31
3 Becoming a subject: entangling identities, agencies and affect(s) .	34
3.1 Subjecthood and identity.....	34
3.2 (Dis)continuities of identities.....	37
3.3 Affectivity and the impossibility of staying intact .....	38
3.4 Discursive and material agencies.....	43

3.4.1	The main debates and dilemmas over agency .....	43
3.4.2	New feminist materialism and agency .....	45
3.5	Conceptual hybridizing: affective identificatory practices ....	48
3.6	Research questions .....	49
4	Methodologies .....	51
4.1	Feminist methodologies .....	51
4.2	Post-foundational methodologies .....	53
4.2.1	The post-qualitative critique.....	53
4.2.2	Diffractions, intra-action and promiscuity in research....	55
4.3	Affect(s) in researching violence .....	58
4.4	Ethical considerations .....	59
5	Research materials and analytical threads .....	62
5.1	Tabloid news reports .....	62
5.2	Imprisoned women’s narratives .....	64
5.2.1	Research encounters in prison .....	64
5.2.2	The written accounts and interviews .....	69
5.3	Analytical threads .....	71
5.3.1	Critical discursive psychology (CDP), interpretative repertoires and positioning.....	72
5.3.2	Membership categorization analysis (MCA) .....	73
5.3.3	Socio-semiotics and modalities of action.....	76
5.3.4	Incorporating affects into discursive analysis .....	79
6	Analyses .....	81
6.1	Sub-analysis I: Women, men, and the sense-making of lethal intimate partner violence in the tabloid press .....	81
6.2	Sub-analysis II: Entanglements of agency and the identities of women accused of violence in the tabloid press .....	82

6.3	Sub-analysis III: Conversing (with) gendered otherness in the narratives of women imprisoned for violent crimes .....	84
6.4	Sub-analysis IV: Relations of violence and one('s)self in the narratives of women imprisoned for violent crimes .....	86
7	Discussion .....	88
7.1	The tabloids and prison narratives in dialogue .....	88
7.1.1	Being identified and identifying one self.....	88
7.1.2	Meanings of violence and its relations with gender .....	92
7.2	The allure of individuality .....	94
7.2.1	Vulnerability and autonomy.....	94
7.2.2	The trouble with victimhood (versus agency).....	95
7.3	The impure life of gender .....	99
7.4	Against simplicity .....	101
	References .....	104
	Appendix I.....	128
	Appendix II .....	130
	Appendix III.....	132
	Appendix IV .....	133
	Appendix V.....	134
	Appendix VI .....	135

# LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS

This thesis is based on the following publications:

- I Venäläinen, Satu (2016). “She must be an odd kind of woman”: Gendered categorizations in accounts of lethal intimate partner violence in Finnish tabloid news. *Feminism & Psychology*, 26(4), 426–443.
- II Venäläinen, Satu (2016). What are true women *not* made of? Agency and identities of “violent” women in tabloids in Finland. *Feminist Media Studies*, 16(2), 261–275.
- III Venäläinen, Satu (2017). Conversations with otherness: Violence and womanhood in narratives of women imprisoned for violent crimes. *European Journal of Women’s Studies*. Epub ahead of print, doi: 10.1177/1350506817693869.
- IV Venäläinen, Satu (2017). “I no longer let anyone hit me for free”: Affective identificatory practices of women imprisoned for violent crimes. *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 25(2), 126–140.

The publications are referred to in the text by their roman numerals.

The original articles are reprinted here with the kind permission of the copyright holders, Sage (I and III) and Taylor & Francis (II and IV).

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Women and violence

Acts of violence committed by women is an issue that tends to arouse intense debate both in everyday talk and in academic discussion. Women's use of violence has attracted attention in Finnish public arenas in recent years, particularly following a few high-profile cases of violent crime with women as suspects. It has been noted in studies about the prevalence of violent crime in Finland that crimes committed by women have increased, albeit moderately, in recent decades (Putkonen et al., 2008; Sipilä & Honkatukia, 2010). Nevertheless, women continue to constitute a clear minority of suspects of violent crimes in the criminal statistics: in 2015, for instance, the percentage of female suspects in police-recorded violent crimes ranged from 12 to 23 (Kääriäinen, Danielsson & Salmi, 2016).<sup>1</sup> Arguably, the acute interest in and ambivalent affective reactions to violence committed by women often emanates from this marginality of women as perpetrators of violence.

Several researchers have discussed how images of women who have perpetrated violence circulating in public arenas lay emphasis on their gendered exceptionality and deviance, and are often based on reductionist categorizations (e.g. Boyle, 2005; Morrissey, 2003). Such observations concerning the difficulty of the topic of women's use of violence and the recurring suppression of its complexity in public discussion have largely motivated this PhD study. The seeds for the inquiry were sown when I encountered the subjects of gender and violence as I was doing my Master's thesis (Venäläinen, 2011). I was drawn to the dilemmas and misfits that seemed to pervade the issue of women as perpetrators of violence. Therefore, like much poststructurally inspired work (McCoy, 2012), this study grew from an interest in something that appeared dilemmatic and thus invited inquiry.

This study focuses on sense-making in the context of violence perpetrated by women both in crime reports in the Finnish tabloid press and in the narratives of women serving prison sentences for violent crimes. My aim in exploring meaning-making processes within these two quite different contexts – the tabloid press and the narratives of imprisoned women – is to provide a multifaceted glimpse into how womanhood and violence are constituted in relation to each other in contemporary discursive practices. In my analyses of tabloid portrayals of women who have committed violent crimes I focus on discursive constructions of relations between gender categories and violence, and on how women's violent action is portrayed in terms of agency and the

---

<sup>1</sup> Women comprised 23 per cent of the suspects in cases of petty assault, 16 per cent of assaults, 18 per cent of aggravated assaults, 12 per cent of attempted homicides and 19 per cent of homicides (Kääriäinen, Danielsson & Salmi, 2016).

constitution of identities. My analyses of the narratives of women serving a prison sentence for violent crimes, on the other hand, explore the ways in which these specifically positioned women attach meanings to their violence and simultaneously constitute themselves as gendered subjects in relation to it. I was particularly interested in how the women who participated in my study grappled with the potentially multiply troubled relationship between being and acting as a gendered subject and perpetrating (and experiencing) violence.

As noted above, understandings of gender variously delineate how violence committed by women is perceived, not only in the media but also in the courts and in academic discussions. By emphasizing the gendered deviance of ‘violent women’, the images that circulate in these contexts tend to position women who have committed violence as the ‘other’ in relation to ‘normal women’ (Chesney-Lind, 1999; Morrissey, 2003). Moreover, not only do women who have perpetrated violence tend to be perceived as having transgressed notions of femininity, the widely reproduced associations between female violence and insanity and / or inhumanity (see Chapter 2) also contradict the idealistic image of a rational, self-contained human that continues to prevail in the normative discourses of the psychological sciences (Blackman & Walkerdine, 2001, 9–10). These ideals are dealt with specifically in the theoretical discussion on subjecthood, identities, agency and affect(s) in Chapter 3, and revisited in Chapter 7.

The observations about the mutual constitution of the images of ‘violent women’ and recognizable womanhood have directed my interest in this study towards femininity and the ways in which it is shaped in the context of talk about women’s violence. In this inquiry I view femininity as a set of ideals about socially acceptable and valuable ways of being and acting as a woman. As several feminist researchers have noted, these ideals are generally based on the reproduction of various social exclusions through which valuable femininity becomes a classed, racialized, sexualized and ethnicized construct (see e.g. Ringrose & Walkerdine, 2008; Skeggs, 1997).

Moreover, what is considered as constituting socially acceptable femininity is constantly shifting, resulting in several different femininities, which may not only transform in line with historical, societal and cultural changes but also co-exist (Gill & Arthurs, 2006). According to several feminist researchers, in recent decades valuable femininity has been increasingly shaped in accordance with a postfeminist sensibility (e.g. Gill, 2008; Ringrose & Walkerdine, 2008). Postfeminism<sup>2</sup> draws simultaneously upon both feminist and anti-feminist influences, and is based on the idealization of women’s agency and their assumed capacity to choose to act in contemporary social contexts in ways not limited by traditional notions of gender-appropriate behaviour (Gill, 2008; McRobbie, 2004; Sharff, 2012). Rosalind Gill (2008) has observed that postfeminist idealizations of women’s individuality, choice

---

<sup>2</sup> See Gill (2016) on recent debates over the usefulness of the term.

and empowerment resonate closely with neoliberal ethos that values autonomy, rationality and the entrepreneurial capacity to flexibly capitalize on one's strengths (Gill, 2008; Walkerdine & Bansel, 2010). Both postfeminism and neoliberalism place the responsibility for both successes and failures in becoming a proper subject on individuals themselves, and therefore tend to foreclose possibilities for identifying existing gendered inequalities or the impact of the social on individuals in general.

Postfeminist sensibilities may be linked in various ways with publicly circulating perceptions of women's relationship with violence. Focusing on postfeminist portrayals of teenage girls, Jessica Ringrose (2006), for instance, has suggested that the rise of postfeminism and the gendered anxieties attached to it can generate new kinds of divisions, such as a division between normalized 'mean girls' and the deviant 'violent girls', through which femininity is regulated and continues to be separated from violence. Thus, while postfeminist idealization of women's assertiveness and agency may on some level appear to diminish the contradiction between violence and femininity, the perceived changes in the ways in which acceptable femininity is defined may also instigate new ways of polarizing femininity and violence in public discussions and imagery (e.g. Chesney-Lind, 2006; Chapter 2).

Furthermore, notions of femininity vary according to the cultural context and its socio-historical specificities. Finnish ideals about proper womanhood have historically focused on mothering and the associated responsible role in society (Lempiäinen, 2002). Several researchers refer to the myth of the supposedly characteristically 'strong Finnish woman', based on ideals of endurance and an active role not only at home but also in the public sphere (Markkola, 2002). The assumption has similarly been observed in studies on violence that Finnish women abused by their male spouses are to adopt a responsible position in the family, and to endure and regulate the violence and/or alcohol abuse of their spouses (Keskinen, 2005; Virkki, 2007). In the following section I discuss further the relations between gender and violence in the Finnish context.

## **1.2 The Finnish context, gender and violence**

Inherent in the Finnish context are several paradoxes concerning the constitution of relations between gender and violence that make an inquiry such as this one particularly relevant. Along with other Nordic countries, Finland tends to be considered advanced in terms of gender equality and women's societal position. However, as several researchers have noted, this image of a progressive, women-friendly welfare state becomes less coherent in the light of issues such as the prevalence of violent abuse directed at women. (Eriksson & Pringle, 2005; Ronkainen, 2002; Virkki & Jäppinen, 2017.) For

instance, Finland ranked second in terms of the rate of violence against women in an EU-wide survey conducted in 2014 (Violence against Women, 2014).

Statistics (each of which obviously only provides a view that is circumscribed in a particular way; see Ronkainen, 2004) about the victimization of both men and women, particularly in intimate partner relationships, in Finland allow for viewing violence as a gendered phenomenon: in a national survey conducted in 2012, 10 per cent of women and six per cent of men reported having been physically abused by their intimate partners at some point in their lives (Danielsson & Salmi, 2013). In another survey focusing particularly on men's experiences of violent abuse 35 per cent of the interviewed women and 22 per cent of the men reported having encountered violence from their current or former partners, the women reporting considerably more serious consequences from the violence they had encountered in their intimate partner relations than the men (Heiskanen & Ruuskanen, 2010). However, the Finnish state has tended to approach the issue of violence in families and intimate partner relationships as a gender-neutral rather than a gendered problem (Clarke, 2011; Hautanen, 2005; Kantola, 2006; Niemi, Kainulainen & Honkatukia, 2017; Virkki, 2017). Thus, even intimate partner violence, which is the form of violence that women encounter particularly often<sup>3</sup>, tends not to be considered in the light of gendered power relations but is rather discussed in ways that do not facilitate the addressing of gender as a social system that perpetuates violence (Husso et al., 2017).

Related to the ideal of gender neutrality, the Finnish societal context has been characterized as relatively harsh in its treatment of women as victims of intimate partner violence. Services for victims of violence in intimate relations, for instance, are largely built on assumptions of the victim's own activity and responsibility in the help-seeking process (Hearn & McKie, 2010). Tuija Virkki and Maija Jäppinen (2017) observe in their studies on the views of professionals who work with victims of violence that even though Finnish professionals nowadays may not commonly directly engage in victim-blaming, they still tend to expect female victims to be active in ending the abuse they encounter. Suvi Ronkainen (2002, 2008) has discussed the societal organization of these practices around violence in relation to the prevalence of individualistic value placed on autonomy. According to Ronkainen (2002), the alignment of Finnish welfare-state practices with ideals of equality and gender-neutrality is based on the historically motivated valuation of individualism and autonomy, which includes the suppression of differences between people (see also Menard, 2016) and a lack of sympathy for gender-specific vulnerabilities.

In sum, even though feminist views about genderedness have challenged Finland's gender-neutral approach to violence, it still appears to be powerful,

---

<sup>3</sup> In the light of the statistics, men are in turn more likely than women to encounter violence from perpetrators unknown to them (Piispa & Heiskanen, 2017).

and intimately linked with notions of equality (Kantola 2006).<sup>4</sup> Given this prevalence of gender neutrality and gender-neutral linguistic expressions<sup>5</sup> in Finland, men and women as perpetrators or victims of violence are not always talked about or otherwise treated in gender-specific ways on an explicit level. At the same time, however, in various social contexts the potential to perpetrate violence is constantly linked specifically with masculinity (and not with femininity), and with the lives of men as a self-evident expectation (Jokinen, 2017). Due to these associations, positions in relation to violence are likely not inhabited similarly by women and men, and hence, for women in particular, the position of a perpetrator of violence may entail specific trouble.

Violence is defined in various ways in different contexts, and in different conceptual frameworks. These definitions are highly significant in terms of how relations between victims and perpetrators are perceived, whether, and if so how societal power relations are seen as being entwined with the potential to perpetrate violence, and what kinds of interventions are deemed necessary (Ronkainen, 2017). Violence is generally understood in common definitions as action that harms other people, and as entailing at least some level of intentionality (Hearn, 1998, 15–16). My focus in this study is on ways of making sense of criminalized violence, in other words violence that is reported in the tabloid press as crime and has led to criminal sanctions in the narratives of imprisoned women. Focusing on the practices of sense-making in the context of these rather narrowly circumscribed modes of violence enables me to concentrate on the entanglements of violence with gender and womanhood, and their affectiveness, from a multidimensional perspective.

## 1.3 Overarching theoretical and methodological orientations

### 1.3.1 A dual approach to gender

I characterize this work as a social-psychological, social-constructionist study of gender, the constitution and living of which is explored in the context of making sense of women's use of violence. On a broad scale, my study aligns with social constructionism (particularly) in social psychology (e.g. Burr, 2015). Hence, I am primarily interested in social and discursive processes of meaning-making that are not seen as vehicles for truths about realities but rather as constitutive of them. More specifically, I have drawn both

---

<sup>4</sup> A gender-sensitive view on violence gained ground in Finland relatively late: it was only in the 1990s that the prevailing gender-neutral discourse became more extensively challenged. The gender perspective on violence has nevertheless remained moderate in Finland compared to other Western countries. (Ronkainen & Näre, 2008; Virkki, 2017.)

<sup>5</sup> Finnish uses the same third-person personal pronoun "hän" to refer to both men and women.

theoretically and methodologically on feminist poststructural (infused to some extent with new materialist thinking; e.g. Davies, 2014; 2016a; Davies et. al., 2006; Højgaard & Søndergaard, 2011) and critical/feminist discursive psychological (Edley & Wetherell, 2008; Magnusson & Marecek, 2010 a & b) perspectives on gender, subjecthood and identities. The adopted overarching methodological orientations come from poststructurally inspired post-foundational approaches and feminist methodologies (see Chapter 4). In brief, these heterogeneous approaches primarily allow for viewing the phenomena of interest as fluid and fragmented, and as enacted in ongoing social and discursive practices.

The social-constructionist study of gender in (social) psychology, like social-constructionist research in general, falls along two different lines of research: *ontological constructionism* and *epistemic constructionism* (Edley, 2001b; Edley & Wetherell, 2008). The thinking in the first, poststructurally inflected ontological line is that discursive practices produce not only forms of talk but also gendered subjectivities, in other words more enduring relational and personal orientations, and sometimes even material phenomena such as bodies. The focus in the second, epistemic line (influenced by micro-level approaches such as conversation analysis and ethnomethodology) is restricted to the discursive construction of descriptions (e.g. of gender), which is usually scrutinized in detail in its local, micro-level contexts.<sup>6</sup> (Edley & Wetherell, 2008.) Reflecting the work of Nigel Edley and Margaret Wetherell (2008), I situate my study closer to ontological constructionism, drawing in part on micro-analytic views on locally emergent meaning-making, but also being interested in how they are entwined with the macro-analytically viewed discursive (and material) constitution of phenomena beyond local contexts of language use.<sup>7</sup>

In line with this dual focus, my interest in gender is interspersed with an interest in both subjectification (e.g. Weedon, 1987, 97) and the discursive enactments of identities. This dual interest produces some tensions. Parallel to the distinctions discussed above, analyses of subjectification and discursive enactments of identities tend to follow different theoretical and methodological paths (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006, 17–18). The concept of identity is frequently associated with individualistic views based on the liberal humanist thinking of the West (Lawler, 2014) that is challenged in the analyses of subjectification. Also in social psychology identities tend to refer to people's inner mental states or inclinations (Howard, 2000; Potter & Wetherell, 1987) and are thus, arguably, individualized. Because of these associations, the use of identity as a concept in research could thus be viewed as potentially

---

<sup>6</sup> Failing to see differences in the phenomena that are analytically focused on within each of these strands of work sometimes leads to misunderstandings about constructionist research, which is why it is important to attend to the underlying assumptions of each one (Edley, 2001b; see also Speer, 2000).

<sup>7</sup> I revisit these analytical orientations in Chapter 5, in which I discuss the various analytical threads running through this work.

reproducing individualizing notions that ignore people's social embeddedness (c.f. St. Pierre, 2011). As I discuss further in Chapter 3, in this study I however aim towards an exploration of the sociality of identities in which their individualizing and stabilizing connotations are laid bare, questioned and potentially overturned.

Through a multitude of theoretical and methodological perspectives, I intend purposefully to disturb prevalent ideals of coherence that easily lead to the suppression of the complications and uncertainties of knowledge. My study is based on the view that movement in-between disciplines and discourses allows for new modes of thought (see e.g. Gannon & Davies, 2007), and that engaging with points of difference between various approaches or paradigms facilitates the development of new angles that can address the main dilemmas that differentiate them (Falmagne, 2009). In short, then, the underlying aim is to value and cultivate a multiplicity of viewpoints, analytical approaches and, ultimately, of questions asked in research. The analysis comprises four sub-analyses (Chapter 6), each of which consists of a specific, exploratory combination of theoretical and methodological approaches, research questions and materials.

### **1.3.2 Language and writing**

A few words about language before I proceed further. I write in English, which is the language that I believe will enable me to make the most of my contribution. Through my various engagements with it, English has become the vessel for most of my thinking. Obviously, as a non-native speaker I use it imperfectly – impurely. In my view, however, this may not always be an impediment to meaning-making. Language structures one's thinking and sense-making, and is a powerful vehicle for sustaining power relations through the repetition of what has already been said and thought. As poststructurally-inclined feminists have noted, to use it impurely is to use it against such normativities, to make use of the flexibility and plurality that reside alongside the normativity (e.g. Gannon & Davies, 2007). At times, therefore, I purposefully take the liberty to stretch the boundaries of linguistic correctness, and aspire towards the unidiomatic use of language. Words can activate several webs of associations and therefore allow for the forging of unexpected connections, borrowing from various directions simultaneously, and thus for fluidity in meaning. Although writers of scientific texts have traditionally not been allowed to exploit the possibilities of a multitude of meanings (see Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005), such activity is consonant with poststructural orientations.

I use the pronoun “I” in this study to situate my inquiry, to imply a particular subjectivity that is moulded along with the study, inseparably from it. This is not to imply a singular, coherent entity, but rather refers to

contingent, incoherent and embodied situations from which this text has been produced. The text enfleshes this “I” in a mutually constitutive way (see Davies et al., 2004), in an ongoing process infused with histories of discursive and affective contact with various epistemic and ontological assemblages. In line with Donna Haraway (1991), then, I wish to situate the knowledge produced in this study, and simultaneously understand that which situation(s) come to matter varies, as they are always plural, and yet it also matters from which one of them it is possible to talk.

## **2 BECOMING SUSPECT: WOMANHOOD AND VIOLENCE**

My aim in this chapter is to go through some of the recurring ways in which women as perpetrators of violence have been made sense of in research as well as in the media and the courts. I view these sense-making practices in this study specifically in terms of the possibilities they provide or foreclose for construing relations between women and violence. In the last section I also briefly discuss ways of perceiving the relationship between doing and narrating violence.

### **2.1 Quantities and notions of change in discussions on women's use of violence**

It has been noted by researchers working on the topic of women's violence that every now and then claims are made about an increase in women's involvement in violent crime. Under closer scrutiny these claims have generally gained little support, however, and are perceived by several researchers as akin to moral panic rather than indicative of significant changes in the perpetration of violence (Jones, 2009; Kruttschnitt & Gartner, 2008; Pollock & Davis, 2005; Schwartz, Steffensmeier & Feldmeyer, 2009). Focusing particularly on the debates in the USA, Meda Chesney-Lind (1986, 1999) has discussed how in the attempts to make revelations about the purportedly rising, hidden problem of women's violence links are often drawn between the (purported) increase in women's use of violence and changes in their societal position.

Freda Adler (1975) claimed in the 1970s, for example, that improvements in women's societal position led to an increase in their perpetration of violence and crime. Similar attempts to reveal what has been taken for the truth about the prevalence of the use of violence by women are evident also in some academic texts (see e.g. White & Kowalski, 1994) and texts directed at wider audiences (e.g. Pearson, 1997) published particularly in the 1990s and from then on. Somewhat ambivalently, attempts have been made in some of these texts, such as the ones mentioned above, to show how stereotypes of non-violent or non-aggressive women are linked to their subordinate societal status and thus are detrimental to women. In Finland, a book edited by Hannele Törrönen, published in 2009 (Törrönen, 2009), aroused much of the attention that has been directed towards women's use of violence in recent years. The aim of the book was to raise public awareness about violence committed by women, and thus to break the silence that was seen as surrounding this taboo subject.

Meda Chesney-Lind (1986, 2006) has observed that discussions about an increase in women's involvement in violent crime tend to follow the logic that rests on the assumption that women's liberation causes women to start acting like men. According to Chesney-Lind (1999), the media tend to portray women and girls who have used violence as masculine, thereby distinguishing them from 'good', feminine women (for further discussion see section 2.3). Chesney-Lind (*ibid.*) has also noted the racialization of the moral panic over women's use of violence: it is particularly violence perpetrated by women of colour that is raised as a concern in public discussions. Christie Barron and Dany Lacombe (2005) have made similar observations about the concerns expressed in the Canadian media over a purported increase in violence among girls. A study conducted in Finland, focusing on public discussions about girls' (purportedly) changed relationship with sexuality, crime and violence in the 1990s (Aaltonen & Honkatukia, 2002), shows that similar links between gender equality and girls' assumedly masculine ways of acting have been drawn also in Finnish debates.

Drawing on Susan Faludi's (1991) discussion about a backlash against feminism, Chesney-Lind (2006) claims that the periodically heightened emphasis on violence perpetrated by women and/or girls is linked with resistance to feminist attempts to bring about changes in the societal position of women. These discourses thus appear to be linked with efforts by certain groups of people to show that gender equality has detrimental effects, and thus to vilify feminism and feminists. Indeed, as Christina Scharff (2012) among others notes, the figure of a feminist, like that of 'a violent woman,' is frequently positioned as 'the other' in relation to desirable femininity in the contemporary Western culture, and is also sometimes directly associated with violence (Hinds & Stacey, 2001) and monstrosity (Edley & Wetherell, 2001). As I discuss further in Chapter 7, these recurrent associations may indeed be read as symptomatic of the anxiety provoked by changes in the societal position of women.

In academic discussions as well an interest in women's use of violence has often coalesced with attempts to refute the value of a gender perspective and feminist studies on violence (Enander, 2011). Many of the studies concerned have adopted a (apparent) gender-neutral view that is presented as overturning feminist analyses of gender and violence (*ibid.*). Some of them report results that are taken to support the idea of gender symmetry in violence, particularly in intimate partner violence (e.g. Dutton & Nichols, 2005; Straus, 2004, 2008). Some authors have even claimed that women's violence in intimate partner relationships is a more serious social problem than men's violence because it is silenced, thus making men's victimization invisible (see e.g. Graham-Kevan, 2007).

More specifically, claims about gender symmetry in intimate partner violence tend to be based on studies reporting no significant differences between women and men regarding the frequency of their victimization or the perpetration of violence. These studies have been extensively criticized,

however, for failing to take account of several factors that according to the vast literature on gendered violence markedly differentiate experiences of intimate partner violence by women and men (Enander, 2011; DeKeseredy & Dragiewicz, 2007; Dobash & Dobash, 2004; Johnson & Leone, 2005; Kimmel, 2002). Overall, the issue of women as perpetrators of intimate partner violence has evoked frequent and fierce debate (Hughes, Corbally & Chau, 2014; Johnson, 2006; Worcester, 2002). According to Enander (2011), these debates could also be perceived as providing the motivation to develop yet more theoretically sophisticated feminist views on gendered violence.

## **2.2 Research on the causes and contexts of women's use of violence**

In addition to the gender-neutral strand of research on women's use of violence in intimate partner relations that portrays violence as gender-symmetrical, Shamita Das Dasgupta (2002) identifies two other strands: the emphasis in the first is on the victimization of women who have used violence, and in the second on both their personal histories and the societal contexts of the violence. All these themes have also emerged in academic discussions about women's use of violence in contexts other than intimate partner relations, and about women's involvement in crime in general.

It has been noted in several studies that women's use specifically of lethal violence is often, although not exclusively, directed at people close to them, usually family members (Laitinen, 2006; Moen, Lennart & Edin, 2016; Putkonen, 2003; Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2003). As mentioned above, violence perpetrated by women in intimate partner relationships is often associated with their victimization by male partners (e.g. Allen, Swan & Raghavan, 2009; Moen, Lennart & Edin, 2016; Swan & Snow, 2006). This association was also noted in a recent study conducted in Finland focusing on lethal intimate partner violence (Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012).<sup>8</sup> However, it has also been observed that in some cases women's use of violence in intimate partner relations originates from their own initiative rather than the often-cited motivation of protecting themselves or their children against abuse from their male partners. For instance, some women have been seen as using violence to exert control over their partners or as revenge for being abused earlier (Frieze, 2005; Miller & Meloy, 2006; Swan & Snow, 2006). The role of alcohol and/or drugs in perpetration of violence by women has also been emphasized in studies conducted in Finland (Putkonen et al., 2008;

---

<sup>8</sup> However, some studies on women's violent offending on a broader scale in Finland challenge the notion that women's violence is primarily linked to their own victimization (see Weizmann-Henelius, 2006).

Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2009) as well as in Sweden (Moen, Nygren & Edin, 2016).

Among several feminist criminologists, Elisabeth Moen, Lennart Nygren and Kerstin Edin (2016) explicitly draw attention to gender as part of the context in which women inflict violence on an intimate partner. Their discussion focuses particularly on intimate partner homicides committed by women in Sweden. Similar to the work of Suzanne Swan and David Snow (2006), Moen, Nygren and Edin (2016) point out the significance of women's subordinate position in the home and the failure of social services to provide adequate support for female victims of intimate partner violence. In a similar vein, Jennifer Wesely (2006) describes violence as part of cumulative victimization in the lives of women in multiply marginalized positions. She goes on (*ibid.*) to suggest that violence may become normalized in disadvantageous contexts as a means of coping, and in leading to criminalization may further contribute to the marginalization of the women resorting to its use.

Discussions about the contexts in which women use violence tend to be enacted in dialogue with views that several feminist criminologists consider reductionist and dichotomizing. These discussions have questioned the particularly sharp distinctions drawn between victimhood and the intentional perpetration of violence (see e.g. Banwell, 2010). As Mimi Ajzenstadt (2009), for example, points out, taking into consideration the contexts of women's violent action, such as their own victimization, need not foreclose seeing women who have used violence as active agents responsible for their actions. By developing theorization on the relative autonomy of women who have used violence, Ajzenstadt (*ibid.*) among others (see e.g. Banwell, 2010) has attempted to counter dichotomous understandings of individual agency and structure in discussions about violence perpetrated by women.

It has also been noted in these discussions that social structures linked with inequality other than gender, such as those organized around race and class, are also highly significant in relation to women's use of violence (Kruttschnitt and Carbone-Lopez, 2006). Referring to these discussions, Candace Kruttschnitt (2016) in her recent article calls for a more nuanced focus on gender in studies about (violent) offending, as well as on situational variability in the ways in which gender and other structural effects unfold in the lives of offenders. As I discuss below, despite these criticisms a vast body of research points towards the persistence of reductionist views on women's perpetration of violence based on categorizations that reify the otherness of women who have perpetrated violence.

## **2.3 Gendered categorizations and the meanings of women's use of violence**

It has been claimed that women who have committed violence have, throughout history, been cast as the 'other' to the properly feminine women through processes such as masculinization and sexualization (Sjoberg & Gentry, 2008). Efforts to make sense of women's use of violence and their involvement in crime in general have ambivalently characterized violence either as linked to women's natural tendencies or as abnormal aberration. Caesar Lombroso and William Ferrero (1898) claimed in their influential work from the end of the 19th century, *The Female Offender*, that it is more difficult to identify female criminals than male criminals because criminality is a latent characteristic of all women. Criminologist Otto Pollak (1950), writing in the 1950s, also suggested that women tend to be deceitful and thus criminally deviant. He believed, for instance, that the incidence of women poisoning men and children under their care was much more frequent than was generally acknowledged.

According to Lynda Hart (1994), the criminological discourse of the 19th century produced a masculinized construct of 'a violent woman'. Resembling the construct of a hysterical woman produced in the sexological and psychoanalytic discourses of the time, the violent woman was construed around the notion of assertive female sexuality that was deemed abnormal. Drawing upon poststructural and psychoanalytic theorizations, Hart (1994, 4–14) claims that what connects the othered figure of a lesbian and that of the violent woman is the displaced sexual assertiveness attached to them. Racial and class distinctions also play a role in these constructs that allow the image of the decent, i.e. non-violent, white, middle-class and heterosexual woman to emerge as their opposite (*ibid.*).

Similar kinds of gendered dichotomizations have also been claimed to prevail in efforts to make sense of women's violence in contemporary Western societies, not only in public arenas but also in some academic discussions (e.g. Ferraro, 2006; Gilbert, 2002). My discussion in the next section turns to studies focusing on portrayals of women accused of violence both in the media and in the legal system. Given the relevance to my subsequent analyses of media portrayals, however, I begin with a brief discussion about the functioning of the media in the construction of conceptions about violent crime.

### **2.3.1 Women and violence in the media and the courts**

Several criminologists concur that the media constitute a relevant component in processes through which socio-cultural conceptions about crime and its perpetrators are shaped (Peelo & Soothill, 2000). It has been claimed, for

instance, that some crime cases can be considered *signal crimes* (Innes, 2004) that essentially tap into the prevailing anxieties of the current socio-historical context. Lizzie Seal (2009) draws upon this notion in her discussion about the ways in which societal questions of gender and class impinge on newspaper portrayals of a specific crime case involving a female suspect in Britain in the 1950s. Finland has had two murder cases with female suspects in recent years, the Ulvila case and the Insulin murder case(s) (see Articles I and II), which could indeed be seen as signal crimes, the portrayals of which both construct and tap into anxieties about several societal questions, including gender and violence.<sup>9</sup>

There are, however, various perspectives on the relations between the media and socio-cultural conceptions in both criminological (see e.g. Smolej, 2011) and media studies, each of which construes the agency of audiences and the operations of the media industry in different ways. Summarizing debates about the extent to which media texts encourage certain interpretations on the one hand, and heterogeneity in terms of meaning-making practices and uses of media products by audiences on the other, Cynthia Carter and Linda Steiner (2004; also Gill, 2007) conclude that both the production and the interpretation of media texts largely depends on the socio-culturally shared understandings that are circulated and shaped in the process. The portrayals of violence and of women (and men) as its perpetrators in tabloid news reports, for instance, can then be seen as offering audiences possible ways of making sense of violence and the people involved in it, depending largely on their resonance with understandings circulating in other social arenas. Therefore, news reporting can be considered an integral part of social reality and the practices of making sense of it (c.f. Bennett, 1982).

Lisa Blackman and Valerie Walkerdine (2001, 14–15) have made similar observations from the perspective of critical psychology. In particular, they discuss how media images co-produce notions about gendered normality alongside various other sites and technologies, such as the legal system. As I discuss further in the next chapter, by inviting subjects to inhabit certain kinds of positions these normalizing practices can be seen as participating in their constitution as *particular kinds* of subjects, shaping both their possibilities for understanding themselves and their desires (Blackman & Walkerdine, 2001, 117–118, 196).

The ways in which cases of violent crime are portrayed in the news media depend on their news value, which especially in tabloid-type newspapers is largely based on the potential for sensationalism. Hence, cases that are taken to deviate most markedly from cultural norms tend to have the most news value (Carter, 1998; Jewkes, 2004, 108–109). In line with these principles, violence committed by women is likely to have more news value than that

---

<sup>9</sup> From a different angle, the role of media reporting in the Ulvila case has been the topic of public debate, and has also been analysed in a study suggesting that the suspect was predominantly portrayed in a way that supported the assumption of her guilt (Noppari, Raittila & Männikkö, 2015).

committed by men because of its relative rarity and the meanings attached to gender categories (Jewkes, 2004). However, studies have also indicated that the selection of homicides to be covered in newspapers, for example, is based to some extent on how well they fit into prevailing stereotypes concerning gender, race and other social categorizations (e.g. Gruenewald, Pizarro & Chermak, 2009). Thus, not only does the principle of emphasizing the devious influence the selection of violent crime for reporting in the media, the way in which different cases are presented is also guided by what is assumed to be familiar to the audiences.

Studies focusing on portrayals of violent crime in the news from a gender perspective point towards recurring processes of normalization and the de-gendering of violence perpetrated by men and, in turn, the pathologization and demonization of women as perpetrators of violence (e.g. Boyle, 2005; Naylor, 2001b; Nikunen, 2006, 2011; Sternadori, 2014). Bronwyn Naylor (2001b), for instance, analysed the reporting of violence perpetrated by both men and women in Britain, and claims that in comparison with portrayals of men's use of violence, women's usage is more often attached to exceptionality and irrationality. Several researchers have concluded that, in line with stereotypical conceptions, women's use of violence is frequently made sense of in the news media through categorizations that portray the accused as mad or/and bad (Berrington & Honkatukia, 2002; Brown, 2011; Eastel et al., 2015; Naylor, 1990; Nikunen, 2005; Noh, Lee & Feltey, 2010; Quintero Johnson & Miller, 2016), and that reproduce dichotomizations of good and bad women (Collins, 2016; Meloy & Miller, 2009). Moreover, it has been found that violent crime committed by women specifically against children is pathologized based on notions about motherhood and its naturalness to women (Barnett, 2005; Naylor, 2001a; Nikunen, 2006).<sup>10</sup>

As Belinda Morrissey (2003), among others, remarks, categorizations such as those described above serve to distinguish women accused of violence from other women, whose image as non-violent is thus retained. Moreover, apart from being categorized as mad, bad or victims (discussed further below), according to Morrissey (2003) women accused of violence are also frequently aligned with mythical archetypes (see also Barnett, 2005; Berkowitz, 2005; Nikunen, 2005) and hence their actions are cast into the realm of the inhuman. In a similar vein, Hilary Neroni (2005) has suggested that this splitting of femininity and violence in media products such as films indicates a reluctance to see women who have used violence as part of society. Resonating with the view of Chesney-Lind (2006), she describes the figure of a violent woman as symbolizing the threat to the gender order from societal changes that call gendered boundaries into question.

According to Anette Ballinger (2000), what makes female perpetrators of violence particularly threatening is the notion that they may not be securely

---

<sup>10</sup> See Wilczynski (1997) on the functioning of similar pathologizing categorizations in court cases in which women are accused of killing their children.

distinguished from 'normal' women. Lisa Blackman and Valerie Walkerdine (2001) similarly note that underlying the othering portrayals of violent criminals is anxiety over the difficulty of identifying criminals and thus setting them aside from 'normal' people. Such portrayals could therefore be perceived as attempts to draw moral boundaries that are affectively loaded, feeding the fears that the gendered transgressiveness of violence perpetrated by women evokes, for instance (Naylor, 1990).

Media portrayals of women's use of violence are discussed in several studies in conjunction with views adopted in the legal system, and it is frequently suggested that mutual influences are at play (Easteal et al., 2015; Naylor, 2001a; Skilbrei, 2013): similar categorizations of women accused of violence as mad, bad and/or victims also seem to be prevalent in the courts (see e.g. Weare, 2013). Other authors similarly discuss how notions of acceptable femininity have an impact on how women are treated in the courts, depending on how well they appear to fit the prevailing images of femininity (Ballinger, 2000; Lazar, 2008; Seal, 2010). These images are thus perceived as detrimental to women who seemingly do not fit in with them, such as racialized and classed others to white, middle-class heterosexual women. According to Ruthy Lazar (2008), this may result in their harsher treatment in the courts.

Both Lazar (2008) and Morrissey (2003) claim that stereotypical categorizations of women accused of violence produce otherness in minimizing their agency (see also Allen, 1998). Lazar (2008; Morrissey, 2003) specifically discusses how reliance on the battered-woman syndrome (BWS) as an explanatory framework in Canadian courts serves to pathologize women accused of killing their abusive intimate partners. BWS was initially developed as a concept to enhance understanding of how abuse in intimate partner relationships influences the women who experience it. The basic premise is that their victimization affects these women's capacity to decipher their situation (Walker, 2000). Thus, women who are seen as suffering from BWS and who commit acts of violence against their abusers are assumed not to be fully aware of their actions. According to Lazar (2008, also Morrissey, 2003), in laying emphasis on the psychological deficiencies caused by their experiences of being abused, reference to BWS disturbs any perception of women accused of killing their partners in response to being abused by them as acting agentically in reasonable self-defence. Lazar (*ibid.*, also e.g. Ogle & Jacobs, 2002) further argues that references to BWS individualize and psychologize the abuse encountered by the accused women, which may result in failure to see gendered, classed and racialized inequalities as aspects of violence.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Regarding the therapeutic treatment of female offenders within the penal system, Allison McKim (2008) and Shosana Pollack (2007; 2013) have similarly discussed the emphasizing of psychological pathology in criminalized women.

Elisabeth Wells (2012) has conducted an analysis of Canadian sentencing decisions involving women convicted of killing their abusive intimate partners. She concluded that the mutuality of violence in the intimate relationship was often emphasized in the decisions, whereas the significance of the abuse experienced by the convicted woman was minimized (see also Ferraro, 2006). Thus, alongside potentially pathologizing portrayals of women that lay emphasis on their helplessness in such situations are portrayals that basically deny the impact of victimization on their actions. According to Minna Ruuskanen (2001, 2005), the latter kinds of portrayals have been prevalent in Finnish courts. In her view, the notion of 'strong Finnish women', entwined with gender-neutral notions of intimate partner violence as a couple's shared problem, is reflected in the courts' decision-making, which seldom takes into consideration the victimization of women who kill their abusive intimate partners. Given the assumption that abused women in Finland can get help and/or leave abusive relationships, victimization leading to their killing their abusers appears implausible. Moreover, not fitting easily into the position of someone who uses violence in self-defence either (which is shaped in the legal system on the assumption of a male actor), violence perpetrated by abused women tends not to be perceived as a response to the abuse they have encountered. (ibid.)

### **2.3.2 Criminalized women's own accounts of violence**

Feminist criminologists have noted the scarcity of studies focusing on criminalized women's ways of making sense of the violence they have perpetrated (e.g. Comack & Brickey, 2007). Some studies in which interviews with women convicted of violent crimes are analysed (e.g. Ferraro, 2006), refer to the notion of 'blurred boundaries', meaning the entwinement of women's victimization with their perpetration of violent or other crimes. According to Kathleen Ferraro (2006), this notion facilitates the countering of stereotypical images of women who have committed violence as masculine or passive by blurring clear demarcations of categories that prevalent modes of binary thinking purport to preserve.

Elizabeth Comack and Salena Brickey (2007) have analysed narratives of criminalized women to see how they might draw upon or resist common discourses such as those that construct them as mad, bad, or victims. The authors concluded from their analysis that all such categorizations were present in the women's narratives, but in different ways: whereas it was most common to align with victim positioning, positioning as mentally insane was usually resisted, despite the acknowledgement of its prevalence as an explanatory framework. They also concluded that the meanings of violence perpetrated by women should not be reduced to any singular frame but should rather be perceived as multiple.

Candace Kruttschnitt and Kristin Carbone-Lopez (2006) similarly argue against stereotypical views on women's use of violence based on their study focusing on interviews with women in prison. They observed that the violence committed by the women they interviewed was linked to various contexts and motivations. The most common motivation in the interview talk of the study participants was as a response to disrespectful treatment, which generally tends to be associated more with male than with female violence.

In Finland, Emmi Lattu (2016) has examined women's experiences and their own interpretations of their use of violence by means of interviews conducted in prisons and family counselling centres, and from written accounts collected by means of advertising in magazines. She has observed that the women talked about themselves as doing violence both as a response to being victimized (by their male partners) and on their own initiative. These women also talked about the contradiction between violence and womanhood, and frequently attached emotions such as shame and guilt to their violent behaviour. Some, however, also positively attached violence to power. In another study conducted in Finland, Aune Flinck and Eija Paavilainen (2010) similarly drew attention specifically to expressions of guilt and shame in the interview talk of women whose experiences of committing intimate partner violence they analysed.

In line with the studies discussed in this section, I analyse imprisoned women's accounts of their violence in Articles III and IV. These analyses draw upon theoretical and methodological approaches that are not commonly used in studies examining women's accounts of their use of violence. In adopting these approaches, I seek novel angles from which to address the topic of women and violence, and hence contribute to efforts to broaden the perspective. More specifically, I focus in the analyses on discursive and affective processes in the imprisoned women's talk/texts about violence, and view them from the angle of identity enactments. My analytical starting point is therefore these women's talk/texts about violence as action to be analysed, through which one's self, one's actions, others and the surrounding world, and the relations between all these, are constituted in locally specific ways. Thus, I do not attempt to grasp the experiences of my participants in and of themselves in my analyses of their narratives about violence, but rather aim to explore the meanings in which various contexts, ranging from societal-level discursive understandings to violent encounters in the past as well as the current prison context come together and are mutually informative. I further elaborate on this analytical orientation in the next section.

## **2.4 Doing and narrating violence**

Offenders' talk about their crimes is most commonly analysed in criminological studies in terms of factors that influence their perpetration

(Presser & Sandberg, 2015). In narrative criminology (e.g. Presser, 2010; Presser & Sandberg, 2015; Sandberg, 2009), in turn, offenders' narratives are seen as constitutive of their experiences, to which the analyst therefore does not assume to have direct access, purified of the influence of narrating practices and contexts. As I discuss further below, this approach most closely resembles the way in which I view the narratives of women imprisoned for violent crimes in my study.

Lois Presser and Sveinung Sandberg (2015) specify the aims of narrative criminology as studying the ways in which narratives influence criminal behaviour or desistance from it. Studies falling within this stream of research therefore focus analytically on how offenders discursively associate meanings with their criminal acts and constitute identities, with an emphasis on how these discursive constructions influence the offenders' criminal behaviour. In other words, as Presser and Sandberg (2015) note, although drawing upon constructionist approaches, these studies adopt a realist stance. Despite various overlaps, the constructionist orientation I have adopted, as well as my primary interest in the social-psychological constitution of gendered subject(ive)it(ies) and not on criminal behaviour, entail a (slight) difference in approach to narratives about violence than those adopted in narrative criminology.

Research on discursive constructions of violent or criminal activities and identities has tended to focus specifically on men's attempts to resist the stigma of deviance, with fewer studies concentrating on women (Fleetwood, 2015; see however e.g. Geiger & Fischer, 2003; Opsal, 2011). Having analysed the talk of both female and male offenders, Brenda Geiger and Michael Fischer (2005) have claimed that resisting being labelled a deviant with the help of discursive devices such as justifications may be less straightforward for imprisoned women than for men, which they attribute to women's lack of confidence and sense of competence in comparison to men. My approach to gender follows a somewhat different theoretical and methodological path, however (see Chapters 3 and 4), and thus I do not compare women's and men's accounts for the purpose of observing possible gender differences or similarities.

From the perspective of narrative criminology, Jennifer Fleetwood (2015) has analysed how women imprisoned for drug trafficking in Ecuador drew on gendered notions of womanhood to account for their crimes in ways that allowed them to resist being misrecognized. Jody Miller, Kristin Carbone-Lopez and Mikh V. Gunderman (2015) have similarly analysed how imprisoned women users of methamphetamine adopted gendered notions of respectable womanhood in their narratives about their drug use (see also Rajah, 2006). Similar to my study, these studies take gender to be both interactionally accomplished in the narratives, and as part of the context of narration and the women offenders' resources for constituting gendered selves in relation to their criminal activities.

In line with poststructural theorizations about subjecthood as well as ideas in critical discursive psychology about the analysis of language use, I view the narratives of imprisoned women in this study, similar to those produced in the tabloid press, as drawing upon and reproducing socio-cultural understandings and valuations, which are reworked and modified in context-specific ways. Thus the emphasis in the analysis of the imprisoned women's narratives is on the possibilities of narrating one's violence and one's self. Similar to narrative criminology, these possibilities are assumed to rely on both culturally shared and contextually specific social resources for meaning-making.

What my adopted approach means in practice is that the social action I am analysing is narrating violence rather than doing violence. In line with Jeff Hearn (1998, 66–68), however, I view narrating violence as action that is both separate from the violence that is being narrated and linked to it. To begin with, memories about past events are always narrative reconstructions, in which the context of remembering/narrating is inscribed (Lawler, 2008; c.f. Davies & Gannon, 2012). Narratives can therefore be seen as linking interpretations made in the present to past events, which nevertheless do not have a specific form separable from the narratives (Lawler, 2008). In general, assuming an experience separate from the narratives is problematic from the perspective I have adopted, because it would mean treating some aspects of people's lives as knowable independently of discourse, and thus would also mean assuming that a distinction between the discursive and the extra-discursive could be made without resorting to discourse (c.f. Speer, 2000).

In sum, my study is based on the notion that narratives are central resources for sense-making and are an inseparable part of people's everyday lives (Lawler, 2008; Peterson & Langellier, 2006; Taylor, 2006).<sup>12</sup> Given that narratives are constituted in ways that comply with social intelligibility (Lawler, 2008), they are highly relevant for analyses of its modes of operation. Moreover, in granting the means to account (see Chapter 5.7.2) for one's actions, narratives attach people to the social order and therefore always also have moral components (Presser, 2004). However, social orders also entail local variations, which allow for a multitude of ways of becoming a recognizable person (c.f. Sandberg, 2009). As I discuss further in Chapter 3, this variability can be seen as producing both continuity and discontinuity in the discursive/narrative enactments of selves.

---

<sup>12</sup> In line with Steph Lawler (2008), in my discussion I do not distinguish between the concepts of a narrative and a story, but view both as resources for sense-making that allow for characterizing different actors, building relations between them and between various events, and imbuing actors and their actions with meanings.

### **3 BECOMING A SUBJECT: ENTANGLING IDENTITIES, AGENCIES AND AFFECT(S)**

The studies discussed in the previous chapter about women as perpetrators of violence point out the significance of questions of identity and/or subjectivity, and ascribed assumptions about agency, in relation to making sense of women's violence. My study also focuses on these concepts, and the discussion in this chapter concerns the angles from which I approach them. First I will briefly discuss (feminist) poststructural theorization about subjecthood in dialogue with critical discursive psychology, and the possibilities for conceptualizing identities and agency from these viewpoints. I then move on to questions concerning the continuity of identities/subjectivities, and from there to the viewpoints accommodated in theorizations of affectivity and the new materialist thinking on these questions. Finally, I attempt to connect some of the strands in these discussions in conceptualizing what I call affective identificatory practices.

#### **3.1 Subjecthood and identity**

Poststructuralism has been characterized as a mode of thinking that challenges liberal humanist, and more recently neoliberal, conceptualizations of subjects as autonomous entities separable from their environments and other people (Davies et al., 2006; Davies, 2010). There are frequent references to the work of Foucault, as well as Derrida, Barthes and Deleuze (see e.g. Gannon & Davies, 2007). Feminist poststructuralism (e.g. Butler, 1990, 1993; Weedon, 1987) has challenged liberal humanist thinking in its view on the constitution of gender, which has been formulated as ongoing social doing instead of stable, internal characteristics of individuals.

As an analytical orientation, poststructural thinking directs attention to the prevalence of dichotomizing modes of thought that work to establish identities through binary categorizations (Gannon & Davies, 2007). These binaries form hierarchical relations and hence are essential for maintaining gendered power relations (Weedon, 1987), along with various other social distinctions. Discursive practices that work to maintain such binaries constitute women and men as belonging to separate categories, and by establishing what are considered appropriate modes of being and acting for women and men, performatively and repetitively make them into gendered beings distinguishable from those belonging to the opposite category (Butler, 1993). However, as poststructuralist thought is based on the notion of meanings as plural and fluctuating, poststructural feminist theorizing lays emphasis not

only on the gendering power of the discursive but also on the variability in how gender and other intersecting categorizations are made to mean, and inhabited (Weedon, 1987).

According to Foucauldian theorizations of subject formation, discursive power constitutes subjects in ways that are both productive and delimiting (e.g. Foucault, 1972, 1976, 1980). Power thus works on and through, and is worked on by subjects, in various ways. As Davies et al. (2006, 92) state, processes of subjectification are “dual processes through which we become specific individuals actively taking up as our own the terms of our subjection, and through which we are categorized, totalized and governed”. In other words, on the one hand norms talk through people in ways of which they are not aware, constituting what is intelligible, and through that intelligibility the subjects’ desires and modes of being and acting (Butler, 1997a, 1997b). On the other hand, subjects are perceived as being active, not only in their alignments with the normative but also in carving out resistant spaces made available by cracks and inconsistencies within discursive regimes (Søndergaard, 2002).

As Morrissey’s (2003) analysis that was briefly described in the previous chapter illustrates, for instance, Judith Butler’s (1993) discussion of abjection in relation to the production of properly gendered beings sheds light on the processes of othering involved in prevalent ways of making sense of women’s violence. The designation as abject bodies that do not conform to prevalent ideas about gendered subjecthood sustains those ideas and their power to mould subjects. However, these processes are inevitably unstable, requiring constant ‘othering’ work, in which ‘the other’ continues to haunt the identities that are enacted on the grounds of its exclusion. (Butler, 1993, 7–8, 112.)

As noted in Chapter 1, processes of othering such as in talk about women as perpetrators of violence both draw upon and work to sustain not only gendered differences but also normative ideals of subjecthood in general (Blackman & Walkerdine, 2001), in other words ideals about what it means to be a proper subject within the socio-historical contexts shaped by predominant discursive practices. Through discursive practices that prevail in Western societies we are constituted *as if* we were individuals with distinguishable selves (Davies & Gannon, 2012). This individuality is enacted in practices of positioning in relation to subject positions made available by discursive regimes. Being positioned in subject positions is always precarious and fluctuates depending on the societal-level power relations and the dynamics of the interaction in encounters among people. (e.g. Davies et al., 2006.)

These processes of positioning are specified in *positioning theory* as originally developed by Bronwyn Davies and Rom Harré (1990; see also Harré & van Langenhove, 1999). Positioning theory has strongly influenced discursive approaches in (social) psychology, and specifically the development of critical discursive psychology, as discussed below. It concerns the constitution of selves, which, as mentioned above, is discussed in terms of both the socio-cultural availability of subject positions and the dynamics of

interaction among people in more local contexts. According to Davies and Harré (1990), positioning involves the uptake of a certain kind of outlook on the world, including other people and oneself in relation to them. Different subject positions entail different rights and responsibilities, and their availability is guided also by the past positionings of each interactant (*ibid.*).

Davies and Harré (1990) also claim that life is both narrated and lived through discursive practices with spatial and temporal continuity. Although conceiving of the self, i.e. who one is, as being constructed in interaction through positioning and hence as always in flux, they also posit that people have a need to see themselves as coherent entities. They go on to suggest that coherence is constructed through stories in which one's self and one's life are made socially intelligible. Thus building such coherence is a way of constructing identity, in other words constituting oneself as an individual that is separable from others (Davies, 2010). These linkages between past and present positionings that Davies and Harré (1990) touch on are of specific interest in my work, and are further discussed in the next section.

Building on the perspectives discussed above, I adopt a view on enactments of identities as fluid alignments with, and attachments to, social intelligibility (c.f. Hall, 1996), through which recognizable (in the sense of both worth and identifiability) selves are constituted. These enactments are conditioned by the availability of subject positions that is based on intersecting categorizations, whereby subjects are produced, and produce themselves, not only as gendered, but also as classed, sexualized, racialized, and so on (McNay, 2008). My interest in the enactments of identities intertwines with an interest in subjecthood, in other words the condition(s) of being (seen as) a subject. Within predominant Western liberal-humanist practices this tends to mean the separateness from others that becoming identifiable both presupposes and produces (e.g. Lawler, 2012). Historically, however, this separateness has not straightforwardly informed the ways in which othered groups of people such as women have been perceived and subjectified (Blackman, 2008). Due to this centrality of, and trouble with, identities (associated with separateness) in the reproduction of liberal-humanism, which poststructuralism, in turn, aims to challenge, the concepts "identity", "subject" and "agency" (the links between which I explore below) do ambivalent work in my inquiry: I wish to critique the prevalent functions of these concepts, particularly in terms of the relations that are constituted with their use among people, and between people and their environments. At the same time, given their prevalence both in academic writings and in everyday practices, I believe that engaging with them will give an illustrative perspective on how people's lives are pervasively organized and made sense of. My dual aim, therefore, is to discuss the ways in which predominant, individualizing practices are organized around these concepts, and to explore alternative conceptualizations and practices.

### 3.2 (Dis)continuities of identities

*I'm just a painting that's still wet  
If you touch me I'll be smeared,  
you'll be stained  
Stained for the rest of your life*

*Marilyn Manson: Leave a Scar, The High End of Low album*

If identities are enacted in fluctuating processes of positioning in encounters with other people and social systems of power, how is it possible to account for their continuity in people's lives? In other words, how do our encounters with others stain us in ways that may stick with us? To what extent do we remain the same across encounters, and to what extent do we, to borrow the metaphor from the lyrics quoted above, remain paintings that are wet? These questions have provoked various discussions in (social constructionist) psychology, as well as in other disciplines such as cultural and feminist studies (see e.g. Blackman et al., 2008). The challenge of seeing subjects' particularities, shaped by their diverse paths in life, is also lengthily discussed in the classic book *Changing the Subject* (Henriques, et al., 1984), which brought poststructural thought on the regulative effects of discursive practices into psychology, in dialogue with psychoanalytic thinking.

The concept of *subjectivity* is frequently used in poststructurally inspired writings to refer to the continuity of the constitutive effects of discursive power (e.g. Weedon, 1987). Some theorizations explicitly distinguish subjectivities – linked to a person's inner life shaped through lived experience – from identities, which in turn are associated with displays of selves in social situations (Hollway, 2010). As Margaret Wetherell (2008) and Wendy Hollway (2010) point out, however, this distinction may not always be useful because it may serve to reproduce the separation of the individual and the social that poststructural/constructionist psychologies seek to overcome.

Hollway (1989, 2001, 2010) likens the continuity in being positioned in certain subject positions and their internalization to investments, through which affective relations are created in relation to subject positions that are inhabited on a recurring basis in a person's life. Wetherell (2003a), a proponent of critical discursive psychology (CDP), puts more emphasis on the situatedness of positionings and the kinds of action they allow speakers to enact within specific interactional situations. Despite this emphasis on the situatedness of identity enactments, however, she has also addressed the question of continuity in positioning in terms of "personal orders" in meaning-making that people adopt through repetition in their social encounters and the kinds of positionings they allow. Wetherell (2007, 2008) has also used the concept "psycho-discursive practices" to account for both continuity and local variability in positioning. These conceptualizations emphasize the constant, observable and discursive doings through which positionings are enacted.

Wetherell's view, similar to that of Nicola Gavey (2002), thus represents an attempt to avoid making similar inferences about the internal structures of people's minds as they observe in psychoanalytically-inspired approaches such as Hollway's.

Stephanie Taylor (e.g. 2006; see also Taylor & Litteton, 2006) discusses the continuity of selves from a narrative-discursive perspective that draws on a similar critical discursive-psychological orientation as adopted by Wetherell. In line with Davies and Harré (1990), Taylor (2006) suggests that people strive to see and portray themselves as having coherent identities, which they construct through biographical narratives. The construction of narratives is dependent on local contexts of telling, in which previous instances of narrating one's life (partly) constitute the resources on which people draw, and which both enable and constrain the telling. Thus, according to Taylor (ibid.), certain kinds of life-narratives become personalized resources for identity construction through repetition and "rehearsal".

Partly in line with Hollway, Taylor (e.g. 2015) also refers to emotional attachments as a part of identity enactments. She posits, for instance, that the personalization of discursive resources involves the emergence of idiosyncratic affective associations. Suvi Ronkainen (1999a) also describes how people get emotionally attached to certain meanings and positions they inhabit, which thus come to centrally define who they see themselves as being, and how they act in, see and experience the world around them. Sara Ahmed (2014a) has elaborated similar affective processes in subject formation, and it is to her theorization on affects, embodiment and the constitution of boundaries between people that I turn in the next section.

### **3.3 Affectivity and the impossibility of staying intact**

*The skin functions as a boundary or border, by supposedly holding or containing the subject within a certain contour, keeping the subject inside, and the other outside. But as a border, the skin performs that peculiar destabilizing logic, calling into question the exclusion of the other from the subject and risking the subject's falling into – or becoming – the other.*

*Sara Ahmed, 2000, 91*

*One does not always stay intact. One may want to, or manage to for a while, but despite one's best efforts, one is undone, in the face of the other, by the touch, by the scent, by the feel, by the prospect of the touch, by the memory of the feel.*

*Judith Butler, 2004b, 23-24*

As Sara Ahmed and Judith Butler eloquently describe above, the containment of subjects within their own skins – and thus their separability from others – is always at risk. Or, as Margrit Shildrick (2002) puts it, such containment is an impossible illusion that is, arguably, maintained precisely because of its impossibility. These views allow for profound questioning of the presumptions of separateness on which predominant conceptions of subjecthood and individuality are based. This questioning is what unites most theorizations of affect(s)<sup>13</sup> on which the so-called affective turn in the social sciences and feminist studies builds. Below, I briefly address the discussions related to the affective turn and their ambivalent relations with discursive approaches before returning to Sara Ahmed's views, which I discuss in relation to my own work.

The affective turn, like new materialism in general (to which affect studies are frequently attached), is based largely on the critique of poststructuralism, or the discursive turn (e.g. Clough with Halley, 2007). At the centre of the critique is the focus in the above-mentioned approaches on meaning-making, which is claimed to result in a lack of engagement with embodiment and other dimensions that would seem to fall outside the realm of discourse (Blackman & Venn, 2010). However, although some scholars focusing on the study of affect argue against poststructural/discursive approaches, others see it as building more closely upon them (Koivunen, 2010). These different relationships with the discursive turn run parallel to differences in conceptualizations of affect(s). Affect is assumed to be separate from emotions in a large part of the conceptualizations, and generally refers to abstract (albeit in a sense material) forces or intensities that affect people's bodies autonomically, whereas emotions are associated with the meaning-making operations of discursive/social regimes (Blackman & Cromby, 2010; Koivunen, 2013). Hence, given this separation of affect from emotions, studies on affect tend to focus on forces beyond individual people and their actions rather than on processes of (discursive) meaning-making (Koivunen, 2013).

According to Bettina Papenburg and Marta Zarzycka (2013), the focus of interest in affect studies is on links between dimensions such as culture and biology, psychology and the somatic body, and feeling and knowing. However, some researchers claim that despite these aims to find connections, unproductive divisions are frequently produced in discussions on affect. Anu Koivunen (2013), for instance, claims that strictly separating affect from emotions reproduces binary logic that is unproductive, particularly because it does not allow for viewing links between affect and historical and cultural particularities. In Koivunen's (2013) view, the power of affect rather emanates from its connections with culture and its "interpretative histories". Similar

---

<sup>13</sup> I use this expression so as simultaneously to refer to affect in the singular, which many advocates of the affective turn do, and affects in the plural, which in turn is more common in strands of research in which the term is used interchangeably with the term "emotion". The relations between these terms and conceptualizations are discussed further below.

views are expressed by Sara Ahmed (2014a), Margaret Wetherell (2012) and Eeva Sointu (2016), for instance.

Not all scholars focusing on affect(s), therefore, advocate a strict distinction between affect and emotions. Working in the field of psychology, Rachel Joffe Falmagne (2016; see also e.g. Leys, 2011) has also criticized the separation of affect from thought, which she observes in many studies focusing on affect, as well as in the areas of cognitive and discursive psychologies. On a related note, Lisa Blackman (2014) has criticized ways in which the automaticity of bodily responses as a notion has been integrated into affect studies, also mentioning the lack of theorization on subjectivity in these discussions.

Clare Hemmings (2005) has critically examined the ways in which the distinction between affect and emotions runs parallel to that between ontology and epistemology. The ontological turn, with which the affective turn is associated, largely entails the viewing of affect and its study as engagement with the ontological (i.e. states of being), which is distinguished from engagement with the epistemological (i.e. knowledge organized discursively), to the realm of which the interpretation of affect as emotions belongs. According to Hemmings (*ibid.*), these distinctions serve to associate epistemology, and studying it, with the rigid assumption that people inhabit fixed slots within the social fabric that are construed in discourse, whereas ontology and affect, and studying them, are associated with a fluidity that allows for creative escape from the rigidity of the discursive and from submission to the power imbalances it reproduces.

Ashley Barnwell (2016) has similarly drawn attention to the distinction between so-called paranoid, critical reading and the study of affect that is in turn portrayed as engaging with dynamic and creative everyday life. Barnwell (2016) has attempted to disturb this distinction with a re-reading of Kathleen Stewart's (2007) study on affect as indicative of what she calls "creative paranoia". Lisa Blackman (2013) has also commented on these distinctions concerning affect, observing that what is present in current debates on affect is the history of psychology in which the formation of habits is perceived either as modes of governance or as allowing for innovation, but not both at the same time. She thus observes a resurfacing of either-or thinking on habituation and creativity in discussions about affect such as those described above.

In sum, the affective turn has predominantly envisaged the study of affect as looking 'beyond' the discursive, and therefore as potentially allowing for escape from the debilitating effects of getting stuck in the endless circle of deconstructive criticism of what is being constituted in the normative realm of discourse. Adding to the critical voices discussed above, Margaret Wetherell (2015) has also criticized such a view of affect as "excess" in relation to discourse. She has claimed (Wetherell, 2012), for instance, that attempts to

isolate affective phenomena from those that are considered linguistic render affect unapproachable with the tools available for doing social research<sup>14</sup>.

Wetherell (2012) conceives of affects not as the indeterminate opposite of (partially) structured human action, but as intricately linked to it and therefore not to be analysed in separation from it. She further points out (Wetherell, 2012, 2013, 2015) that a fruitful path towards analysing affects could be to direct attention to social practices that are considered both affective and discursive. In line with her previous discussions about practice as, in a sense, an alternative conceptualization for subjectivities, she sees this approach as a way to grasp open-endedness and situational specificity, but with the constraints of repeated patterns (Wetherell, 2012). It incorporates the view of agency not as total freedom or autonomy but rather as deriving from the subjects' connectedness with others and the emergent nature of social practices that also establish the grounds for unprecedented actions. In sum, Wetherell (2013) sees that, in line with the general goals of new materialism (discussed further below), this approach allows us to attend to the ways in which the social world is constituted in ongoing processes in which elements of various kinds, including "embodied states and the semiotic", become entangled.

I have drawn specifically on the notion of practice as described by Wetherell in this study, my aim being to explore the possibilities for combining an interest in affect(s) with an interest in discourse (see Chapter 3.5). Alongside Wetherell's view, and similarly to Christina Scharff (2011), I have also drawn upon Sara Ahmed's (2014a) theorization of emotions, which I find highly illuminating regarding the affective and discursive constitution of relations between people and, entwined with those relations, their senses of self.<sup>15</sup> Inherent in this combination are some tensions: whereas Wetherell (2015) sees promise in Ahmed's take on affects (in combination with her own notions about practice), she has also criticized it on various grounds, specifically for granting too little agency to human actors. She also claims (ibid.) that because Ahmed does not analyse affects as tightly bound to people's social activities, they emerge (unproductively) in her account as enigmatic, uncanny actors that have agency and existence separate from

---

<sup>14</sup> This point has been acknowledged in studies on affect in calls for new methodologies, and is therefore seen not as an obstacle inhibiting research but as a challenge that guides towards innovative modes of research (e.g. Knudsen & Stage, 2015).

<sup>15</sup> Ahmed's (e.g. 2014a) theorizations came along in the latter half of the process of this study. I read her writings when I was in the process of analysing the research materials I had gathered in prisons, and I found that her writings and my materials opened new insights into both. In fact, my interest in affect(s) started to arise after my encounters with research participants in prisons, along with my encounters with the materials they produced. These encounters instigated a search for theoretical and analytical approaches that would allow me to expand, or modify, my focus on discursive meaning-making, and writings about affectivity, particularly Ahmed's, seemed fruitfully to resonate with those aims.

human action and its contexts. This criticism illustrates the differences in analytical emphasis and in underlying notions about humanness or subjecthood between Wetherell's view, stemming from CDP, and Ahmed's view, which is aligned with cultural studies.

Ahmed's (2014a) theorization highlights the importance of emotions in the constitution of subjects. In forming borders and relations between bodies, emotions constitute certain kinds of subjects in relation to others, to whom certain kinds of meanings are attached, and thus towards whom certain modes of relating are adopted (Ahmed, 2014a, 28). People's bodies are shaped in specific ways through emotions, and they become attached to or invest in certain modes of being (Ahmed, 2014a, 12), such as those that constitute them as separate from others. In sum, subjects materialize in affective contact with others, and through certain kinds of histories of contact with others (Ahmed, 2014a, 40).

Ahmed (2014a, 9–10) views emotions as social and cultural products that constitute the distinction between inside and outside individuals' psyches, or that between the psychological and the social, instead of viewing such distinctions as preceding the expression of emotions. She also (Ahmed, 2014a, 1–4) sees emotions as being linked with continuously forming power relations enacted by attaching meanings and value to the self and others. In her theorization, affect and emotions do not reside within human bodies but circulate and become attached to different objects. This circulation creates affective economies and consolidates and increases the affective value of certain signs, "based on 'sticky' associations between signs, figures and objects" (Ahmed, 2014a, 45), created by histories of repetition. In other words, certain emotions, meanings and valuations may stick with certain bodies, and therefore come to define relations between certain (groups of) people, and the identities that are forged through those relations, in ways that may be difficult to escape (e.g. Ahmed, 2014a, 59–60).

Ahmed's theorization sheds light on how affect operates in the constitution of boundaries through which socially valuable selves are enacted, such as those between good and bad women, as well as between men and women. Moreover, it gives insights into how a person's history of contacts leaves imprints on their bodies, aspirations, thoughts and affects. As Ahmed explains in her essay "Orientations Matter" (2010), these affective contacts are not only with other people but also with other, both material and immaterial elements such as material objects, modes of thought, or conceptualizations. In the same essay she discusses how encounters involving such contacts shape people's *orientations* (c.f. Ronkainen, 1999, 76) to the world that, in turn, shape what they see, feel and hear – and what they do not. Orientations in this context do not refer to internal or stable structures of the psyche, but rather link a specific person's past to their present and future. In other words, they particularize persons in ways that are not their own but are (co-)dependent on their relations with human and nonhuman entities, in other words the

environments they encounter. Orientations, then, are simultaneously psychological, social, material and immaterial (or discursive).

There is an interplay between fluidity and continuity in Ahmed's discussion that I find particularly illuminating with regard to the formation of subject(ivities). The particularities that are formed as orientations are not seen in deterministic terms, but are rather embodied tendencies, or "tendings to" (Ahmed, 2010), towards certain objects and modes of acting. A somewhat similar interplay between fluidity and continuity is also visible in Karen Barad's (2003, 2007) theorization. Barad's views also allow for a reconceptualization of agency that I find useful and pertinent to the aims of my study. I therefore include in the next section on agency a brief description of these views, which I believe add another, relevant layer to the theorization that runs through this study.

### 3.4 Discursive and material agencies

*...the agencies and actors are **never** preformed, prediscursive, just out there, substantial concrete, neatly bounded before anything happens, only waiting for a veil to be lifted and "land ho!" to be pronounced. Human and nonhuman, **all** entities take shape in encounters, in practices; and the actors and partners in encounters are not all human, to say the least.<sup>16</sup>*

Donna Haraway, 1994, 65

#### 3.4.1 The main debates and dilemmas over agency

Notions about agency are (implicitly or explicitly) present in each of the theoretical orientations discussed above, attached to different meanings. Given the centrality of agency as a concept both in previous discussions about women's use of violence and in the analyses of this study, I address it explicitly in this section, also returning to the discussion on the relations between narratives and other actions I began in Chapter 2.4.

Agency as a concept is generally taken to refer to the level of freedom in people's actions (Barnes, 2000; McNay, 2008). From a sociological perspective, Barry Barnes (2000, 47–49) has criticized the prevalence of individualistic views on agency that build an image of rational, individual actors with assumed possibilities to control not only their own actions but also

---

<sup>16</sup> Emphases in the original.

their environment.<sup>17</sup> Indeed, theorizations of agency in social psychology as well as in other social sciences involve finding a balance between the opposite poles of determinism and voluntarism, which often finds expression in so-called agency-structure debates (Hollway & Jefferson, 2005). Critical discursive psychology (CDP) seeks (at least a partial) balance in viewing actors as both the products and producers of discourse (see e.g. Wetherell & Edley, 1999). This underlying assumption is accompanied in this stream of research with analyses that approach notions of agency as discursive resources, with the help of which people can make sense of themselves and their actions (e.g. Reynolds, Wetherell & Taylor, 2007; Wetherell, 2005). From the psychosocial perspective advocated by Wendy Hollway and Tony Jefferson (2005), in turn, attempts are made to overcome the voluntarism/determinism dichotomy by attuning to the impact of unconscious dynamics on people and their actions.

In poststructural theorization agency often appears to refer primarily to people's capacity to resist the power of discursive regimes.<sup>18</sup> According to Butler (e.g. 1993, 220), for instance, agency is facilitated by the variety of ways in which normative discursive practices that reproduce gender are reiterated: in other words, gender can, at least theoretically, be done differently. Lois McNay (2008, 162–163, 170), among others, has criticized Butler's theorization of agency, claiming that its emphasis on the effects of discursive power gives only a one-dimensional view that ignores its connections with embodiment, for instance. McNay's theorization (2008, 180–194), in turn, evokes the Bourdieusian conceptualization of habitus, referring to the embodiment of social practices that produce gendered, classed and racialized (etc.) distinctions and hierarchies, which she sees as also allowing the possibility of agentic, unpredictable and creative action.

However, from a poststructural perspective agency as a concept can also appear suspect to begin with, given its frequent use in the vocabulary of liberal humanism (see e.g. St. Pierre, 2011), in which it has become the mark of proper individuals with the freedom to choose (see e.g. Cronin, 2002). Davies (2010, 66) sees that while it is possible for individualized actors to choose and to appear as the source of the action in choosing, what is not seen from the predominant perspectives of liberal humanism is that the actors' possibilities are limited in various ways by "forces outside itself". The poststructural view on subjecthood thus inclines towards a reconceptualization of agency – if not rejecting it as a concept altogether – and a relational view that replaces the predominant emphasis on individual actors and their will (e.g. Davies, 2010).

The orientation towards agency I adopt in this study largely follows the poststructural view of humans as both products and producers of discourses and the social practices linked to them, and as thus having limited space to

---

<sup>17</sup> See also Virkki (2004) for a critique of rationalism in prevalent notions about agency.

<sup>18</sup> As Leslie Miller (2008) points out, there are various views about the role of agency in Foucauldian theorization; whereas some claim that there is not enough room for agency in Foucault's thinking, for others it is plausible to see people as having limited freedom of action from a Foucauldian perspective.

manoeuvre in the contexts of available discourses and subject positions. However, in line with the CDP's focus on discursive action, my analyses engage with agency primarily as a phenomenon that is constituted in discursive descriptions of people and their actions (c.f. O'Connor, 1995). In sum, I have assumed in my analyses that people are able to make sense of their own and others' activities by drawing upon culturally and socially available understandings about agency. In so doing I have subscribed to certain background assumptions about the (limited) agency of people as sense-makers and negotiators of their identities. Agency is therefore considered in this study on two different levels, which are perceived not as unrelated to each other but rather as informing each other (c.f. Vesala, 2012).

Even if the analytical emphasis is on discursive descriptions of agency, I am also interested in the ways in which these descriptions entwine with the possibilities and modes of becoming a subject within a specific socio-cultural context: what modes of acting and relating to others and the world do they enact, assume and allow, and for whom? Fuelling this interest, apart from poststructural thinking and the theorizations on affectivity discussed above, were some of the new materialist approaches that have gained ground in feminist studies and other fields in recent years. Below I first briefly discuss new materialism in relation to poststructuralism, and then I describe a view on agency for which Barad's (2003, 2007) thinking (falling within new materialism) allows.

### **3.4.2 New feminist materialism and agency**

Reflecting the discussions in studies on affect, conceptions of the relations between new materialism and poststructuralism or discursivity vary. Many advocates of new materialism would posit this work as departing from a poststructural emphasis on language and epistemology, which they may consider excessively emphasized, unfruitful and/or obsolete (e.g. Barad, 2003; Hekman, 2008; Lykke, 2010b). Others, however, see new materialism as an extension of poststructural thinking and hence do not demarcate these strands of thought as markedly (see e.g. Irni, 2013). Bronwyn Davies (2016b) sees both continuity and discontinuity between poststructural and new materialist theorizing, noting that what particularly differentiates them is the focus on the activity of matter in the latter, as is evident in Barad's (2007) conceptualizations, for instance.

As described in the anthology *Material Feminisms* edited by Stacy Alaimo and Susan Hekman (2008), for instance, from the beginning of the 21st century proponents of new materialism in feminist studies have aimed to refocus attention on the material but without uncritically reverting to modernism or realism. This refocusing has been based on the premise that social-constructionist studies following the discursive turn have failed to engage with dimensions such as nature, biology and bodies, and have therefore

made unfruitful distinctions between those dimensions and discourse.<sup>19</sup> The aim of new materialist studies, in turn, is to overcome the dichotomizing of the discursive and the material, human and non-human, and language and reality (ibid.).<sup>20</sup>

Essential aspects of new materialist thinking include the ontological assumptions of processuality, entwinement and unpredictability (see e.g. Hinton & Iris van der Tuin, 2014). Due to these ontological assumptions that stress indeterminacy, new materialisms (Coole & Frost, 2010) or material feminisms (Alaimo & Hekman, 2008) differ from materialist feminisms that draw on Marxist thinking (see e.g. Jackson, 2001) in their conceptualization of matter.<sup>21</sup> These views also entail a rethinking of the ontology of human actors and their agency; moving away from human-centred thinking, the emphasis is on humans' entanglements with matter, things and the universe.

The concept of *intra-action* developed by Karen Barad (2003, 2007) focuses on encounters in which humans as well as other elements such as material objects and discourses become entangled and together produce real effects. The entangling elements that intra-act with each other do not enter these encounters in predefined forms but are rather continuously shaped in them. Hence, the agency of humans is not separable from intra-actions, but rather emerges as distinct in intra-action: the distinctiveness is related inseparably to their entanglements (Barad, 2007, 33). Matter is thus also considered agentic in intra-action, and distinctions between active subjects and passive objects are dissolved.

Barad's (ibid.) views and her concept of intra-action foster the notion of subjects as formed and as actors in discursive-material relations, which are in constant flux. Thus, according to Barad, multiple and complex forces are at play in the enactments of phenomena. Barad therefore broadens the scope of agency as a concept: the primary reference is not to the resistance of discursive power, as it tends to be in poststructural thinking, but to the enactment of happenings that are not focused exclusively on human action. Indeed, drawing on the notion of intra-action along with theorizations on affect, it might be possible to replace agency (if seen as a concept that describes people's relations with their environments) with the notion of affectivity, referring to the capacity to "affect and be affected" (Davies, 2016b).

Although these theoretical developments have expanded the scope of feminist inquiry, the radical de-centring of human subjects they entail raises questions as to their suitability for a social-psychological study of

---

<sup>19</sup> See, however, Ahmed's (2008) critique of these notions.

<sup>20</sup> These aims and discussions resonate remotely with the debates in psychology concerning social constructionism and (critical) realism since the 1990s (see e.g. Nightingale & Cromby, 1999; Parker, 1998). For discussions on embodiment in social psychology that advocate discursive *and* material approaches, see e.g. Berg, 2010; Lyons & Cromby, 2010; Ussher, 2008.

<sup>21</sup> See also Sari Irni's (2013) critical discussion about how the matter that is emphasized in new materialism is of the natural sciences, whereas other conceptualizations of it may be deemed obsolete.

subjectivities. Lis Højgaard and Dorte Marie Søndergaard (2011; see also Søndergaard, 2016) (indirectly) address this question, drawing on both poststructuralism and new materialist thinking in their attempt to develop a discursive *and* material approach to subjectivity. With particular reference to Karen Barad and the concept of intra-action, Højgaard and Søndergaard (2011) put forward a view on subjectivity as enacted, and enacting, in intra-action with various other discursive and material, mutually constitutive elements. They have attempted in this work to retain the poststructuralist notion of subjectification as entailing both being subjected to forces beyond one's control and acting agentially with them. They claim that this notion has not been attended to in enough detail in many of the new materialist or STS (science and technology studies) analyses that take the agency of matter as their starting point, with less interest in questions of subjectivity.

New materialist thinking offers intriguing possibilities for the analysis of processes in which human and non-human elements come together. Obviously, however, my engagements with these theoretizations within this PhD study are limited in terms of analytical application, partly also because of the gradual and partial nature of my encounters with them. Nevertheless, I believe that Barad's (2007) concept of intra-action in particular has the potential to add new insights to the research topic of my study. I have drawn upon these views particularly in imagining the encounters in the context of which the narratives about violence that I analyse emerge. As I discuss further in Chapter 4, this includes research encounters in which certain theories, methodologies, researchers, research participants and research topics intra-act.

In sum, my intention is to draw selectively — one could say promiscuously (Childers, 2014, see Chapter 4.2.2) — on conceptualizations and orientations deriving from both the discursive-psychological approaches discussed in the first parts of this chapter and the approaches discussed in these latter parts. This obviously produces various tensions within the study. For instance, identity as a concept may appear suspect from the perspective of new materialism (even more so than in poststructuralism) because, as discussed above, it carries the baggage of modernist individuation that assumes entities to be separate and identifiable, in other words as having a core essence (St. Pierre, 2011). Despite being inspired by these conceptualizations and challenges to humanist thinking, as mentioned above, I am also somewhat sceptical as to how clean a break there can be from “old” conceptualizations such as identity. As Susan Hekman (2008) notes, identities provide an important means whereby people become integrated to the social. From my perspective, the world is still deeply invested in practices that organize relations around identities and thus reproduce the logic of hierarchical separations. This means that the processes whereby that logic circulates are (still) a valid topic of inquiry.

Moreover, and significantly to my study, identities are also a pervasive means for *explaining* the world, including people's actions, that flourish

despite, or perhaps because of, the precariousness of the becomings in it, and hence of the possibilities to know these becomings (Barnwell, 2016). Similarly, there may be fluidity in practices whereby (people's) lives are shaped, but there are also points at which they get stuck. Violence is one such practice that inhibits fluidity and movement, when power imbalances become starkly actualized (c.f. Huuki, 2016). In sum, then, in this work I frequently hover between these various approaches, attempting to work *with* the tensions this produces, and utilizing these approaches for the constant questioning of my own as well as others' work.

### **3.5 Conceptual hybridizing: affective identificatory practices**

In Article IV I use a conceptualization I refer to as *affective identificatory practices*. This hybridizing conceptualization draws upon strands of thought discussed above, specifically Margaret Wetherell's (2012, 23) notion of affective practice as well as Sara Ahmed's (2010; 2014a) theorization on affective, dynamic processes in the formation of separable subjects.<sup>22</sup> This conceptualization refers to processes of becoming recognizable—in the sense of being both identifiable and valuable—within social systems. In addition to recognizability, this conceptualization draws on the view that the enactments of identities are also firmly based on the notion of coherence: we tend to expect, and are expected, to remain the same across social encounters. In this sense, both through content and form, identities are seen as vehicles for the reproduction of social systems of power and the image of a person thereby constructed. However, they simultaneously function as forms of sociality that matter to us, to our everyday lives and our potential for engaging in social activities. In their coherence they are both illusionary and yet real, and sometimes necessary.

Through affective identificatory practices, then, people are constituted as particular kinds of persons in relation to others. Such practices entail micro-level, relational dynamics as well as intra-action (Barad, 2007) with socio-cultural, material and discursive systems of meaning-making and societal positioning. Hence, the past, the present, and potentially the future become implicated and entwined with each other, along with gendered cultural notions about what it means to be a proper subject.

Through this conceptualization locally customized expressions of selves can be seen as at least potentially linked to more continuous modes of constituting selves in relation to others. These orientations (Ahmed, 2010) gain affective weight over the life course, drawing one towards certain

---

<sup>22</sup> I will come back to these attempts at hybridity and plurality of approaches in Chapters 4 and 5.

positionings and away from others. Thus, the imprisoned women's narratives about violence that I analyse in this study, for instance, can be viewed as a part of practices that, in their affectivity, entwine with other events in their lives (c.f. Wetherell, 2012, 93).

To sum up<sup>23</sup> the ways in which the various theoretical strands discussed above play out in this study; I see the various elements of interest, such as portrayals of women and violence in the tabloid press, violent (and non-violent) encounters and narratives about them told by the imprisoned women, and the analytical readings of all of the above, as being involved in intra-actions that shape each of them in ways that cannot be reduced to simple cause-and-effect relations (c.f. Søndergaard, 2016), nor to any finalized, singular meanings. In the next chapter, I discuss further how these and other theoretical and methodological orientations can be employed for making sense of the empirical research practices in my study.

### 3.6 Research questions

The aim of this study is to explore the social, discursive and affective processes through which meanings are attached to women and their use of violence, both in news reports published in Finnish tabloids and in the narratives of women imprisoned for violent crimes. By drawing particularly on poststructural and discursive-psychological theorizations on gender, identities, subjectification, agency and affectivity, I adopt a perspective on women and their use of violence that engages with multiplicities of meanings and their interplay in the constitution of relations among people and their selves.

The concepts of identity and agency are employed in several of the sub-analyses comprising this PhD study, and are analysed in terms of the ways in which they work to constitute each other. This is based on the view that notions about identities and agency(s) often entwine in meaning making (particularly within prevailing liberal humanist practices). Who you are taken to be impacts on your possibilities to act, and how you are (seen as) acting impacts on the kinds of possibilities there are for being identified and recognized as a particular kind of a person. Both are taken to be thoroughly social: there is no action, including the enactments of identities and acts of imbuing action with

---

<sup>23</sup> In this summing up, various scholars whose writings I have discussed above speak through me and, again through me (whatever we take "me" to be), with each other and with my interpretations, in part agreeing and disagreeing. Although this entails inevitable risks, I hope that my writing retains enough of their disagreements, evident in the contra-distinctions and incoherences, so as not to go too gently into the folds of mainstream academic conventions working to smooth them out (e.g. Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005).

agency, that would not require the participation of other entities or elements, or that would not happen in conjunction with them.

The empirical part of this PhD study is focused around the following research questions, each of which is explored in one of the sub-analyses:

1. How are relations between gender categories and violence constructed in reporting about (lethal intimate partner) violence in the tabloid press, and how are notions about gender drawn upon in making sense of violence (sub-analysis I)?
2. In what ways is women's violent action made sense of in terms of agency in the tabloid press, and how are the identities of women suspected of violent crimes constituted in descriptions of their agency in relation to violence (sub-analysis II)?
3. How do women imprisoned for violent crimes negotiate their positionings and construct identities in relation to culturally circulating conceptions about womanhood and its relations to violence (sub-analysis III)?
4. What kinds of meanings do women imprisoned for violent crimes attach to their violent action, and how do their narrated selves become (affectively and discursively) positioned in relation to violence in that process (sub-analysis IV)?

## 4 METHODOLOGIES

*Strumming my pain with his fingers*  
*Singing my life with his words*  
*Killing me softly with his song*  
*Killing me softly with his song*  
*Telling my whole life with his words*  
*Killing me softly, with his words*

*Roberta Flack, Killing me Softly, Killing me Softly album*

How is it possible to *know* about the people whose lives, or rather the possibilities for whose lives, we conceptualize in social research? What does our knowing *do* to them, to the researchers and to society at large? Can certain theoretical and methodological approaches kill subjecthood along with authorship in ways that render people's lived lives invisible and thus othered, or could they allow for subverting the violence of reductionism and some of the power imbalances inscribed in the practices of knowing?

I grapple with some of these questions in this methodology chapter. I discuss the overarching methodological orientations that have informed my study – feminist methodologies and what I summarize as post-foundational approaches – as well as the role of affects in research on violence and ethical issues. These are not completely distinct orientations, but it is notable that not all feminist methodologies share the same epistemological and ontological assumptions as post-foundational ones (see e.g. Gannon & Davies, 2007), nor are those assumptions, or the ways in which they are put to work, identical in all the various approaches grouped here under the term 'post-foundational'. My purpose is to discuss how these orientations have increasingly come to shape my thinking, and how the insights made available by them may allow for an illuminating view on the process of doing this study. This discussion is continued in Chapter 5.2.1 with a focus on encounters with women in prison, and revisited in Chapter 7.4.

### 4.1 Feminist methodologies

Feminist methodologies are generally based on sensitivity towards ways in which power works both societally and in research (Harding & Norberg, 2005; Phoenix, 1990). Feminist research aims at challenging power imbalances and the prevalence of inegalitarian socio-cultural practices (Gill, 1998). Doing feminist research, therefore, involves adopting a reflective stance on behalf of

the researcher, in terms of both research procedures and the socio-political impact of the research (Fonow & Cook, 2005; Maynard, 1994; see also Gergen, 2008). Hence feminist research generally departs from a positivist valuation of objectivity, based on assumptions about research as a politically neutral activity conducted by detached researchers, and rather draws on the view that all knowledge is situated (in one way or another) and political (Haraway, 1991).<sup>24</sup>

In more specific terms, feminist research is usually underpinned by a theoretical understanding of the significance of gender and other hierarchizing categorizations for people's lives and the ways in which they are socially organized (Maynard, 1994). Both the researchers and the research participants are seen as being positioned in various ways in terms of distinctions based on gender, class, ethnicity, race and sexuality, for instance. These distinctions, and an awareness of them, inform research processes in many ways (Phoenix, 1990, 1994). However, these social distinctions and their significance can also be theorized in many ways. This has led to the adoption of a variety of methodological and analytical approaches in feminist research – in other words to a plurality of feminist methodologies (see e.g. Fonow & Cook, 2005; Hemmings, 2011; Lykke, 2010a).

Early feminist research particularly focused on the ways in which women, especially those in specifically marginalized positions, described the events in their lives. This was based on the idea that women who are in disadvantaged positions need to be heard to allow the marginalizing and othering views about them that are produced from the standpoint of the more powerful to be challenged. (Maynard, 1994.) Although these concerns are still considered valid, they have become complicated from various directions in the last few decades, not least due to the questioning of the inclusivity and overall validity of the category 'women' from a postmodern perspective (Ramazanoglu & Holland, 2000)<sup>25</sup> and by black feminists, and the development of intersectional approaches (Brah & Phoenix, 2013; Phoenix, 1990).<sup>26</sup>

In line with the theoretical leanings towards poststructuralist thought discussed in Chapter 3, I draw specifically on methodological approaches I characterize as post-foundational (see further below). These approaches tend to build on feminist thought, and are sometimes also delineated as feminist

---

<sup>24</sup> Donna Haraway (1991), for instance, has called for the redefining of objectivity in research to account for the situatedness and partiality of the knowledge produced. Hence, she does not reject the term objectivity in her discussion, but rather purports to shift the meanings associated with it.

<sup>25</sup> For opposing views on the complex issue concerning the compatibility of constructionist/postmodern views with feminist research in psychology, see Gill (1998) and Miller (2000).

<sup>26</sup> Simply put, intersectionality refers to the ways in which different social distinctions such as race, gender, class and sexuality entwine and shape, in unison, the realities lived by variously positioned people in terms of power (Crenshaw, 1991; see also e.g. Gunnarsson, 2017, on different approaches to intersectionality).

methodologies. They are based on explicit problematizations of epistemology and a rethinking of how it relates to ontology, which I find specifically pertinent in relation to the various methodological dilemmas that inevitably arose during this study.

## **4.2 Post-foundational methodologies**

### **4.2.1 The post-qualitative critique**

What I refer to as post-foundational approaches to qualitative inquiry rely on constructionist, poststructural and/or new materialist theorizing. These approaches are generally based on the premise that ontology and epistemology are inseparable (Haraway, 1991), which is a core principle in what have been called post-qualitative approaches (Lather & St. Pierre, 2013; St. Pierre, 2011) or new empiricisms (St. Pierre, Jackson & Mazzei, 2016). These approaches derive from the view that the practices adopted in the majority of qualitative research separate and prioritize the human knower over the objects to be known, and therefore reproduce Cartesian binarism that enacts divisions between subject/object, mind/matter, culture/nature, human/non-human and philosophy/science, for instance. Grounded in such binary thinking, conventional research practices are not considered capable of producing knowledge that would allow to overcome the rigidifying and structuring effects of modern dichotomizations. The usefulness of coding, in the form in which it is typically practised in qualitative research for instance, has been questioned from this viewpoint (e.g. Maclure, 2008; St.Pierre & Jackson, 2014) on the grounds that it detaches parts from the complexity of emergent relations and submits them to the interpretations made by the researcher from the outside: such interpretations tend to rely on conventional ways of knowing and categorizing the world. Instead of relying on the ideal of systematicity and following predetermined steps in qualitative inquiry, Maggie Maclure (2008), for instance, suggests entering into analysis by attending to what “glows” in the research materials, what surprises and intrigues, and affects the researcher. This kind of research process is inevitably indeterminable, and the techniques used cannot be applied in the same form from one study to another.

Conceptualizations of “data” in qualitative research have also been extensively discussed in post-foundational approaches. In their introduction to a special issue on reconceptualizing “data”, Mirka Koro-Ljunberg and Maggie MacLure (2013) discuss the possibility of transgressing conventional views of data as controllable entities that can neatly be fitted into predetermined frames of established methods of inquiry. Of central interest in the above-mentioned special issue is the perception of “data” as agentic in its potential to provoke new kinds of thinking by unsettling what has been

previously 'known'. This means not only extending ideas about what can be considered (valid) data in qualitative research but also engaging with data in ways that allow for complexity and the unexpected. Assumptions that "data" pre-exists researchers' actions and is to be "found" are questioned in these discussions, thus making visible the researcher's role in its creation (Petersen, 2015; St. Pierre & Jackson, 2014). The analytical process also extends beyond typically imposed limits in entailing researchers' encounters with various kinds of data, involving sensations and affects, that are present in their everyday lives (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005; St. Pierre, 2011).

Questions about voice in qualitative research have also been problematized in discussions on post-foundational methodologies. Lisa Mazzei and Alecia Jackson (e.g. 2012) and Patti Lather (2000), for instance, explain how the notion of allowing the research participants' voice to be heard ignore the interpretative work done by researchers in the research process (c.f. Macmillan, 1996). This reproduces assumptions about the epistemological possibility of accessing 'pure' experiences, and thus also works to sustain the belief that individuals or certain groups have coherent, knowable and stable identities. Mazzei and Jackson (2012; also e.g. Mazzei, 2013) propose instead focusing on the multiplicity of voices encountered in research, and the ways in which the mingling of different voices disturbs assumptions about coherence and the centrality of human subjects. Their approach therefore supports the notion that voices are not (inherently) attached to individual subjects or groups, but rather speak of multiple spatio-temporal places in which subjects reside and have resided (c.f. Ronkainen, 1999). I suggest that this stance in post-foundational approaches bears a remote resemblance to analyses in the field of critical discursive psychology, which also focuses on the plurality of positions from where to speak (or otherwise act) instead of searching for individuals' authentic life experiences.

What I find particularly productive in these strands of thought in qualitative research is the prevailing attempt to tie research practices closely to theory, and to encourage the constant questioning of adopted practices and their fit with one's theoretical commitments (e.g. St. Pierre, 2011; St. Pierre, Jackson and Mazzei, 2016). In line with the general aims of feminist methodologies, these approaches aspire towards an awareness of the inseparability and contingency of researchers and the theories that work on shaping them, the practices they adopt and the knowledge produced in research (e.g. Petersen, 2015)<sup>27</sup>. What specifically causes tensions between my work and some of the ideas expressed in relation to these approaches, however, is my focus on meaning-making and language. This appears to be in contrast with the goals advocated in some post-qualitative texts to move

---

<sup>27</sup> However, as discussed in relation to new materialisms, these explicitly expressed attempts to view epistemology and ontology as inseparable sometimes appear in these discussions to be in tension with the proposed research practices in which a certain ontology may appear knowable in an unproblematized way, and (relatedly) with advocating a turn to ontology by turning away from epistemology.

beyond discursive analyses (see e.g. Maclure, 2013). However, these views tend to be based on critiques of representationalist thinking in which the reality and its linguistic representation are assumed to exist separately (e.g. Maclure, 2013). Even though my work focuses on the discursive constitution of subjects and their identities, it relies on seeing meanings enacted in the analysed processes of constitution as plural and context-specific; it therefore does not subscribe to representationalist thinking, which divides reality and its representations. Nevertheless, despite resonances the weight given to discursivity in my analyses means also at least partial divergence from some of the widely-adopted foci in the approaches discussed above.

#### 4.2.2 Diffractions, intra-action and promiscuity in research

During the process of conducting this study I found Bronwyn Davies's (e.g. 2014, 2016a & b, 2017) writings on diffractive methodology/analysis particularly inspiring. Davies draws on Barad's (2007) writings about *diffraction* – initially discussed by Haraway (1992) – as a concept to be preferred over reflection. The boundaries between self and other, being and doing, and the representer and the represented are blurred in diffractive analysis, as each is seen as affecting and being affected by the other (Davies, 2017). This differs from reflection, which as a concept is seen as drawing on representationalist thinking and thus as reproducing the same, instead of accommodating constant mutation. Hence, reflexivity is based on the assumption of separateness of the original that is being reflected, and therefore is seen as working for individualized subjects as a means of knowing, and hence constituting, themselves as separate, stable entities. (e.g. Davies, 2016b; Davies & Gannon, 2012.)<sup>28</sup> As Davies (2014, 735) puts it concerning diffractive entanglements in research processes: “we, as researchers, are part of, and encounter, already entangled matter and meanings that affect us and that we affect in an ongoing, always changing set of movements”. This means viewing research as processes in which bodies of researchers and of participants (along with non-human materialities) and meanings are affected and affect each other, and are hence always in the process of intra-active becoming (Davies, 2014, 2016a; see also Ringrose & Renold, 2014).

In sum, Davies's mobilization of Barad's views allows for viewing the researcher, the theoretical and methodological approaches, the research topic, materials and participants, and the context of the encounters between these

---

<sup>28</sup> Although I am inspired by this discussion, to allow for dialogue with a broader array of writings in the social sciences I also continue to use the term reflection in this study. What I mean when I refer to reflexivity, however, comes close to the aims described in the approach advocated by Davies (2017); I talk about it as a means of intervening with the stabilizing tendencies of discursive systems, which may facilitate the retention of the mobility of meanings and the multiplicity of modes of being.

elements, as fluidly entangling and co-producing each other, in other words intra-acting in research (c.f. Leppänen & Tiainen, 2016). In line with the general principles of post-qualitative approaches, therefore, one could also perceive the research materials as agentic but also inextricably entwined in the processes of their generation. According to Højgaard and Søndergaard (2011), phenomena produced in intra-action become agentic parts of it. Hence, the “data” that I have (partly) generated in the intra-actions of this study, for instance, have become an agentic element that affects its course. It is not, however, an agent that is separable from the process, affecting it and myself as a researcher from the outside, but is rather internal to it in that I as a researcher, along with the elements present in the research encounters, have partaken in its emergence.

Given the plurality of theoretical and methodological approaches I have drawn upon during this research process, and the internal tension that this has created, I also have a strong affinity with a hybridizing methodological approach that Sara Childers (2014; see also Childers et al., 2013) describes as *promiscuous feminist methodology*. Childers uses this term to describe the kind of research that engages with complexities and challenges taken-for-granted boundaries, including those between different theoretical and methodological approaches. It therefore allows for the flexible intermeshing of research practices, theories, methodologies, and the ontological complexities and multiplicities engaged with in the process. Promiscuity here does not mean irresponsibility, but rather affective responsiveness that allows for theoretical and methodological movement and plurality in the research process. Characterizing feminist research as promiscuous not only challenges normative practices of governing women’s sexuality through categorizations that separate virtuous women from the less virtuous, but also enacts a broader critique of practices of othering that establish boundaries between different approaches, through which viable identities are often constructed in academia (see Bendix-Petersen, 2016; Venäläinen, 2017).<sup>29</sup> Childers (2014) emphasises the importance of maintaining flexibility in the research process because, by allowing for movement in theoretical and methodological orientations, it may better enable researchers to engage with the multifaceted materiality of the phenomena under study.<sup>30</sup> This is in line with Turid Markussen’s (2005,

---

<sup>29</sup> Managing certain kinds of methods fosters recognition as a certain kind of researcher, and is thus an essential aspect of the researcher’s (affective) identity work (see Petersen, 2008). Thus, cultivating plurality in this respect also enables the multiplying and complicating of identities on the level of researcher selves, disrupting the core notion of coherence. Furthermore, “choosing” methodological approaches does not happen in a vacuum, but is political through and through (Petersen, 2016). Different approaches and theoretical turns relate to one another hierarchically, and therefore the kind of approach one adopts may also have political consequences in terms of the potential impact of one’s work.

<sup>30</sup> On a superficial level promiscuous methodology might appear as uncritically speaking to the neoliberal ideal of an entrepreneurial academic subject (see e.g. Brunila, 2016), who constantly re-

2006) thoughts on transformative moments in the research process: she argues that allowing such moments to occur enables the conducting of research in an open-ended manner with explicit ethical accountability. In line with Kate McCoy (2012), Markussen (2006) suggests that such moments may allow for the destabilization of established discourses and practices, and thus facilitate not only the seeing but also the *enacting* of realities that escape in their complexity what often appear to be simplified ontologies reproduced in predominant social practices. These methodological orientations to complexity thus rely on seeing research as an active component in the constitution of a reality that is perceived as forever multiple and in the process of becoming (Law, 2005; Mol, 2002).

In my study, what I see as these kinds of shifts have specifically occurred in terms of movement towards a deeper theoretical and methodological emphasis on relationality, contingency and affectivity of subjects' acting and being in the world. It was not only my encounters with new theories and methodologies (such as the post-foundational approaches described here) that instigated these shifts, but also my encounters with women in prison and their accounts of violence. Listening to these narratives opened worlds that I partially recognized and that yet partially differed (even radically in some respects) from the ones I (thought I) inhabited (see also Chapter 5.2.1 and article III). The affectiveness of these encounters motivated a continued search for modes of inquiry that would better allow to comprehend the social dynamics at stake. The accompanying shift from relying on discourse analysis to experimenting with an affective-discursive analysis allowed me to better engage with the ambivalent sensations, ranging from what could be described as empathy to discomfort, aroused by the encounters with the women who participated in my study, and the violence in their narratives. It meant moving closer to them and to the subject area; from the safe(r) confines of discursive analysis it is possible to retain a larger distance and detachment from the topic and the research participants than in an analysis that engages with affect(s) and thus, for instance, attempts to imagine the affective aspects of the research participants' positionings (see Chapter 5.3.4).

On the practical level of doing analysis, the multiplicity of influences on my study is evident for instance in my analyses of both the media and the prison materials, which involve both systematically combing through the materials for recurring meanings, in the spirit of more conventional research methodologies, and attending particularly to aspects in them that seemed to

---

invents itself and is capable of adapting to the changing environment of its work. However, in my reading this approach enables a critique of such individualizing practices due to its sensitivity towards power imbalances and towards a plurality in ways in which they are lived, and towards the kinds of worlds that one's work may contribute to building. It is thus not based on the belief that individuals can freely choose the practices they engage in – and have equal opportunities to do so – even though it emphasizes the potentiality of flexibility in those practices based on responsiveness.

“glow” (Maclure, 2008). These different approaches, motivated by different analytical threads running through this work, and the incongruities between them, can be considered as allowing for nuanced overall analyses.

One of the advantages of reading and engaging with a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches is that it allows for a better understanding of the underlying epistemological and ontological assumptions on which they draw (c.f. St. Pierre, 2011). These engagements facilitate the reading of various approaches through each other, in other words diffractive reading (Barad, 2007). While I was doing this study, revisiting writings on critical discursive psychology for instance, after having engaged with writings on affect, brought to light what I see as (residues of) an emphasis on individual agency in CDP that I had not noticed to the same extent before.<sup>31</sup> Expressions such as ‘the use of linguistic resources’ rubbed uncomfortably against the orientations towards (the impossibilities of) subjecthood and the entwinements of discursive and non-discursive happenings that affect theory highlighted. This discomfort led me to re-evaluate my relationship with CDP, which nevertheless did not result in its abandonment but rather revealed its situatedness and partiality. These are likely indebted to the historically recurrent tendencies in psychological sciences to take individuals as their point of departure (e.g. Blackman & Walkerdine, 2001), the predominance of which, in turn, theoretizations of affect and materiality challenge, even more profoundly than the discursive turn. Hence, such readings of texts with various orientations may foster critical engagement with predominant thought patterns and the envisioning of alternatives, which is another reason for cultivating plurality even within a singular study.

### **4.3 Affect(s) in researching violence**

Both Davies (e.g. 2014) and Childers (2014), among several other proponents of post-foundational methodologies, discuss the methodological significance of engaging with the affectivity of research encounters. The affectivity of the research process is also referred to in discussions about research on sensitive topics such as violence (e.g. Burman et al., 2001; Dickson-Swift et al., 2009; Liebling & Stanko, 2001; Pickering, 2001; Seal, 2012), although it is generally approached in these discussions from a different onto-epistemological angle than in post-foundational research. Engaging with the affects involved in the research process matters in terms of both the quality of the research and the researchers’ well-being (Dickson-Swift et al., 2009). Markussen (2005, 2006)

---

<sup>31</sup> I do not offer this reading as absolute, and do not wish to undermine CDP, but instead see this approach as entailing various possibilities and bearing traces of various discourses that constitute subjects in different ways.

has also claimed that attuning to affect in research encounters is vital in attempts to do research in an ethical and politically conscious way (c.f. Bengtsson, 2014).

Similar to my experiences of doing this study, much of the research on violence has elements of emotional ambivalence, brought out, for instance, in situations in which the researcher is confronted with ways of relating to violence as a justified mode of acting by the research participants (Burman, Batchelor & Brown, 2001). Sharon Pickering (2001) points to the need to recognize and work with these ambivalences because such work is reflected in the interpretations of the researcher. I suggest that engaging with the issue of women and violence is likely to evoke intense, ambivalent and potentially disturbing affects, not least because it disrupts the comfort offered by prevalent binary categorizations on which gendered common-sense notions about violence lean. Despite a willingness to challenge such binaries, researchers (including myself) are not immune to the affectiveness of common sense based on binaries and naturalized categorizations (Davies, 2016a). Therefore, reflectiveness – or what could be called a diffractive stance – throughout the research process is of special importance in research on issues such as (women’s use of) violence, or indeed when one reads about studies delving into such issues. To me this means *staying with* affect, including the unpleasant and unexpected sensations, to find out something central, and perhaps new, about the topic and the research materials through which it is approached. As discussed further below, this kind of stance can also allow for ethicality in research (see also Mäkinen, 2016).<sup>32</sup>

#### 4.4 Ethical considerations

Ethical sensitivity throughout the research process is of paramount importance, particularly with sensitive topics such as violence. I have given considerable attention to the issue of ethicality when conducting this study. In particular, I carefully considered the issue of anonymity, making sure that the study participants could not be identified. I have used pseudonyms when I refer to them in the articles, varying the names so that the same participant may have been assigned several pseudonyms. I also made sure when I selected and edited the extracts from the interviews and written accounts that they

---

<sup>32</sup> Attuning to the ways in which the researcher is bodily affected is considered essential for doing research on affect in a way that departs from more traditional studies focused on phenomena such as “structures of signification” (Knudsen & Stage, 2015, 2). Thus, a common goal in this strand of research is to aim at innovative experimentation in which the researcher attunes to the affective, bodily felt resonances that encounters with the research topic or materials evoke (e.g. Blackman, 2015; Trivelli, 2015; see also Walkerdine, Olsvold & Rudberg, 2013).

would not include details that might allow the participants to be identified. For the same reason I do not give detailed information about the prisons in which I collected the research materials. I was the only person to work with the research materials, and nobody else had access to them. Furthermore, as noted above, participation in the study was voluntary, and the participants were given information about it beforehand. In terms of informed consent, I signed a research contract with each interviewee. Those contributing a written account gave their consent either in a signed research contract enclosed with the account, or informally in writing. Moreover, concerning my analyses of tabloid news reports, I have tried in my choice of analytical approaches and expressions to avoid reiterating the tabloids' sensationalizing style of presentation.

In addition to practicalities such as those described above, ethicality in research also concerns how the researcher relates to and encounters the research participants as well as the research topics. For Bronwyn Davies (2014), ethical research means suspending judgement that relies on that which is already known when encountering research topics, situations and participants, and being open to unexpected ways in which entanglements occur. In describing her approach to ethicality in research, Davies (2014, 740) writes:

*Ethics, as Deleuze and Barad define it, requires being open in each moment to assessing the impact of the research, the research instruments and the researcher as well as the intra-active effect of the research on the researcher – ontologically and epistemologically.*

In line with Davies (ibid.), for me ethical research means not only constant sensitivity and the reflexive (or perhaps rather diffractive) questioning of one's doings in the research process (c.f. Guillemin & Gillam, 2004), but also fluidity as a means of resisting power-infused, conventional ways of knowing, and hence refusing the temptation of closure or of assigning non-problematized truth-status to any singular view (c.f. Halse & Honey, 2005; Lather, 2000). I have attempted to achieve that in this study by allowing for fluidity in the adoption of theoretical and methodological approaches, including constant dialoguing among research materials, practices and theories, and methodologies. Moreover, during this process I carefully considered my ways of not only doing but also presenting my analyses, aware of the possibility of multiple readings and the danger that my descriptions would be used in ways that could prove detrimental to the groups for which the research may have relevance. I hope this research will be read with a similar awareness of complexity I have striven to maintain.

Finally, it is worth pointing out that advocating flexibility and plurality in ethical practice should not be equated with moral relativism, but is rather based on the responsiveness that seeing the relationality of actors enables.

Furthermore, as Seyla Benhabib (1987) observes about 'interactive universalism', recognizing universal rights to dignity need not foreclose recognizing the particularities of variously positioned people's needs. Hence, for Benhabib (ibid.) it is possible to unite the generalized other that is at the heart of Kohlbergian justice-based thinking with the concrete other proposed in the ethic of care in the development of an approach to ethics that is based on dialogue and a critique of assumptions of autonomy of moral actors.

## 5 RESEARCH MATERIALS AND ANALYTICAL THREADS

In this chapter, I first describe the research materials – tabloid news reports and narratives of imprisoned women – and then move on to the introduction of the specific approaches drawn upon in the analysis of the materials. The description of the narratives of imprisoned women is accompanied by further discussion of my research encounters in the specific context of prison.

### 5.1 Tabloid news reports

Both the reporting of violence in the news and audience engagement with news reports are embedded in several layers of interdependent social contexts (Buttny & Ellis, 2007). As briefly discussed in Chapter 2.3.1, the conventions of the media-industry considerably limit the decisions that journalists make concerning the kind of cases of violent crime to cover and how this is done. Furthermore, the genre into which media texts fall and the types of framing that are common for certain kinds of texts guide their construction (Erickson et al., 1987).

The news reports about violence analysed in this PhD study come from two Finnish tabloids, *Iltta-Sanomat* and *Iltalehti*. Both of them are among the most widely circulated newspapers in Finland, and they are the only Finnish tabloid-type newspapers.<sup>33</sup> Because of their style they have been characterized as serious popular press. Their main goal is the mediation of news, even though their presentation is sensationalist and focused on entertainment. (Herkman, 2005, 288–289.)<sup>34</sup>

In their quest for sensationalism, tabloids such as these rely heavily on ‘the deviant’ and the shocking for their content (Gill, 2007). Violent crime is a prevalent theme in these Finnish tabloids, and in parallel with the increased competition in the media market in recent decades the reporting of it has yet increased and the depictions of it have become increasingly graphic (Smolej, 2011; Syrjälä, 2007). These papers therefore offer vivid descriptions of violent crime that are instrumental in selling them, and therefore occupy a prominent

---

<sup>33</sup> The estimated number of readers of *Iltta-Sanomat* in 2013 was 544 000, and of *Iltalehti* 428 000 (MediaAuditFinland 2014).

<sup>34</sup> The style of crime reporting in Finnish tabloids as well as other newspapers is, however, less sensationalist than, for instance, in the UK or US press. Eileen Berrington and Päivi Honkatukia (2002) have attributed this difference to the lower level of competition in the Finnish media market due to its organization.

position in them. As such, they constitute a fruitful body of research material for anyone with an interest in culturally shared understandings about violent crime, and of normality and deviance in this context. This was why I chose them as sources of research materials in my study.

I collected all the news reports about cases of violent crime involving women suspects published in *Ilta-Sanomat* and *Iltalehti* within three years, 2009–2011, with the help of microfilms. This yielded 657 reports involving women as suspects.<sup>35</sup> Of these reports, 43 per cent (N=284) were about violence towards a male spouse, 10 per cent (N=66) were about violence towards a man other than a spouse, 18 per cent (N=117) were about violence towards people labelled “elderly” in the reports (in practice mostly women)<sup>36</sup>, 10 per cent (N=68) were about violence towards another woman, and 19 per cent (N=122) were about violence towards children (under 18 years of age). A large proportion of the reports (N=219) about violence towards a spouse concerned the heavily reported Ulvila murder case. There were also 15 articles published in the two papers within the above-mentioned time frame in which women’s use of violence was discussed as a phenomenon (N=15), and which were used as research materials for sub-analysis II (along with the 657 reports).

In addition, I initially gathered all the news reports about cases of violent crime involving men suspects published in the same tabloids during the year 2009. This was motivated by the goal of getting a more comprehensive picture of the ways in which tabloids report on violent crime and how gender is deployed in the process. I used the research materials covering the reporting of all violent crime by both women and men in 2009 in a study focusing on the headlines of reports of violence in the tabloids, the results of which were presented in an article (Venäläinen, 2013), which is not included in this dissertation (having been written in Finnish). In it I explored the ways in which gender categories were used for constructing newsworthy descriptions of crime cases and thus to arouse interest in the headlines (Watson, 1997). I concluded from my analysis that explicit references to the gender category ‘women’ in the characterizations of both perpetrators and victims featured prominently in the headlines markedly more often than references to the category ‘men’. I took this as being associated with how the normality of men’s involvement in violence is reproduced, whereas the contradictions in the relations between women and violence are recurrently drawn upon in the tabloids to construe engaging angles on the violent crimes covered in the reports.

---

<sup>35</sup> Cases involving women and men suspected of having perpetrated violence together are not included here.

<sup>36</sup> This was the categorization used in the reports, and is therefore used here as well because it is descriptive of the ways in which tabloid newspapers deploy gendered categorizations, or in this case categorizations that efface gender.

During my preliminary analytical encounters with the materials consisting of all reports from the year 2009 it became evident that working with such large amounts of material (N= 961)<sup>37</sup> (including not only the headlines but also the main text) covering the reporting of various types of violence, would prevent me from giving sufficiently detailed attention to the specifics of the processes of meaning formation in reporting. I therefore decided to focus on only one type of violence – lethal intimate partner violence – in the analysis that also included the reports about men as suspects in 2009 to be included in this PhD study. This decision was primarily based on the observation that the reporting of cases of lethal intimate partner violence as opposed to other types of violence included detailed descriptions of various cases both with men and with women as suspects, although as noted in sub-analysis I, the level of detail in these descriptions also varies considerably.

A total of 101 reports about lethal intimate partner violence published in 2009 were analysed in sub-analysis I.<sup>38</sup> The suspects were men in 60 of the reports, and women in 41 of them. However, it should be noted that 32 of the 41 reports on cases involving women suspects were about the Ulvila case mentioned above, thus the number of such cases was considerably smaller (N=6) than the number of cases involving men as suspects (N= 25).

## **5.2 Imprisoned women's narratives**

### **5.2.1 Research encounters in prison**

I collected imprisoned women's narratives during visits to a few Finnish prisons in 2012-2014, where I met potential research participants, i.e. women imprisoned for violent crimes. I had a contact person in each of the prisons, who helped me to recruit participants. My initial plan was only to collect written narratives, which seemed to me to be suitable material to be analysed alongside media reports. However, it soon became apparent that this would exclude potential participants who were reluctant to make their contributions in writing, therefore I decided to conduct interviews as well. Before I started collecting these materials I obtained research permits from the Criminal Sanctions Agency, first for the written accounts in 2011 (permit number 36/332/2011) and then for the interviews in 2013 (permit number 54/332/2013). I visited the prisons multiple times, and talked about the aims

---

<sup>37</sup> See Venäläinen (2013) for a more detailed description of the principles of delimiting the reports included.

<sup>38</sup> All the reports were about lethal intimate partner violence in heterosexual relationships; there were no reports about cases of such violence in non-heterosexual relationships.

of my research and how women convicted of violent crimes could participate in it. Usually, however, only a few of the women I met ended up as participants. As some of the women told me, the topic of violence was not something to be easily revisited.

I followed similar procedures when I invited potential participants to send in written accounts or to be interviewed. In some prisons the contact persons looked up the women with a current prison sentence for violent crimes who would be offered a chance to participate. The contact person and I then visited the women in their cells, where I told them about my study and, if they were interested in participating, gave them a sheet with instructions (Appendixes I-II) along with a return envelope and a research contract they were asked to return along with their written account. In some cases, however, I did not talk to potential participants individually, but was given the opportunity to talk about my research collectively to groups of women. Some of the interviews were arranged such that the contact person delivered an invitation (Appendixes III-IV) to potential participants and set up the interviews with those who were willing to participate without my having met them beforehand. The themes covered in the interviews as well as in the instructions for the written accounts primarily concerned perpetrating and experiencing violence, and the feelings and consequences associated with it (see Appendixes V-VI).

Before conducting the individual interviews I held a group meeting in one of the prisons with six women imprisoned for violent crimes.<sup>39</sup> The purpose of the meeting was to introduce my preliminary interview themes and questions and to ask the participants how they felt about them. What I attempted to practice by setting up the meeting was feminist research that takes the participants' concerns into consideration and aims at listening to their views in terms of the procedures adopted, and thus, ideally, to allow less imbalanced power dynamics to evolve. Indeed, after holding the meeting I felt more confident about doing the interviews, because overall the women who were there seemed to relate positively to my study and my interview questions. However, what also materialized in the meeting were the particularities of their lives in prison, and often also before their imprisonment. Those lives seemed to be imbued with insecurity, violence and a lack of options. Compared to the encounters with written accounts I had had prior to the meeting, these aspects of their lives became much more vividly graspable in this encounter.

The group meeting thus served to concretize to me the significance of the prison as the context of the participants' inhabitation that shapes their concerns and distinguishes them from the life and people outside (Schlosser, 2008). In other words, it brought to the fore the differences in the life circumstances of this group of participants and myself as a researcher who lived and acted outside the prison walls, without the uncertainties shading the lives of imprisoned women (see also article III). As Celia Kitzinger and Sue Wilkinson (1996), among others, have pointed out, it is important to

---

<sup>39</sup> Five of the participants in the group meeting later volunteered to be interviewed.

acknowledge such differences between researchers and participants, particularly when the latter are in a more disadvantaged position than the researcher. This acknowledgement, however, should not mean viewing the participants only in the light of their difference in relation to the researcher, which could also work to reinforce their otherness (*ibid.*). Similar risks lie here as with an emphasis on empathy, which may also work to reify notions about those one empathizes with as powerless objects known (and knowable) through the knowledge systems of the more powerful (e.g. Hemmings, 2012; Lather, 2000; Pedwell, 2012).

In line with Davies (2017), I believe it is important while attuning towards difference not to view the differences as irredeemably fixed or absolute, because that can easily lend to enacting individuality through distinguishing oneself from the 'other'. Besides acknowledging the materiality of the differences in circumstances between the researcher and the research participants, attuning to fluid, relational enactments of differences allows a fruitful, dynamic angle to emerge. As I briefly describe in Article III, I feel that in my encounters with imprisoned women, both face-to-face and via tapes, transcripts and written accounts, there is constant movement between blurring and enacting boundaries between myself and the research participants. For my part, this movement can be interpreted as largely aligning with being affected by the violence in the participants' narratives and attempting to gain distance from the anxiety it evokes, while also being empathetically moved by the narratives.

Similar dynamic, along with similar dilemmas of difference and sameness, has resurfaced when writing (as I do now) about these research encounters, and about myself in relation to the imprisoned women. While I feel that it is highly important to acknowledge my different, privileged position, as a PhD student writing her dissertation at the moment of encounters, in relation to the imprisoned women, I fear that this may too easily turn into an identity performance in which the imprisoned women are once again othered by being cast as irredeemably different. However, to bring forth sameness, such as us inhabiting the same categories of Finnishness and women (which, in unison, are predominantly signified through the unmarked category of whiteness in the context of Finland), risks losing sight of the particularities of the imprisoned women's situation. These dilemmas are further complicated by the tensions attached to the practice of reflexivity, particularly if viewed from a poststructural angle (and thus relating to the suggested shift to diffraction [Davies, 2014, 2016a]), that revolve around wariness caused by the threat of appearing too self-centered and as reproducing the notion of coherent, stable selves that poststructural approaches seek to unravel on the one hand, while nevertheless seeing the necessity of reflection for becoming aware of the ways in which discourses and power talk through us and thus constitute us (Davies et al., 2004), along with the power relations in which we are implicated. In my ongoing and partial efforts to grapple with these dilemmas, I have attempted to keep sight of the multiplicities and variance as well as the stabilizing and

divisive effects of power in the positionings of the imprisoned women in relation to myself. Overall, I have tended towards attempts to foreground the positionings that I see the women who participated in my study as adopting in their narratives, with less emphasis on my own affective and discursive positionings.

To sum up the main strands of the discussions above, feminist research in particular needs to take into account the situation in which the participants find themselves at the time of its enactment, and thus contextualize their accounts with an awareness of power relations that inform the storytelling (Presser, 2005). From a poststructural/new materialist perspective, the prison context can be seen as being inscribed into the imprisoned women's talk/texts in a variety of ways, both materially and discursively (c.f. Davies & Gannon, 2012). Prison as a context has its own relational dynamics that often, for instance, work to distinguish the staff from the prisoners as distinct groups with their own meaning-making repertoires through which identities are created (Lindberg, 2005). Thus, those in prison tend to adopt certain visions that may not be shared by those coming from the outside (Clough & Fine, 2007). These visions are affected not only by the meaning-making modes developed among prisoners, but also the discourses the prisoners encounter, and are expected to reproduce, in their interactions with law-enforcement agents and prison workers during their imprisonment (*ibid.*).

Imprisonment means being deprived of the power to influence one's daily life, which, as touched upon above, also creates a power imbalance between researchers and imprisoned participants (Presser, 2005). Furthermore, in the prison context, being asked to participate in a study focusing on violence one has perpetrated offers a position from which to account for one's crimes (c.f. Schlosser, 2008). This entails not only the risk of being marked as a deviant 'other' but also the opportunity to counter othering accounts compiled in official settings. Thus, telling their stories by participating in research may also allow imprisoned participants to resist, even if only momentarily, their powerless position via the accounts they tell. (Presser, 2005.) I obtained all the information about the imprisoned women and their backgrounds from their narratives, of which I also informed them. In so doing I attempted to allow the women to tell their own stories, and to avoid the position of a passive object of examination.

Talking about their life experiences in a research interview (or writing about them) may also have therapeutic significance for some research participants, even though research encounters, and the positions of the researcher and the participants, should not be confused with therapy (Corbin & Morse, 2003). Moreover, participating in research makes available a position of a socially acceptable, benevolent helper, which also allows for resisting views about oneself as immoral and/or antisocial (Presser, 2005). Indeed, quite a few of the imprisoned women told me that they had agreed to participate because they wanted to share their experiences and/or because they wanted to help other women in similar situations. Several of them

concluded the interview or written account by stating that they hoped their participation had contributed to my research. Furthermore, since I told potential participants that I was also analysing media portrayals of women suspected of violent crimes, they may also have perceived my study as providing for an opportunity to counter and critique the stereotypes circulating in the media.

The interviews were held in meeting rooms made available by the contact persons. There were no other people in the room apart from myself as the interviewer and the participant. Before beginning I asked the interviewees for permission to record the interview, and all of them agreed<sup>40</sup>. As interactional situations, interviews entail the uptake of predefined positions, imbued with power, of an interviewee and an interviewer with their respective rights and responsibilities. Interviewees, for instance, are supposed to answer the questions posed, and to focus their talk on the topics of interest to the interviewer. (Ruusuvuori, 2010.) I attempted to make the interviews informal and thus to give the participating women a chance to talk about violence on their own terms. At the same time, practices such as my taking notes, for instance, may have reinforced the difference between my position as the researcher and the position of the participant. It could also be taken as a sign of the significance of what the interviewees told me, however, indicating my attentiveness to their story and hence its importance.

Acknowledging the sensitivity of my study topic and its potential to arouse anxiety (see e.g. Corbin & Morse, 2003), I came to the interviews intent on being sensitive to the needs of the participants in terms of the direction of their talk and the depth at which they desired to discuss the violence they had perpetrated, and that they had experienced. I was aware of my tendency to use (sometimes overly) abstract language in the interviews, and as a result I was sometimes hesitant about which words and expressions to use to avoid making the interviewees feel uncomfortable. This hesitancy might have, ironically, caused me to use obscure expressions that at times seemed to cause puzzlement. Paradoxically, therefore, it could have highlighted the difference between us and my status as an outsider with little knowledge about life in prisons or of the subcultural circles in which some of the women had resided. However, this outsider status may also have encouraged the interviewees to adopt an active stance, at least in some cases. Indeed, some of the imprisoned women seemed to be comfortable in the position of a storyteller, and my less knowledgeable posture allowed them to enact this position with an audience that was content just to listen.

As in the instructions I gave for the written accounts, I told the interviewees that my study was about women as perpetrators of violence, and that I was interested in hearing about their experiences of using violence. I ended up covering most of the interview themes I had compiled beforehand with all the

---

<sup>40</sup> Excluding the interviews I was not allowed to record at the request of prison employees (see the next section).

interviewees, with varying degrees of detail and reflection. Before the interview started I showed the interviewees the questions I would ask. I did this to let them know in advance what I wished to talk about, and to give them sufficient information to evaluate whether they felt comfortable enough to talk about the issues in which I was interested. Moreover, whenever possible I ascertained that the participants had the chance to talk with the social workers after the interview in case it had evoked distressful emotions.

### **5.2.2 The written accounts and interviews**

Twenty women convicted of violent crimes participated in my study. The research materials comprise eleven interviews and 14 written accounts, five of which are from women who were also interviewed. Five of the interviews were recorded, but six of them were not because the prison employees did not give me permission to do so. The length of the interviews ranged from one to two hours, and of the written accounts from half a page to four pages. Both sets of material were originally in Finnish.

The interactional dynamics in interviews, as described above, are inseparable from the kinds of meanings that are being constructed in the participants' talk (e.g. Enosh & Buchbinder, 2005; Holstein & Gubrium, 1997; Rapley, 2012). Meanings are therefore produced collaboratively, and the interviewees have the chance to accommodate their talk to the reactions of the interviewer. In written accounts, on the other hand, meaning-making relies more on the interpretations of the participant. Nevertheless, although obviously differing from interviews, written narratives can also be considered interactional in terms of their relation to socio-culturally circulating understandings and valuations. Similar to interviews, written accounts draw upon these understandings and valuations (e.g. May, 2008), and often include negotiation between multiple and potentially contradictory discourses that allow for different ways of constituting recognizable selves.

Vanessa May (2008) has claimed that the absence of the researcher when written narratives are constructed may result in the participants constituting accounts that comply with widely shared social norms in a more straightforward way than accounts constituted collaboratively in interviews. My observations about the differences between written accounts and interviews in my study are somewhat in line with May's claims. It seems that there is more variability in interviews in terms of how cultural resources for meaning-making are drawn upon and related to than in written accounts, most likely partly because of my more intrusive participation in meaning-making as an interviewer. Moreover, although some of the written accounts entail nuanced, moral negotiation between dilemmatic understandings, others merely include a description of a violent event, with less reflection on the life of the writer or the violence involved.

However, in partial contrast to May's observations, some of the written accounts entail positionings that may appear more clearly transgressive of normative conceptions than those evident in the interviews. This may be linked with efforts to save face in face-to-face interaction when talking about deeply morally problematic action such as violence. In sum, these differences in the materials may have resulted in a high level of variability in the meanings attached to violence and one's self. Despite these differences between the written accounts and the interviews, I have not analysed them separately, but rather see them both as providing insights into the ways in which the participating women enact relations between themselves, violence and notions about womanhood.

Moreover, my engagement with the interviews I was not able to record is different than with the recorded interviews. Even though I attempted to write down, partly verbatim, as much of the participants' talk as possible, the level of detail at which I could record their expressions was obviously much lower than in the tape-recorded interviews. Consequently, I have not been able to analyse those interviews in as much detail as the recorded ones. Nevertheless, I see the unrecorded interviews as having provided for important affective and discursive insights.

The women sending written accounts or/and being interviewed were aged 23–54 years<sup>41</sup> at the time the research materials were collected. All of them are white and of Finnish descent. Their prison sentences are for violent crimes ranging from aggravated assault to homicide. The current sentence was the first in some cases, and in others the women had also been sentenced previously for violent or other crimes. In terms of involvement with violence they similarly form a heterogeneous group: some recalled using violence only once in their lives (which had resulted in the current prison sentence), whereas others talked about perpetrating violence recurrently. Most had been violent against their male spouses, although some had been convicted of violence against other female or male victims. In most cases the violence was against people the women knew well.

The imprisoned women's narratives about their earlier lives resonate quite closely with what has been written previously about women prisoners in Finland and elsewhere, characterizing them as a multiply marginalized group (Granfelt, 2007; Jokinen, 2011; MacDonald, 2013).<sup>42</sup> Many of them recalled having encountered abuse, either in their childhood or/and in their adult lives, often from their male spouses. Many also mentioned problems with substance abuse and fractured engagement with working life and/or education. Some referred to their current prison sentence as a welcome opportunity to detach themselves from criminal life and violent relations, and to accrue competence in staying away from substances and in finding stability in their lives. Others

---

<sup>41</sup> The age of four of the participants is unknown.

<sup>42</sup> It was observed in a report about women in Finnish prisons (Naiset näkyviksi, 2008), for instance, that three out of four female prisoners had experienced violence in their intimate relationships.

talked about how they, along with other women, were in a marginalized position in prison, which did not give them enough opportunities to find stability and assistance regarding their future lives.<sup>43</sup> Finally, many of the participants expressed the desire to live a ‘normal life’ when they left prison, together with their current spouse and children<sup>44</sup>, with whom opportunities to meet while they were imprisoned were usually quite limited.

### 5.3 Analytical threads

As mentioned above, when conducting analyses I have drawn upon various approaches that relate somewhat contentiously to each other. These analytical approaches are underpinned by and reproduce different images of subjects and the worlds they inhabit, which requires sensitivity to the differences between them (see e.g. Honan et al., 2000), and has encouraged me to mostly apply them impurely, thus partly departing from their underpinnings.<sup>45</sup> They resonate in various ways with the theoretical strands discussed in Chapter 3 and the overarching methodological orientations discussed in Chapter 4, partly rubbing against them in conflict and partly in concurrence.

Despite this relational complexity and in line with the notion of promiscuous methodology (Childers, 2014) discussed above, this plurality enriches inquiry in enabling the partial overcoming of some of the limitations of each approach. Somewhat similar pluralist orientations have been previously adopted for instance by Christina Scharff (2011) and Tracy Morison and Catriona McLeod (2013), both drawing on Butler’s performativity theory and discursive-psychological approaches.<sup>46</sup> I have tended to draw simultaneously on more than one discourse-analytical approach in the articles that constitute this PhD study, and in the last two (Articles III and IV) I have purposefully attempted to blur the boundaries of discursive analyses by partially moving towards an affective reading. Below I briefly review some of the main principles of the approaches from which I have borrowed and how I have applied them in my analyses. Just as my engagements with these approaches in the analyses have been partial, so are the introductions here. I

---

<sup>43</sup> Similar observations about women’s marginalized positions in prisons have also been made in official forums (Jokinen, 2011).

<sup>44</sup> Most of the participants told me that they had children, and many also talked about a current spouse.

<sup>45</sup> As in all discourses, there are also internal incoherencies within these approaches, and it is these fractures and areas of contention that reveal not only the differences but also their partial overlaps.

<sup>46</sup> Similar to my study, Christina Scharff (2011) has also combined Ahmed’s theorization on affects with discursive-psychological and poststructural theorizations of gender.

focus mainly on the aspects and the concepts on which I have explicitly drawn in my analyses, and thus do not offer comprehensive accounts of these approaches.

### 5.3.1 Critical discursive psychology (CDP), interpretative repertoires and positioning

As briefly discussed in Chapter 3, CDP focuses on people's situated action as language users (McAvoy, 2016). Combining insights from ethnomethodology and poststructural theory, CDP is based on viewing meaning-making in micro-level interaction as entwined with macro-level discursive affordances. These affordances are therefore viewed as constituting resources for local instances of meaning-making (Wetherell, 1998). Thus, in addition to a focus on context-specific interaction, CDP is also concerned with the ways in which socio-cultural orders of predominance among different understandings guide and set limits on local instances of meaning-making. This means that, compared with general discursive psychology, analyses that draw upon CDP tend to be more attuned to questions of power and the reproduction of inequalities through discursive practices (Wetherell, 2003b).

Analyses in CDP tend to draw upon three key concepts – interpretative repertoires, subject positions and ideological dilemmas – of which the first two appear in my analyses. *Interpretative repertoires* are defined as “relatively coherent ways of talking about objects and events in the world” that function as “a basis for shared social understanding” (Edley, 2001a, 198). In short, an interpretative repertoire works to construct a specific kind of understanding of the object of interest. CDP is based on the notion that interpretative repertoires are flexibly drawn upon in meaning-making, and thus can be utilized in a variety of ways in local interactions. The plurality of interpretative repertoires means that contradictions in the form of *ideological dilemmas* (e.g. Billig, 1987) often appear in practices of meaning-making. Although the concept of ‘interpretative repertoire’ is sometimes used interchangeably with the concept of ‘discourse’, it is generally taken to refer to more fine-grained means of sense-making than discourses (Edley, 2001a). I refer to the concept of interpretative repertoires in Article I of this study, using it to explore the discursive resources that are drawn upon in tabloid news reports about lethal intimate partner violence.

CDP also approaches the enactments of positionings in *subject positions* (see Chapter 3) through the analysis of language use that is considered flexible and context-specific (Wetherell, 1998). Positionings involve fluctuating negotiations with socio-cultural discursive understandings. These discursive accomplishments are subject to the requirements of the immediate interactional context, in which other people's discursive action dynamically occasions specific kinds of positionings, which can be taken up or resisted (e.g. Edley, 2001a).

The notion of *trouble* (Wetherell, 1998; Reynolds & Taylor, 2004) is also integral to the CDP perspective on identity work accomplished through positioning. In short, a position within interaction is assumed to become troubled when it does not allow the speaker to appear as a legitimate subject within the specific discursive configuration. Hence it refers to incongruities with social acceptability in people's identity performances that lead to efforts to repair such potential ruptures. The notion of trouble therefore points to dilemmas, contradictions and shifts that appear to be inherent in these identity negotiations. A variation of CDP known as the narrative-discursive approach (e.g. Taylor & Littleton, 2006) has also adopted these concepts of positioning, trouble and repair in analyses that focus on the construction of narratives as a means of performing identities. These views have indirectly and partially inspired sub-analysis I, in which I considered (among other things) the ways in which sequencing and ordering life events into narratives allows for certain kinds of identity enactments.

In sum, as an analytical approach CDP draws attention to how interpretative repertoires and subject positions are constructed and taken up within local contexts of interaction. The focus is on what these meaning-making resources allow users of language to accomplish in those contexts, in terms of sense-making and the presentation of themselves as particular kinds of people, for instance (Edley, 2001a). In comparison with poststructural analyses, CDP focuses more strongly on the detailed analysis of context-specific language use (in interaction), and thus seems to provide more concrete tools with which to conduct such analyses (c.f. Morison & Mcleod, 2013; Scharff, 2011). Moreover, as Jean McAvoy (2016) puts it, the epistemological commitment in discursive psychology, including the critical variant, to focus on psychological phenomena in terms of the functions that references to them have in talk could be seen as a limitation,<sup>47</sup> but also as an advantage: it allows consideration of the kind of person, in terms of psychology (including emotions, dispositions and intentions; see e.g. Edwards, 1999, 2008; Nikander, 2002), that is being constructed in any particular context, and what the construct allows to be accomplished within that context. In my view, considering those constructs in the light of recurring socio-cultural patterns in the formation of subjects may allow for an illuminating critical analysis of subjecthood.

### **5.3.2 Membership categorization analysis (MCA)**

MCA is an ethnomethodologically inflected and thus micro-oriented analytical approach developed by Harvey Sacks (1992; see also e.g. Hester & Eglin, 1997).

---

<sup>47</sup>Discourse-analytical studies such as those drawing on CDP have been criticized, for instance, for failing to address affect as something that is felt and not just as a discursive device (McAvoy, 2015).

Ethnomethodology specifically focuses on the production of *social and moral orders* in everyday interaction through the establishment of commonsensical, culturally shared conceptions (Garfinkel, 1984/1967). From an ethnomethodological perspective, what is considered normal and moral is continuously constituted in social interaction. Morality and normality are based on taken-for-granted assumptions that become visible only through their ruptures, which are therefore of specific interest in ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1984/1967; Jayyusi, 1984).

MCA is generally grounded on the idea that members of a culture doing interpretative work resort to shared knowledge that is organized into categories. Categorizations are therefore seen as mechanisms through which the world, our selves and others are made sense of, and through which normality is defined (Sacks, 1992, LCI, 40). Establishing criteria to determine what kind of action is categorizable as violence (and further, what kind of violence constitutes criminalized activity), for instance, is seen from an ethnomethodological perspective as a way of ordering social life (Hester & Eglin, 1992). Culturally shared resources for meaning-making and their varying implementation are implicated in the construction of moral orders, referring to divisions of rights and responsibilities among different people (Jayyusi, 1984). Even simple descriptions of action are seen to involve evaluations that activate common-sense understandings and contribute to the construction of moral orders (ibid.).

*Accountability* in this context means that the people whose activities are made sense of are held morally accountable for their actions in relation to the categories of which they are members (Jayyusi, 1984, 52). Thus, the activities and characteristics that are commonsensically bound to categories serve as resources for describing and at the same time morally evaluating the action of those who are placed in them (Stokoe, 2003). They are referred to in MCA as *category-bound activities* (Sacks, 1992, LC1, 337–338). Due to categories' *inference-richness*, certain identity categories make available certain kinds of explanations for action. *Indexicality*, in turn, means that the meanings attached to identity categories and to action always depend on the context in which they are evoked. Moreover, many of the identity categories are perceived as paired, hence the presence of one could imply the presence of the other. (Sacks, 1992, LC1.) Elizabeth Stokoe (2010), for instance, describes how the category pair 'victim-perpetrator' is routinely mapped onto the normative category pair 'woman-man', thus establishing the 'naturalness' of men hitting women and not the other way around.

From an ethnomethodological perspective, discontinuities between expectations and action create a need to account for deviant behaviour (Scott & Lyman, 1968). Accounts can allow for accomplishing moral insulation work that offers a defence against accusations of failing to act in accordance with one's category membership (Nikander, 2002). In cases of violent or otherwise criminal activities, for instance, non-agentic accounts that place the origins of deviant actions outside the perpetrators' influence can serve to protect his or

her moral identity (see Jayyusi, 1993; Kurri & Wahlström, 2001, 2007; also e.g. Edwards, 2008; O'Connor, 1995).<sup>48</sup> Moreover, the boundaries between acceptable and unacceptable violence are negotiated through these accounts in connection with making distinctions between 'us' and 'them' (e.g. Buttny & Ellis, 2007; Rapley, McCarthy & McHoul, 2003).

Accordingly, how extensive a breach of 'normal' behaviour violence is deemed to be, and in relation to which qualities, depends on the categories in which the perpetrator(s) and victim(s) are placed, and (similarly to positioning theory) on predicates such as rights and responsibilities (Jayyusi, 1984) that are routinely attached to these categories. For instance, given that violent action is more likely to be associated with the category 'men' than with the category 'women' (see e.g. Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005), the appearance of women as perpetrators of violence is more likely to make their placement in the gender category 'women' and the category 'normal people' seem problematic. In practice, though, if using MCA, the establishment of connections between categories and activities would be analysed with a specific focus on local variability. There is, however, some debate among proponents of MCA concerning the ways in which the mobilization of common-sense knowledge in research materials should be approached. More specifically, it concerns how strictly analysts should rely on orientations that are directly evident in the research materials, and to what extent they may draw upon their own cultural knowledge about normative associations between categories and different attributes (on orientations to gender, see e.g. Eglin, 2002; Kitzinger, 2007; Stokoe & Smithson, 2001). Thus, the issue concerning the role of the external context of research materials in the analysis, which has generated much debate in discursive studies, also plays out in MCA-related discussions (see McKinlay & McVittie, 2008).

Feminist proponents of ethnomethodology (e.g. Kessler & McKenna, 1978; West & Zimmerman, 1987) have focused on how the naturalness of gender as a structural phenomenon is routinely accomplished in everyday social encounters. Gender categorization is considered a central device in the construction of social order; Candace West and Sarah Fenstermaker (1992, 154), for instance, refer to gender as "potentially omnirelevant to the organization of social life". The ethnomethodological notion of *doing gender*, like other social action, is based on the idea of accountability (West & Zimmerman, 1987, 2009): people become accountable for action that departs from gendered expectations, and this is what largely reproduces gendered modes of acting. Accounting for one's own as well as others' actions (through

---

<sup>48</sup> Various studies focusing on offenders' talk make a distinction between excuses and justifications (see Scott & Lyman, 1968; also e.g. Hearn, 1998). *Excuses* serve to make sense of actions in ways that mitigate personal responsibility by placing agency outside the actor, while admitting that the action undertaken was reprehensible. *Justifications*, in turn, involve portraying the action as acceptable or understandable under the circumstances, while not denying agency in relation to it.

the use of identity categories) is recognized as one of the everyday practices through which gender is constructed. The apparent naturalness of connections between gender categories and activities or other features that are routinely attached to them, accomplished in continuous practices of doing gender, is considered highly consequential in legitimizing and thus sustaining gendered social stratification (Baker, 2000; Stokoe, 2004, 2006; West & Fenstermaker, 2002; West & Zimmerman, 1987). West and Fenstermaker (1995), for instance, have also extended these ideas to account for the intersections of different social categorizations such as race, class and gender.

Despite some apparent similarities with constructionist approaches such as poststructuralism, ethnomethodological approaches such as MCA and conversation analysis (with which MCA is often combined), with their different theoretical roots, differ from them specifically in their analytical emphasis on the orientations of those whose talk is analysed (see e.g. Speer & Stokoe, 2011, 4–8; also Koschmann, 2013). Whereas the implicit (albeit naturally partial) influence of ethnomethodological views on my study may be overarching, I explicitly draw upon concepts and insights from MCA in sub-analysis I, in which I use them in combination with the CDP concept of interpretative repertoires in my analysis of the sense-making of lethal intimate partner violence in the tabloid press.

MCA, like discursive psychology, is more commonly used in analyses of talk in interaction rather than of media texts. There are, however, some studies focusing on media texts that draw on these analytical orientations (e.g. Attenborough, 2015; Eglin & Hester, 1999; Macmillan & Edwards, 1999; Nikunen, 2005; Rapley, McCarthy & McHoul, 2003). In my view, MCA offers a useful perspective on how media stories about violence, for instance, exploit and construct cultural knowledge about what kind of activities and other features constitute ‘good’ and ‘normal’ incumbents of the categories ‘men’ and ‘women’. It also allows viewing how certain accounts of actions, such as violence, become implicitly available via the use of identity categories in the media. This allows for nuanced readings of research materials that go beyond the explicit content to take in implicit references to cultural knowledge that is being reproduced in the process.

### 5.3.3 Socio-semiotics and modalities of action

The socio-semiotic theorizations of Algirdas J. Greimas (e.g. 1987) have informed my sub-analysis II of how the agency and identities of women suspected of violent crimes are constituted in the tabloid news. I relied mostly on the conceptualizations and models developed by Pekka Sulkunen and Jukka Törrönen (1997 a, b & c) on the basis of Greimas’s theorization, specifically the notion of *pragmatic modalities* (Sulkunen & Törrönen,

1997a).<sup>49</sup> Analysis of the appearance of these modalities in talk/texts sheds light on how descriptions of action, actors and the relations between them are constructed. In other words, different modalities refer to the construction of different descriptions of action, and the positioning of actors in the narratives in relation to their action, other people and the surrounding world. In line with Sulkunen (2007), in my analyses I view these descriptions as constituting different modes of narrating agency.

In Sulkunen and Törrönen's model (1997a) pragmatic modalities belong to the level of *utterance*, that is the level of the story or statements, which is distinguished from the level of *enunciation* referring to the acts of language use and stances adopted in relation to statements (Greimas, Courtés & Rengstorf, 1989; c.f. Sulkunen & Törrönen, 1997b).<sup>50</sup> In my analysis, however, I did not directly follow these distinctions. A further distinction is made within pragmatic modalities between the *endotactic* that focus on factors that appear internal to actors, and the *exotactic* that instead attach action to factors that appear external to the actors (Sulkunen & Törrönen, 1997a). This distinction therefore allows considering whether the origins of action are placed in the narratives within the actors or whether they are associated with factors that appear as residing outside of the actors and their (assumedly internal) desires.

Endotactic modalities are further divided into those that are linked with the *will* of the actors and those that are linked with their *competence*, referring to skills and knowledge acquired by learning and thus to the internalization of what appear as originally external factors. Exotactic modalities, in turn, are divided into those that are linked with *obligation*, referring to the role of other people and their expectations in motivating action, and those linked with *ability*, which refers to the ways in which other (human or non-human) actors facilitate action (ibid.). I conceptualize ability in a slightly different way than Sulkunen and Törrönen (1997a) in my analysis: I use it to refer in a comprehensive way to forces portrayed as external to the subject's control, including mental disorders that are deemed to cause action without volition. As Sulkunen (2007) notes, even though these groups of modalities often work in narratives in unison, some tend to play a more central role than others.

Pragmatic modalities have been linked in socio-semiotics with narrative structures. Greimas and Courtés (1982) distinguished three stages in narratives: the *virtualizing* stage, which entails preparation for action, the *actualizing* stage, which refers to the execution of the action, and the *realizing* stage in which the action and, based on that, the actors are evaluated.

---

<sup>49</sup> See also Törrönen's (2001, 2014) discussion about various ways of approaching positioning in social scientific research, in which he relates these socio-semiotic concepts to positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990).

<sup>50</sup> Sulkunen and Törrönen (1997a) further distinguish between two types of enunciative modalities: veridictory modalities through which relations are constructed between reality and how it is seen to appear, and epistemic modalities through which knowledge about the reality is evaluated in terms of its truthfulness.

Pragmatic modalities may be mapped onto these stages so that modalities of obligation and will are virtual and thus linked to the preconditions of action, whereas ability and competence are associated with, and observable through, the actualization of action (Sulkunen & Törrönen, 1997a).

I also drew upon the *actantial model* (Greimas and Courtés 1982) in sub-analysis II. In combination with modalities, the actantial model allows to identify the kinds of relations that are constructed among actors (or rather actantial positions), and shows how they, as part of those relations, are portrayed as contributing to the unfolding of events in a narrative. The actantial positions which the model distinguishes are the *subject* (i.e. the actor whose action is in focus in a narrative), the *object* (i.e. what is being pursued), the *helpers* and *opponents* that either facilitate or hinder the pursuit of the object, and the *anti-subject*, the goals of which are in opposition to the pursuing of the object of action. Distinguishing these positions in the analysis of talk/texts therefore reveals who are constructed as villains and hero(in)es, depending on how their action appears to be aligned or disaligned with what are portrayed as valuable objects of pursuit.

In addition to the concepts described above I also drew upon socio-semiotic views on the construction of images depicting relations between the reality and modes of knowledge in sub-analysis II. As Greimas and Courtés (1982) suggest, these can be associated with the stage of realization in narratives at which the subject of the action is *recognized* as a particular kind of person, or one could say as having a certain identity, on the basis of how the action is evaluated: here, doing and being mutually shape each other. My interest in these notions arose when I observed that the news reports often included elements of so-called detective stories, in which the pursued object is the truth about what really happened in cases of violent crime, and on a more general level about the perpetrators of violence and how can they be identified. Hence, the theme of truth appeared to play a central role in many of the news reports, and it seemed significantly to affect how the women suspected of violent crimes were portrayed. *Truth* is discussed in socio-semiotics as a veridictory modality that, with reference to the nature of knowledge, entails both being and seeming (Greimas and Courtés 1982, 369). As I discuss further in Chapter 6.2, women suspected of violent crimes are often portrayed in the tabloids as *deceivers* (ibid., 67), who hide the truth about their mode of being and whose actions are thus linked to a disalignment between being and seeming.

It is to be noted that my application of these concepts is partial and thus unfaithful to the original models of which they are a part. Hence, they are detached from the original, structuralist theorization of language that aligns with a different theoretical tradition than those I mainly follow in this study. The use of these concepts specifically in analyses inspired by poststructuralism may appear to be problematic because they apparently reproduce several unhelpful and dichotomizing distinctions. Despite these challenges, it is my view that they can also be fruitfully applied for the purpose of deconstructing the ways in which action is portrayed in terms of its origins, and how those

ways entwine with relations constructed between people and their environments in talk/texts. In addition to sub-analysis II, I have drawn upon the insights offered by socio-semiotics in the initial stages of my analysis of agency in sub-analysis IV.

#### 5.3.4 Incorporating affects into discursive analysis

As discussed in Chapter 3.3, discourse studies and studies on affect tend to follow quite different paths. Despite these incongruences, Margaret Wetherell (2012) and Jean McAvoy (2015, 2016) advocate a synthetic analytical approach that combines an interest in affects/emotions with discursive analysis that follows the principles of (critical) discursive psychology. In line with these views, I believe that a discursive *and* affective analytical approach can facilitate attunement to the entwinement of the social and the psychological in the context of societal-level power relations and the knowledge linked to them (see e.g. McAvoy, 2015).

When analysing what kind of work affect(s) do in the research participants' talk/texts (sub-analyses III and IV) I drew upon not only Wetherell's (2012) views but also on Ahmed's (2014a) notions about the interlinkages between the constitution of subjects, the boundaries between them, and macro-level cultural evaluations and power relations. These analyses thus engage with affect(s) through both the entwinements of discursively expressed affective states with the enactments of positionings, on the one hand, and cultural valuations and personal histories, which I see as being inscribed into the movement constituting positionings, on the other.

By attuning to affectivity in the context of discursive analysis I aim towards viewing positionings enacted in the research participants' talk/texts not only as tied to the local context of their production but also as having relevance beyond it. As Ahmed (2014a) points out, affects work to link the past to the present and the future. Viewing positionings as affective also allows to perceive relations between individuals and societal-cultural contexts as multidimensional and therefore assists in unsettling the distinctions between them.

In practice, however, the influence of discursive approaches on my analyses was such that my engagements with affectivity was largely through words making reference to emotions. This results in analyses that differ from, for instance, most Deleuzian-inspired inquiries of affect. I have not, for instance, primarily attended to what Maggie Maclure (2013) calls "quasi-linguistic" elements, in other words non-verbal gestures and bodily movements, to which my "data" collection methods gave only limited access. However, as Ahmed (2014a, 13–14) notes, also discursive labels for emotions and references to them in talk/texts can be seen as doing relevant work in constituting subjects in relation to others. Ahmed (*ibid.*) sees that words work *with*, not in isolation from, the experience of emotions and the bodies they constitute.

My analytical focus in sub-analysis III is on the ways in which positionings are enacted through discourse (including discourse about emotions), whereas in sub-analysis IV I draw more extensively on Ahmed's (2014a) ideas about affects and embodiment. I use these ideas in my imagining of connections between the narratives of my research participants, the embodied encounters they recount in those narratives, and the socio-cultural, discursive-material practices of subjectification that privilege certain modes of being and acting over others. The idea of imagining (c.f. Pedwell, 2012) thus allows for viewing the above-mentioned components as entwined, without assuming that the participants' narratives are direct expressions of their experiences. This is what the conceptualization 'affective identificatory practices' (see Chapter 3.5) also aims to capture. It is in the light of this that I view the narratives about the body and its relations (in Article IV as well as in Article III) as belonging to practices of embodied living, and as constitutive of the relations between one's self and the (social) world.

## 6 ANALYSES

In this chapter I summarize the four sub-analyses of this study. Sub-analyses I-IV correspond with Articles I-IV. I will briefly describe the analysis reported in each article and the ways in which it was framed theoretically and methodologically. I conclude each sub-section with a summary of the conclusions and insights derived from the analysis. I discuss the analyses and the insights they bring to light in unison in Chapter 7.

### 6.1 Sub-analysis I: Women, men, and the sense-making of lethal intimate partner violence in the tabloid press

Sub-analysis I explores the ways in which relations between gender categories and violence are constructed in the tabloid news reports, by focusing on the sense-making of lethal intimate partner violence perpetrated by both women (41 reports) and men (60 reports), and on how notions about gender are mobilized in that sense-making. The analysis is based on ideas derived from ethnomethodology as well as (critical) discursive psychology about accounting for deviant action as a way of making it culturally intelligible by deploying socio-culturally shared discursive resources for sense-making. I use the concept ‘interpretative repertoires’ from critical discursive psychology (CDP) as a device for distinguishing overall patterns in sense-making. I also draw upon membership categorization analysis (MCA) to illustrate in more detail how gendered categorizations were used in the news reports. Another reason for relying on MCA was its potential to illustrate how categorizations were used in the descriptions of violence to draw moral implications about the perpetrators and the victims.

I distinguished two recurring interpretative repertoires of violence in my analysis. The first, *a repertoire of relational interaction*, linked lethal intimate partner violence to interactional or relationship problems, whereas the second, *a repertoire of individual pathology or deviance*, characterized the perpetrators as pathological or deviant to make sense of the violence. As I note in Article I, neither of these sense-making modes links violence to societal or contextual factors beyond individuals or the intimate relationship between them. Gender is therefore not generally portrayed as a factor that positions men and women differently in relation to violence in terms of power, but instead there is rather heavy reliance on gender-neutral understandings of violence. More micro-level analyses of the uses of categorizations, in turn, illustrated how the meanings attached to gender categories allowed explanations of violence to emerge through subtle references to culturally

circulating, frequently taken-for-granted notions about women and men and their relationship with violence.

I concluded from my analysis that gender-neutral notions entwine with the circulation of gender-specific assumptions in the reporting. I drew attention to the ways in which gendered categorizations in the reports tended to preserve the normality of men as perpetrators of lethal intimate partner violence, while placing more emphasis on deviance in the case of women. Moreover, the categorizations frequently attached moral questionability not only to women suspected of violence in the reports, but also to women victims of lethal intimate partner violence perpetrated by men. This can be seen as reproducing (to an extent) gendered victim-blaming patterns identified in previous studies on the reporting of lethal intimate partner violence (e.g. Richards, Gillespie & Smith, 2011).

## **6.2 Sub-analysis II: Entanglements of agency and the identities of women accused of violence in the tabloid press**

I focused in sub-analysis II on ways in which women's use of violence was portrayed in the tabloid news reports in terms of agency, and how these portrayals served to construct the identities of women suspected of violent crimes. Drawing particularly on Stuart Hall (1996), I grounded this analysis in Article II on the ways in which the categories 'violent women' and 'feminine women' worked dialectically in constituting each other. More specifically, I was interested in how images of identities, such as those of a violent woman and a non-violent woman, were constructed, and how they came to establish or question gendered assumptions about the essence of women (see St. Pierre, 2011). I purposefully put the word "violent" in parentheses in Article II, because it already implies a certain mode of sense-making (that appeared to predominate in the tabloid news reports) that explains violence through personality, locating it within the suspect's body, and making it stick to it.

The research materials used in sub-analysis II included all the reports about cases of violent crimes involving women suspects (N=657) and articles discussing women's use of violence as a phenomenon (N=15) published in *Ilta-lehti* and *Ilta-Sanomat* in 2009–2011. I relied on socio-semiotic concepts (see Chapter 5.3.3), specifically pragmatic modalities, to describe the different ways in which violent action was related to the suspected women in the news reports, and thereby served to construct their character. Thus, by referring to different pragmatic modalities I distinguished various modes of agency that were attached to violent action in the reports. The descriptions of violence attaching to different modalities appeared to constitute a continuum of agency. Those relying predominantly on the ability to do (or rather the inability to avoid doing) violence seemed to attach the least agency to it,

whereas competence and, to an even greater extent, will endowed it with stronger agency, tying it more intimately and permanently to suspects and to what were portrayed as their inner desires. This is, of course, an inevitably simplified portrayal of the overall tendencies in the reporting: in practice, many of the modalities were entwined, and the boundaries between them appeared hazy.

According to my analysis, women's use of violence was seldom made sense of through portrayals of weak agency on behalf of the suspects. Furthermore, the reports that relied predominantly on this kind of sense-making were usually short and did not include much detail about the case. The most sensationalized cases, in turn, relied heavily on portrayals of violence that associated it with strong agency, thus characterizing the suspects through their implied intent to harm. In some of these reports there were also recurrent references to the suspects' mental disorders, more specifically psychopathy and personality disorders. These references did not serve to diminish the culpability of the suspects, however (e.g. Allen, 1998), but rather strengthened their portrayal as antisocial, deviant 'others'.

Furthermore, it was apparent from the analysis that in several of the news reports the search for truth was entwined with the implied threat of a failure to reach a phase of satisfactory, truthful recognition (understood here in terms of socio-semiotics) that would allow the suspect to be safely identified as a particular kind of person. Again, in the reports about the most sensationalized cases this threat coincided with the portrayal of the suspected women as deceivers, which in turn implies that they would have purposefully tried to hide their true identities as characterized by their violence. I noticed in several reports how their appearance as feminine, exemplified in acts of nurturing and mothering for example, was juxtaposed with their acts of violence, thus portraying their femininity as deceptive appearance that hides their true, violent essence, which the reports aimed to reveal.

All in all, these problems of recognition in the reports appear to imply to audiences that women suspected of violence cannot be recuperated (c.f. Morrissey, 2003) and thus re-integrated into society, but instead remain suspects. Moreover, they can be seen as enacting the splitting of violence and femininity (Neroni, 2005) by relating them to each other as truth and falsehood, or essence and deceptive appearance.

The themes of truth and deception were also apparent in the articles that discussed violence committed by women as a phenomenon. In these articles, deceptiveness was occasionally linked with advocates of the women's movement in Finland, who were portrayed as attempting to hide the truth about women's capacity to perpetrate violence. Moreover, the societal context of the women's actions was portrayed as enabling them to act deceptively and possibly also violently. This kind of assumption about a society that places few restrictions on women's action is also implied in many of the news reports portraying the suspected women as having strong agency, and as being able to deceptively hide their violence.

In Article II I interpret these patterns in reporting as being associated with anxieties over the feared loss of gender difference, and not being able to rely on the notion of women as traditionally feminine and thus non-violent as the truth. I therefore view the portrayals in the reports in the light of notions about change in women's societal position, which in some of the articles on women's violence as a phenomenon is explicitly linked with a purported increase in women's perpetration. The reports also seem to reproduce notions about strong and equal Finnish women, whose actions are not notably limited by gendered constraints.

### **6.3 Sub-analysis III: Conversing (with) gendered otherness in the narratives of women imprisoned for violent crimes**

Sub-analysis III focuses on the gendered identity negotiations of women in prison. It is based on the research materials I collected in prisons, consisting of 14 written accounts and 11 interviews with women imprisoned for violent crimes. The starting point was an interest in how these women negotiate with the potential, gendered stigma associated with being perceived as a 'violent woman'.

Theoretically and methodologically I drew upon feminist poststructuralism (Davies, 2016a; Davies et al., 2006; Gannon and Davies, 2007) and critical discursive psychology (CDP) (Edley and Wetherell, 2008; Wetherell, 1998). I focused analytically on positioning as a means of enacting identities. In line with the principles of CDP, I analysed positioning from a micro- and macro-perspective on language use, and relied on notions developed in feminist poststructural theorizations to view positionings as linked with the constitutive effects of discursive power. Furthermore, given an interest in affect(s) that arose during my research encounters, I experimented with attunement to affect(s), and thus came to label the analysis as illustrative of a discursive-affective approach to positioning. In line with Margaret Wetherell (2012, 4), I conceptualized the affective dimensions of positioning as forms of "embodied meaning-making", attunement to which I saw as enabling consideration of bodily and emotional aspects in the uptake of socio-culturally available positions.

In my analysis based on the above-mentioned theoretical and methodological approaches I concentrated on ways in which affect(s) and discourse in unison produce positionings that are in constant flux. These positionings are shaped through language use in the local context of interaction, but are neither free nor separate from socio-historically circulating meanings and valuations infused with power. This micro- and macro-approach also informs the way I view affect(s) in the context of this

analysis. On the one hand I consider the ways in which articulations of affect partake in local enactments of positionings. On the other hand, I view these articulations as linked to the wider affectivity of the subject positions accrued in recurring cultural practices (Ahmed, 2014a), which work as a backcloth for micro-level positionings. I therefore approach positionings in this analysis as affectual points of contact with the social world and its discursive-material-affective assemblages that allow hearers/readers of talk/text to envision an experience of that world from a certain viewpoint. In sum, the research participants' positionings analysed from this perspective can be seen as locally enacted, relational identity performances that entail discursive, embodied and affectual intra-acting (Barad, 2007) with not only myself as a researcher and the study I represent, but also the socio-culturally available discursive resources and the materialities of the prison and the events that brought the participants there.

I entered into the analysis of these positionings by looking at the meanings the participants associated with womanhood or gender in their talk/texts about violence and the ways in which they related their selves to those meanings. Influenced by the ethnomethodological emphasis on the micro-level meaning-making processes, I focused on explicit references to gender and womanhood in the research materials, looking at how associations were forged between gendered categories, different modes of being and acting and the participants themselves. Based on this analysis I distinguished four different modes of positioning: *aligning with forcefulness*, *aligning with vulnerability*, *(dis)-aligning with demonization*, and *aligning with motherhood*. With detailed analyses of strips of talk/texts as illustrative of these positionings, I aimed in Article III (based on this sub-analysis) to shed light on the complexity and fluidity in the imprisoned women's gendered identity enactments, along with their affectively ambivalent dimensions.

Analysed from this perspective, it was possible to see the imprisoned women's positionings as entailing fluctuating alignments with attributes carrying both traditionally masculine connotations such as forcefulness, autonomy and rationality, and feminine connotations such as vulnerability, a lack of agency, and caring. From a poststructural perspective, these alignments can be seen as part of the inherent multiplicity of gendered identity enactments. My analysis based on such a perspective, therefore, aims to counter stereotypical and reductionist views that abnormalize women who have perpetrated violence on the grounds that their actions are incompatible with proper gender performance.

## 6.4 Sub-analysis IV: Relations of violence and one('s)self in the narratives of women imprisoned for violent crimes

Sub-analysis IV focuses on the discursive and affective processes through which women imprisoned for violent crimes make sense of their violent action and position themselves in relation to it. It is based on the same research materials as sub-analysis III, but with a particular emphasis on the entanglements of meanings attached to violence and those attached to the self in the imprisoned women's narratives. The concept of affective identificatory practices (see Chapter 3.5), with particular reference to Wetherell (e.g. 2008, 2012) and Ahmed (2014a), provided a framework for this analysis in Article IV. Through this conceptualization, I could perceive the meaning-making and identity enactments in the participants' narratives as fluidly drawing on socio-culturally circulating meanings and evaluations, on the one hand, and their personal histories, and the orientations those histories work on shaping, on the other.

The analysis involved, first, looking at how violence and the participants' selves were discursively constructed in their narratives in terms of agency. Second, I attended to the ways in which expressions of emotions and embodiment figured in the participants' identity enactments. Third, I considered the ways in which their various self-presentations were bound together and sequenced in their talk/texts to constitute overall narratives about their involvement with violence.

The different layers emanating from the slightly different theoretical-methodological orientations in sub-analysis IV produce both contradictions and, I suggest, also new insights in their complementarity. They follow different logics of evidence: On the one hand, there is the logic of systematicity in the categorizations of meanings of violence, and in (re)presenting the generalized descriptions of selves on this basis. On the other hand, there is also the close reading of the materials drawing particularly on Ahmed's (2014a) theorizations, which focuses on particularities concerning affects and embodiment, and aims at imagining lived relationalities with temporal continuity.

The analysis I conducted led me to view the participants' narratives as entailing various selves constituted in relation to violence that draw on depictions of both vulnerability and agency. I distinguished four different enactments of selves through which violence assumed different meanings: *victimized selves*, *defender selves*, *lost selves* and *rehabilitated/unrehabilitatable selves*. I read these enactments as the imprisoned women's efforts to attach value to their selves and thus to subvert present and past devaluations. This reading was largely a result of my attending to recurring phrases in the narratives through which several participants stated, for instance, that they no longer allowed anyone to abuse them "for free" or as a "gift". These phrases seemed to "glow", to borrow

Maggie Maclure's (2008) expression; they struck me as unexpected, and yet were used in a rather routine manner by the women in prison. These phrases could obviously be interpreted in various ways, but they appeared in my analysis to point towards the centrality of worth, and efforts to regain it after being subjected to devaluation through abuse. This also made me look at the ways in which worth was implicated in other parts of the narratives.

All in all, violence appeared both as a means of pursuing value as a subject and, particularly in narratives that did not end with rehabilitation, to diminish it in the eyes of others due to what can be seen as the stickiness of the mark of a violent, deviant other. Defender selves were based on the agentic use of violence as an attempt to create distance from victimized selves that appeared worthless and were linked with emotions such as shame. Lost selves, in contrast, were based on portrayals of violence as a threat to one's integrity due to its association with a loss of control that, in turn, was often associated with fear and pronounced attempts at avoidance. Rehabilitated selves were based on attempts to gain value through newly acquired agency in non-violent activities, in other words the capacity to avoid doing violence and/or to participate in 'normal' activities such as working or studying.

By focusing on the processes whereby embodied boundaries constitute the integrity of selves (seen as symbolic and material) in the analysis it was possible to attune to the precariousness of integrity, and thus to see to how vulnerability was both present and defended against in the participants' narratives. Inspired by the writings of Margrit Shildrick (2002) and Sara Ahmed (2014a), I claim in Article IV that women in general occupy pronouncedly precarious positions in relation to integrity and the subjecthood that is based on it, because of the material and symbolic meanings attached to womanhood and feminine-marked bodies. Gender is thus analysed in sub-analysis IV primarily in terms of the varying access of women and men to the positions of subjects because of the meanings associated with gender categories and gender-marked bodies. I therefore also perceive meanings evoked in the imprisoned women's narratives as gendered in terms of both symbolism and embodiment.

In sum, according to my analysis, the imprisoned women's aspirations to become subjects of worth appeared prevalent but fragile. This fragility can be seen as linked both to the inherent impossibilities of separate subjecthood and to the particularities of the women's past and present positionings. Those particularities may motivate pronounced attempts to resist vulnerability by attaching oneself to the ideal form of subjecthood that prevails in western imagery and is based on separability and boundedness.

## 7 DISCUSSION

*We go toward the best known unknown thing, where knowing and not knowing touch, where we hope we will know what is unknown. Where we hope we will not be afraid of understanding the incomprehensible, facing the invisible, hearing the inaudible, thinking the unthinkable, which is of course: thinking. Thinking is trying to think the unthinkable: thinking the thinkable is not worth the effort. Painting is trying to paint what you cannot paint and writing is writing what you cannot know before you have written: it is preknowing and not knowing, blindly, with words. It occurs at the point where blindness and light meet.*

*Hélène Cixous, quoted in Davies (2016b)*

My interest in this PhD study was primarily in modes of sense-making in the tabloid press and in the narratives of imprisoned women concerning, specifically, violence, gender and the identities of women accused of violence. My study has not been motivated by a desire to determine which sense-making modes are more truthful than others but has rather been concerned about which ones may be more prominent than others, what modes of thought, or orientations (Ahmed, 2010), make them feasible, and what is made possible (and what is not) through reliance on them. Below, I first discuss my analyses of tabloid news reports and the imprisoned women's narratives in relation to each other. I then consider the implications of some of the recurring patterns discerned in the analyses, and finally describe the theoretical and methodological contributions that this study can be seen as a/effecting.

### 7.1 The tabloids and prison narratives in dialogue

#### 7.1.1 Being identified and identifying one self

Quite expectedly, both concurrences and divergences in the modes of sense-making in the tabloid news and the imprisoned women's narratives emerged in my analyses. Articles I and II show how the tabloids tended to draw on and construct gendered notions about the antitheticality of violence and womanhood, thereby construing newsworthy, sensationalized depictions of violent crime. The construction of the contradictions between being a proper woman – associated specifically with caring for others – and perpetrating violence is accomplished in tabloid news both through explicit juxtapositions and the more subtle use of categorizations. These notions that work to position women who have committed violence as 'doubly deviant' (Naylor, 1990) can

be considered an integral part of the socio-cultural context within which women imprisoned for violent crimes negotiate their identities and construct relations between their selves and violence.

As illustrated in Articles III and IV, the contradictions between appearing as a socially acceptable, gendered being and serving a prison sentence for violent crimes were negotiated in the narratives of these women through modes of sense-making that attached their selves and their violence to attributes that aligned, but occasionally also dis-aligned, with those traditionally attached to womanhood. For instance, alignment with forcefulness (described in Article III) was based on distinguishing oneself from other women who were associated with vulnerability. Making sense of their violence through victimhood (described in both articles), which some of the participants talked about in explicitly gendered terms (see Article III), could in turn be seen as allowing alignment with womanhood (Gueta & Chen, 2016; Miller, Carbone-Lopez & Gunderman, 2015).

Moreover, as described in Article III, the imprisoned women participating in my study often laid emphasis on their motherhood. These alignments can be viewed as attempts to counter stigmatization by drawing upon the same gendered notions about mothering as a central sign of respectable womanhood (Ferraro & Moe, 2003; Miller, Carbone-Lopez & Gunderman, 2015) that the tabloids, in turn, utilize in their construction of 'violent women' as abnormal deviants. They resemble the positionings of imprisoned women methamphetamine users in the study conducted by Miller, Carbone-Lopez and Gunderman (2015), in which they saw the interviewed women constituting reformed selves through the expressed desire to devote themselves to mothering in the future. Quite similarly, I view these alignments in the narratives of imprisoned women as efforts to enact respectable gendered selves that allow the distancing of violence and the gendered trouble tied to it from the present or future self.

However, similar to observations made by Fleetwood (2015) and Valli Rajah (2006), these were not the only kinds of accounts provided by the imprisoned women. In aligning with forcefulness, for instance, some of them (also) reiterated what could be considered subcultural valuations resonating with inmate or street codes.<sup>51</sup> This kind of talk produces counter-narratives in which value to one's self is sought through different kinds of associations than in discourses with wider social acceptability. For instance, the enactments of forcefulness mentioned above were linked with distancing from femininity defined through vulnerability, which was designated in the process as undesirable. These positionings thus also resonate with those described in Beverley Skeggs's (1997) study about British working-class women who dis-identified with pathologizing notions attached to them by others on the grounds of their social location. Instead of valorizing the middle-class

---

<sup>51</sup> As Rajah (2006) notes, these subcultural valuations are best seen as being entwined with more mainstream ones rather than as clearly distinguishable from them.

femininity against which they were judged as lacking, the women in Skeggs's (ibid.) study invested in forms of becoming respectable that were more easily attainable for them.

As Patricia Clough and Michele Fine (2007) as well as Fleetwood (2015) point out, imprisoned women are expected to give certain kinds of accounts to show that they have been rehabilitated. In addition to alignments with motherhood discussed in Article III, in Article IV I discussed the ways in which I saw the imprisoned women enacting rehabilitated selves through descriptions of change in ways of relating to and coping with violence, for instance, and through emphasizing their ability and willingness to participate in working life or/and acquire education in the future. These narratives serve to distinguish violent acts from the self, which becomes defined through other, non-violent attributes (c.f. Hochstetler, Copes & Williams, 2010). Many of them also contain expressions of remorse for life in the past and the acts of violence in it. According to Jennifer Kilty (2010), such expressions of remorse tend to be expected specifically of women who have committed violence, allowing them to redeem their image as properly gendered. Constituting a confessional mode of establishing oneself as a socially recognizable subject, this expectation aligns with neoliberal ideals according to which subjects take responsibility for their actions and exhibit an ability to exercise reflectivity (ibid.).

In contrast to the imprisoned women's redemption narratives, the tabloid news reports highlight women suspects' *lack of* remorse, which often plays a central role in their construction as deviant others. As discussed in Article II, attention is drawn, particularly in the reporting of the most sensationalized cases, to the suspects' refusal to confess to the violent acts of which they are accused. Moreover, the focus particularly in the reporting of the Ulvila case, for instance, is on the lack of any emotional response (of which tears, for example, would have been indicative) on the part of the suspected woman, which is taken as proof of her insincerity. Indeed, the image of a deceiver (see Article II) constructed in the tabloid news reports is in many ways the opposite of the image that displays of remorse allow for. It is based on a reversed division between (a false) appearance and the true self, which casts the femininity and normality of the accused women as misleading appearance and in turn links their violent acts to their true selves.

In addition to, and often in unison with, portrayals of women suspected of violence as deceptive, in several tabloid news reports women's violence is made sense of in ways that attach it to what appear as the suspects' internal intentions and desires, in other words their will (see Article II). Again, and in contrast to narratives of redemption, these sense-making modes include the implication that the suspects may commit violence again, given that violence is intimately attached to their identity. As mentioned in Chapter 6.2, it can therefore be seen as marking the suspects as unrecuperable (Morrissey, 2003), thus suspending any hopes for their (re-)integration into society.

Following Ahmed (2014b), these attachments of violence to the suspected women's will can be seen as construing them as *willful*<sup>52</sup>: as excessive in their wrongly directed willing and thus as exhibiting “the perverse potential of will” (Ahmed, 2014b, 12). These tabloid portrayals, along with the associated enactments of a divide between their ‘false’ appearance as caring and their ‘true’ essence as violent, allude to the threat that not being able to identify violent women and thus to distinguish them from ‘normal’ women poses for the maintenance of gendered normality (Ballinger, 2000). According to Margrit Shildrick (2000, 2002), what makes monsters – a label frequently used in the popular media to describe women who have committed violence – threatening in the cultural imaginary is their proximity to humanness, in other words exhibiting characteristics that are deemed human along with those deemed unhuman. It is, hence, conceivable that abjection, in terms of how it plays out in the portrayals of “violent” women, is in fact motivated by closeness that threatens and therefore engenders attempts at distancing (c.f. Downing, 2013).

What I did not stress in Articles I and II was that the abhorrence evoked by criminal, and gendered, deviancy is often mixed with awe, or even veiled fascination (Blackman & Walkerdine, 2001). This affective ambivalence in the gendered othering of criminality and violence could partially explain the sustained attention and space allotted in the tabloid press for stories about women suspected of violence. Fascination with criminality that the tabloid press feeds into can be seen as a crucial part of the processes of othering, whereby such fascination is made secure by firmly establishing difference between criminal others and non-criminal viewers of the spectacles put on display.

Overall, a more pronounced focus on the affective aspects of sense-making in my analyses of tabloid news reports could have allowed for a more nuanced understanding to emerge concerning the social dynamics of which media portrayals are a part. After all, sense-making is not just about the rationalizations of violent actions that build up cause-and-effect scenarios; it also constitutes common sense on an affective level, such that certain happenings and states of affairs come to *feel* natural (Wetherell, 2012) and morally right, or wrong. Furthermore, accounting for violence can be seen as (potentially) restoring the feel of naturalness when it has been made suspect, if commonly shared understandings are mobilized in a convincing way. As I claim in Article I, my analysis of news reports about lethal intimate partner violence supports previously made observations according to which this may succeed more often and more easily when men, rather than women, are suspects (see e.g. Nikunen, 2006).

---

<sup>52</sup> According to Ahmed (2014b, 15), being labelled as willful may fall on “those who are *not* compelled by the reasoning of others”, and is also associated with “not meeting the criteria for being human”. Ahmed’s view of willfulness is similar to Lynda Hart’s (1994) view, according to which it is desire, of the ‘wrong’ calibre and ‘wrong’ inclinations, that turns certain women into dangerous others.

There are indeed many ways in which the analysis of the tabloid portrayals' affectiveness could deepen our understanding of the sensibilities circulating as a part of them and their hold on contemporary imagination. Tabloid stories about women's violence can be seen as cautionary tales about the perils of acting against gendered norms, and thus as (affectively and discursively) governing the boundaries of femininity by inviting moral condemnation of, and movement away from, women who have perpetrated violence (Ringrose, 2006). Further, such tales can be seen as a part of wider affective economies (Ahmed, 2014a) of violence, where certain figures emerge as a result of being reiteratively attached to violence, allowing for the constant work of distinguishing non-violent 'us' from violent 'others', as described above. This affective economy likely leans on general desires to distance violence, especially the most severe forms of it that produce abject corpses (Morrissey, 2003), and those involved in it, as well the general affectiveness of gender and the desire to identify all human beings as either men or women (Kolehmainen, 2010), and to keep those categories pure and separate. Related to this, the economy is also linked to the social dynamics of power that allow for keeping the gendered structure of violence in place, and out of sight, by regulating women's involvement with violence, both as victims and perpetrators, through individualized shame and guilt that forestall interventions that take socio-culturally informed gendered dynamics of violence as their entry point (see also below). Looking more closely into these affective dynamics through tabloids or other contexts would certainly constitute a fruitful path for future research.

### **7.1.2 Meanings of violence and its relations with gender**

Emphasis on the deviance of women suspected of violent crimes in the tabloid news reports is coupled with a relative absence of portrayals of women's violent acts as linked with violence directed at them, and hence signified, for instance, as self-defence. This became evident both in the analysis of reports about women's use of violence in general (Article II) and in the analysis focusing on lethal intimate partner violence (Article I). As Lazar (2008) points out, according to the premises adopted by the legal system, to be categorized as self-defence a violent act must be shown to have been a reasonable and thus justifiable response to the threat posed by the victim's actions. This kind of reasonableness, or rationality in general, was seldom attached to women's acts of violence in the analysed tabloid news reports. This is in line with findings from several previous studies indicating that it is more common to portray women's use of violence as irrational rather than rational (e.g. Brown, 2011; Naylor, 2001).

However, as I show particularly in Article IV, many of the imprisoned women's narratives portrayed violence perpetrated by the women as self-

defence, and thus attached quite different meanings to it compared to tabloids. Moreover, some of the women described their own violence as perpetrated in defence of others. This enabled the uptake of the position of an active protector of others, whose violence hence appears as motivated by caring rather than a will to harm. As I discuss further below, these portrayals can be viewed both as local efforts to justify violence and thus to talk against stigmatization (c.f. Gueta & Chen, 2016), and as linked with more comprehensive socio-cultural practices whereby ideal subjecthood is constituted on the basis of ideals of rationality and separateness.

Furthermore, as mentioned above and described in Articles I and II, despite the fact that tabloid news reports frequently drew upon gendered assumptions about ‘normal’ womanhood in their depictions of the suspected women, women’s use of violence was predominantly made sense of in the reports in ways that reproduce gender-neutral notions of violence. Images are frequently evoked in which gender does not appear to position women and men differently in terms of power, and in which there is no room for considering the restrictions that society may impose on women’s actions. Moreover, very seldom are women’s acts of violence (such as lethal violence towards their male spouses) contextualized with descriptions of their own prolonged victimization in an intimate relationship characterized by asymmetry of power. Such contextualizations do appear for instance in research on lethal intimate partner violence (e.g. Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012), however, and in the imprisoned women’s narratives (see particularly Article IV), and can be seen as importantly allowing to see the ways in which gendered power dynamics inform perpetration of violence.

Gender-neutral views about violence circulated in the tabloids were also (at least to some extent) reproduced in some of the imprisoned women’s narratives, in connection with alignments with forcefulness, for instance. This can be seen as reflecting the prevalence of gender-neutral understandings of violence in the Finnish socio-cultural context (e.g. Ronkainen, 2002; Virkki, 2017), and the relative undesirability of feminist views on violence and the positionings they make available. As I discuss in Article II, this kind of undesirability was constructed in articles about women’s use of violence as a phenomenon by attaching deceptiveness not only to the suspected women but also to advocates of the women’s movement. These articles hence echo the ways in which feminist researchers of violence have been positioned not only in public arenas but also in some of the academic discussions on gender symmetry in violence. They draw upon historically powerful discourses about women and the women’s movement as irrational and prone to errors of truth (Shildrick, 2002, 36–37). However, as mentioned above, some of the imprisoned women also positioned themselves in ways that, in contrast, align with feminist notions of women’s gendered vulnerability in relation to violence.

In Article II I briefly contrast these gender-neutral understandings of women’s capability to act violently with the view on agency made available by

the concept of intra-action (Barad, 2007). Indeed, intra-action could offer a viable alternative to such views: it exposes the materialities of bodies as well as unequalizing societal practices, and allows for viewing them as affective in violence and ways of making sense of it. From this perspective, women may not be seen as being in a similar position as men in terms of inflicting violent harm (c.f. Piispa & Heiskanen, 2017), but neither are their differences from men assumed to be stable and/or essential qualities that automatically position all women in certain ways in relation to men and in relation to violence. On the contrary, bodies can be seen as constantly taking shape, also in violent encounters. Thus, they are not fixed in their form (even though they potentially carry histories of abuse with them), nor do they always assume specific, predictable shapes, but nevertheless get inescapably co-constituted with gendered practices, in terms of physique as well as symbolic, social, and psychological meanings.

## 7.2 The allure of individuality

*I'm bulletproof nothing to lose  
Fire away, fire away  
Ricochet, you take your aim  
Fire away, fire away  
You shoot me down but I won't fall, I am titanium*

*David Guetta feat. Sia, Titanium, Nothing but the Beat album*

*They don't want me  
They want Laura Ingals  
Nicely to obey in her pinny*

*Maija Vilkkumaa (a Finnish singer-songwriter), Laura Ingals, Meikit, ketjut ja vyöt album*

### 7.2.1 Vulnerability and autonomy

Read through the theoretical lenses of affect(s) and positioning, embedded in the narratives of the imprisoned women analysed in Articles III and IV are various descriptions of attempts to move away from positions of vulnerability and to establish and protect boundaries between one's self and others. I view these positionings as strivings towards a body with an impenetrable surface that insulates from being affected by others. As I discuss in Article IV, such strivings can be seen as drawing upon notions of autonomy as a valued mode of being a subject that predominate in the liberal-humanist ideology of the West (Lawler, 2014, 180). Since the interplay of vulnerability and autonomy evoked in the imprisoned women's narratives is also markedly present in the

tabloid news reports as well as in theorizations about women's use of violence, I will stay with these issues a while longer in this section.

As Margrit Shildrick (2002), among others, states, vulnerability and autonomy are gender-marked and hierarchically organized in the Western cultural imaginary. Whereas autonomy is the valued property of individuals marked as male, vulnerability is associated with the feminine otherness, against which the establishment of autonomy must defend. These distinctions go together with the gendered distinctions based on masculine-marked rationality and feminine-marked irrationality, emotionality and the associated unruliness or even blatant madness (Ahmed, 2014a; Blackman, 2008; Shields, 2002; Shildrick, 2002; Usher, 1999). In the light of these views, the monstrous deviancy of both feminine-marked, vulnerable bodies (Shildrick, 2002) and those marked with violence can be seen as complicating the identity enactments in the imprisoned women's narratives. Indeed, as illustrated in Articles III and IV, it appears that the deviance implied by one of these modes of embodiment may be defended against by aligning with the other, which however is always fraught with the risk of the other type of deviance. These risks may be particularly salient for women, whose alignments with violence do not generally correspond with gendered expectations (e.g. Downing, 2013), and whose bodies are marked by lack (of boundaries) in cultural imaginary.

As insinuated above, what are taken as signs of proper (i.e. autonomous) subjects in the Western imaginary are bounded bodies that are clearly demarcated from other bodies (Shildrick, 2002, 5). With the help of Ahmed's (2014a) theorizations I attempted in article IV to analyse some of the processes whereby boundaries that allow for such demarcations are enacted. Boundaries that define one's body allow for being distinguished as a particular kind of entity, in other words as having an identity (Shildrick, 2002). What these processes rely on are the normative notions of continuity and coherence of identities (see Chapter 3.2), which make it possible confidently to identify those who are others and those who are, or can be, one of 'us', along with the attributes that can and cannot be attached to 'us' (Blackman & Walkerdine, 2001). These notions thus underlie attempts both to identify criminal others in the media (and the anxieties linked to failure in this) and to resist othering by those labelled as deviants by identifying oneself as a particular type (e.g. non-violent) of person.

### **7.2.2 The trouble with victimhood (versus agency)**

In characterizing contemporary cultural contexts of gendered subjectification, Rosalind Gill (2008), among others, has critically scrutinized the impact of both neoliberal and postfeminist sensibilities that place a particularly high value on women's individuality and agency, and are based on the assumption that these qualities are easily attainable for them. These idealizations of agency and individuality, characteristic of individualistic cultures in general – also

lurking on the pages of this dissertation as an orientation shaping (partially and contentiously) me – are in stark contrast to being identified as a victim. Instead, they guide towards narratives in which one's life course appears as a direct outcome of the choices one has made as a rational individual. This widespread cultural undesirability of victimhood (Baker, 2010), and of a consideration of social and societal constraints in general (Gill, 2016), can partly explain the contradictory positionings in the imprisoned women's narratives as well as the tendencies in tabloid news to emphasize suspected women's individual agency.

According to Ronkainen (2002), victimization puts the penetrability of women's bodily boundaries on display, thus shattering their appearance as (self-)contained individuals associated with disembodied abstractness. Studies conducted in Finland focusing on the accounts of women victimized in their intimate partner relations indicate that being positioned as a victim often seems to be associated with trouble (e.g. Ronkainen, 1999b, 2001; Venäläinen, 2012; Virkki, 2007). Due to its capacity to threaten one's appearance as a proper subject, victimhood easily becomes constituted as shameful and thus to be guarded against, by emphasizing agency and responsibility in relation to it, for instance. It could thus be said that being positioned as a victim does not allow for acquiring an identity that has value (see Skeggs, 2010): in fact, being a victim goes against the idea of having an identity at all, given that identity is about being recognizable as a coherent entity that can be separated from others (c.f. Lawler, 2008).

Dorte Marie Søndergaard (2015) has noted that whether it is possible or desirable for someone to identify themselves as a victim depends on whether the cultures they inhabit are perceived as giving support to those so positioned in ways that allow them to retain dignity. Ronkainen (2002) has discussed problems associated with the victimhood of Finnish women in the light of the history of Finnish society. She has claimed that the high value placed on autonomy and the corresponding devaluation of vulnerability and victimhood in the Finnish cultural context reflect the recent past that saw the rebuilding of the nation after two wars and the suppression of the trauma of the violence they caused. In short, whereas the position of 'a strong Finnish woman' has historically allowed for doing respectable femininity in the Finnish context, positions based on victimhood have, in turn, not been similarly available for women (e.g. Virkki, 2007). As mentioned above, these tendencies were also evident in the lack of focus on the possible victimization of women accused of violence in the tabloid news reports analysed in this study.

In sum, victimhood is a form of vulnerability that threatens a person's appearance as a bounded individual, and thus may not appear as a desirable positioning, particularly in contexts that valorize individuality. As I show in Articles III and IV, although many of the imprisoned women's narratives include descriptions of victimhood, the positionings enacted through them tend to be overridden by the emphasis on rationality and agency in their actions. Linked to the idealization of autonomy discussed above, this resonates

with common understandings that separate expressive from instrumental violence, and place greater value on the latter (Campbell & Muncer, 1994). Perceived as instrumental, violence can be attached to a sense of rational control, and thus may pose a lesser threat to the image of its perpetrator as a deviant (although, as already stated, in the case of women this may not be so straightforward). These alignments with rationality and autonomy thus provide a means for imprisoned women to refute the image of them as irrational, vulnerable others and instead to strive towards being seen as subjects that *matter* (c.f. Henriksen & Miller, 2012).

I suggest that the potentially problematic status of victim positioning (e.g. Ronkainen, 1999b) should be considered in therapeutic interventions in women's violence. Victim positioning may figure in therapeutic encounters in various, dilemmatic ways. Not only the victim position but also the position of a responsible actor may be resisted by the perpetrators with the use of techniques of self-constitution (including claiming victimization) that allow to distance one's self from positionings that pose a threat to dignity (Hochstetler, Copes & Williams, 2010).<sup>53</sup> The position of a victim and that of a responsible actor both entail potential shaming of perpetrators of violence. As a paralyzing emotion that works to separate one from others, shame may impede the experience of belonging to a social group, or society at large, in which one might have a place as a respectable member.<sup>54</sup> The experience and the expectation of being secluded, in turn, inhibits perceiving the relationality of one's actions, and thus their impact on others. (c.f. Helkama, 2009, 243–250.)

Successful interventions thus may require a careful balancing with the positionings made available to perpetrators of violence in therapeutic encounters, including consideration of the affective desirability of certain positionings and of the ways in which people become attached to them through their life histories. The need for such balancing may be particularly acute in the case of women who have perpetrated violence, for whom both the victim and the perpetrator position may entail pronounced risks in terms of their ability to see themselves, and to be seen, as worthy, human subjects. This is all the more so because affects such as shame and associated labels such as 'deviant other' may easily stick (see Ahmed, 2014a; article IV) with women who have perpetrated violence, thus restricting their social possibilities and living space.<sup>55</sup>

Critical discussions about the pathologizing and demonizing portrayals of women who have perpetrated violence (e.g. Morrissey, 2003) have sometimes

---

<sup>53</sup> Terhi Partanen and Jarl Wahlström (2003), among others, have discussed the dilemmatic balancing of victim positioning and the encouragement of adopting a responsible position in relation to violence in group therapy for male perpetrators of domestic violence.

<sup>54</sup> See James Gilligan (2003) for a discussion on how shame may be linked to violence in a cyclical manner.

<sup>55</sup> This also attests to the importance of various forms of state support for women indicted for violent crimes after their release, which according to Riitta Granfelt (2007) is often insufficient.

aimed to counter these prevalent discourses by searching for ways of viewing violent acts by women as rational responses to situations of disadvantage or threat, partly in a similar way as the imprisoned women in my study. These re-framings may facilitate the aligning of such acts more easily with notions about violence that circulate in the legal system, for instance, and thus may prove to be of advantage to women accused of violent crimes (e.g. Lazar, 2008; Ruuskanen, 2001, 2005). A potential shortcoming in these attempts, however, is that they may not allow for questioning, on a deeper level, the gendered idealization of individuality and rationality as its mark. I approach these critiques, and contribute to efforts at subverting othering discourses, in my study by focusing on ways in which the gendered ideals of rationality and separateness that are disseminated by the psy-sciences (Blackman, 2008; Blackman & Walkerdine, 2001), including both psychology and criminology, work in constituting cultural contexts in which women in general and those suspected of violence in particular need to defend against various forms of otherness in their efforts to be seen as individuals.

Entwined with my critical consideration of rationality and individuality is a critique of agency. From the perspective adopted in this study, the predominant understandings of agency as the ability of individuals to choose are problematic, because they create an image of individuals as existing in a particular form prior to their encounters with the social world and their acts of choosing within it. By implicitly distinguishing individuals from their (social) environments (c.f. Cronin, 2000; Davies, 2010; Gill, 2008), this image may reproduce the notion of separateness, on which individuality is based.

I have attempted to overcome some of these problems linked with reliance on individualizing notions in this study by developing the concept of affective identificatory practices. Even though this conceptualization is premised on the pervasiveness of practices of identification, instead of individualizing them it highlights their reliance on cultural imperatives, which are fluidly adapted in interaction. Thus, the aim is to avoid the tendency to view social phenomena in terms of the individual's psychological makeup (Wetherell, 2010). I suggest that this conceptualization facilitates the viewing of links between both vulnerability and autonomy and gender-marked bodies as not only carrying the history of cultural valuations but also as locally, discursively and materially negotiated, contested and solidified. Furthermore, given that it is based on a critique of assumptions about stable and coherent identities, it aims to dissolve the division between vulnerability and agency, and thus also to enact disturbances in the hierarchizing effects of that binary along gendered lines. Overall, by experimenting with a discursive-affective approach in Articles III and IV I have attempted to move towards approaching the boundaries that serve to demarcate subjects and their others as unstable and permeable (Davies, 2017) while simultaneously under constant enactment, as evidenced in my analyses of the narratives in which violence and identities are construed.

### 7.3 The impure life of gender

I have approached gender in this study primarily through the lens of poststructural theorization, coupled with insights from critical discursive psychology and ethnomethodology. Drawing on these theorizations has shed light on both the stabilizing patterns and fluidity, and the context-specificity in enactments of gender. For instance, as illustrated in Articles III and IV, the positionings of imprisoned women in their narratives in relation to gendered meanings were frequently ambivalent, and included both distancing from and attachment to meanings that are widely associated with femininity.

These analyses therefore illustrate how enactments of gendered identities are not simply based on women performing femininity and men performing masculinity<sup>56</sup>, but how, for instance, masculine-marked ideals such as that of a bounded subject may also appeal to women because of the promise of securing one's worth in contexts that valorize individuality. Alignments with gendered attributes are also further complicated by other social categorizations to which one may become attached (Ahmed, 1997). Although the narratives of the participating women included various positionings regarding their past lives, many described economic uncertainty and a lack of privilege. These positionings can be seen as constraining their possibilities for adopting orientations based on middle-class ideals on which predominant forms of femininity rely (e.g. Skeggs, 1997).

One of the contributions of my study is that it approaches gender from perspectives that shed light on complexity in its reproduction. In this way it aims to make available (potentially) new angles on relations between gender and violence, and their reproduction. As noted above, in addition to analysing local enactments of gendered identities and ways in which gendered notions are drawn upon in the sense-making of violence, I also approach gender in terms of how its reproduction is symbolically and materially inscribed into ideals of autonomous subjects and the coherence of identities.

As described in Chapters 6.1–6.4, the sub-analyses also differ in their analytical approaches to gender, and in what they do or do not allow to see. The benefits of micro-oriented approaches such as discursive psychology or MCA include their facility for examining ways in which sexist and discriminatory ideas are subtly circulated and reproduced even if they might be disavowed on the explicit level (Weatherall, 2012; Worth, Augoustinos & Hastie, 2016). Thus, as illustrated in Article I, these approaches shed light on the frequently complex interplay between widespread ideals of equality, on the one hand, and unequalizing gendered assumptions, on the other, that is evident particularly in societal contexts in which it is presumed that gender equality has already been achieved (see e.g. Skoger, Lindberg & Magnusson,

---

<sup>56</sup> This notion has been criticized particularly by the proponents of micro-approaches to discursive analyses focusing on gender (e.g. Speer & Stokoe, 2011). In the field of criminology, Jody Miller (2002) has considered the same issue from a slightly different angle.

2011). Drawing on these approaches in sub-analysis I, I approached gender primarily as a sense-making resource that is mobilized in crime reports through the use of interpretative repertoires and categorizations, and the culturally circulating notions tied to them. Despite the partial use of the micro-oriented approach of MCA, the overarching analytical orientation in the sub-analysis was based on the view expressed in critical discursive psychology (Wetherell, 1998), according to which micro-level language-use is connected with macro-level discourses and other social practices that work to establish relations of power. Similar orientation guided sub-analysis II, which also focused on tabloid news reports but drew on socio-semiotic concepts. The emphasis in this sub-analysis was on the construction of relations between 'violent women' and 'normal women', and how they were implicated in the construction of portrayals of violent deviance through depictions of agency.

Another benefit of micro-oriented approaches is that they reveal the inseparability of meaning-making and the local dynamics of interaction (see Speer, 2002). Even though I did not explicitly emphasize the interaction between myself and the research participants in my analyses of the imprisoned women's narratives (sub-analyses III and IV), I based my interpretations on the notion that meanings are produced in collaboration between researchers and research participants, and therefore bear the traces of local interaction.

However, adopting a purely micro-oriented approach, such as ethnomethodological, to gender (which, as noted above, I did not do in my analyses) also has its complications, not least because it is debatable what makes gender relevant in the analysed talk/texts (see Chapter 5.3.2; Weatherall, 2012). Looked at through poststructural-constructionist eyes, the meaningfulness of this kind of debate diminishes because there is not (even an implied) attempt to capture what is *really* going on in the interaction. Instead, as I see it, more pronounced emphasis is placed on the entwinements of the researchers' interpretations and the theoretical and methodological apparatuses through which they are made. Poststructurally inspired analyses, in turn, allow more easily to draw connections between micro-level meaning-making and the broader patterns of practices that constitute the possibilities for certain modes of being and acting. This is because the possibilities for making such connections require that researchers in their analyses explicitly draw upon theorizations about the ways in which social life is organized, which in micro-oriented approaches causes potential trouble.

Incorporating an interest in affect(s) into discursive analysis further strengthens the visibility of the link between more micro-level interaction and use of language, on the one hand, and the sedimentation of social practices imbued with power, on the other, including the ways in which such practices are lived and corporeally experienced. According to Wetherell (2012), concepts such as subject positions and interpretative repertoires can be utilized also in discursive-affective analysis. Therefore, despite some tensions in the relations between discursive and affective approaches (see Chapter 3.3), they need not be seen as mutually exclusive. In following this notion of a

combined analytical focus (also informing the sub-analysis III), particularly in sub-analysis IV I draw not only on Wetherell (ibid.) but also Ahmed (2014a) in my reading of the imprisoned women's narratives, in order to get a keener feel of the affective aspects of their identity enactments.

In sum, the different analytical approaches and the accompanying concepts that I have drawn upon in the sub-analyses allow for different kinds of engagements with gender, due to which they are not mutually replaceable, but nor is it necessary to see them as mutually exclusive. The differences between them therefore not only highlight a variety in ways that gender matters in people's lives but also in ways in which gender can be analysed in research, depending on the focus of interest. What unites the concepts that I have put to work in the analyses is that their use has allowed to illuminate the processes through which identities – and a sense of identifiability – are constituted (largely through depictions of actions) and positioned in relation to gender, understood in my work as a set of normative practices through which gendered hierarchical relations are built.

The theoretical and methodological approaches to analysing gender that I have drawn upon in this study have revealed the messiness and the impurity, along with the patterning, in the reproduction of gender. They have shown the ways in which gender is lived as not only multiple but also indeterminate. Gender mutates constantly as a force that shapes and is shaped in people's everyday practices. It is present in how people act and account for previous actions, in orientations adopted in relation to the world and the orientations that the world avails and accepts. These personal sedimentations of meanings link people to the sedimentations of the social and the normative in various ways. Gender is not the only thing that moulds orientations; what is also significant is the availability of resources that depends on the relations of possibility between the world and bodies with markings made sense of through notions of class, sexuality, ethnicity and race, for instance. These views challenge unidirectional, predictable modes of doing gender, while nevertheless remaining sensitive to its operations and the power with which they are imbued.

## **7.4 Against simplicity**

This study was largely motivated by attempts to counter and find alternatives to reductionist views in terms of theory, methodology, and the topic of women as perpetrators of violence. This endeavour found resonance and fuel from discussions about post-foundational approaches in qualitative social scientific research in recent years. It also benefited from encounters (although inevitably partial) with new materialism and theories of affect(s), along with poststructural theorizations on which it was (largely) based from the start. Through these theoretical and methodological encounters, what started as an interest in the interplay between images of 'violent women' and of valuable

femininity mutated into a more deep-going inquiry into the ideals of proper subjecthood and the separability and individuality of humans on which it is based. Because of the e/affectiveness of these encounters I will conclude this dissertation with consideration of their processual entanglements with the subject (of) matter within it.

The doing of this study has been pervasively defined by a sense of in-betweenness (c.f. Childers, Rhee & Daza, 2013); of being and moving in-between theoretical orientations, methodological approaches and disciplines, for instance. It is also based on seeing women who perpetrate violence as liminal beings in the cultural imaginary, who threaten the boundaries between what is considered normal (in terms of gender and humanity) and what is not (Shildrick, 2002), and thus as telling us something significant about pervasive, gendered fantasies concerning normative modes of subjecthood. My study is against attempts to tame the disruptiveness of such problematic figures. This does not mean condoning violence committed by women (or anyone else), or naively celebrating the boundary crossing that such figures enact. It rather means speaking against the violence of rigid categorizations by shedding light on contradictions and dilemmas, and staying with that which affects, disturbs and stains without directly attempting to purify it.

During the process of doing this research I have come to advocate, and to strive towards, an analytical approach based on loose (another word for promiscuous) ties to the theoretical-methodological apparatuses that are engaged with in the processes of research. This orientation has both partially motivated my movement among various approaches and allowed to make sense of, and justify, it. Extending the notion of intra-action (Barad, 2007) to research processes allows for seeing them in such a fluid way, as entailing the enmeshment of the researcher/theories/methodologies and the participants/narratives/readings, each of which acts on the others and is (re-)constituted in the process, thus gaining unforeseen shapes. As thinking technologies (Haraway, 1991), theories and methodologies involved in this intra-action work to generate certain modes of subjecthood for both the research participants and the researchers. Awareness of this co-constitutive power is linked with possibilities for doing research in an open-ended manner, because it constitutes the possibilities for knowing that are attached to the (subject) position of the researcher as partial, relational and processual.

Affective approaches in doing research, as I understand them, allow for seeing the possibilities of knowing that constitute the researcher's position as linked with their affective attachments to certain ways of seeing the world. This affective process whereby the researcher, such as I in the context of this study, gets constituted extends also beyond their engagements with theoretical and methodological approaches, which can be seen as mutually formative with their/my more or less lasting orientations in seeing the world and myself in it, allowing the world and its relation with myself to become intelligible and liveable. The cacophonous journey through a mixed collection of approaches that shape my orientations in (this) research and beyond is not, and will not

be, complete, nor does it entail linear or clear-cut replacements of “old” approaches with “new” ones, but rather includes overlapping attachments to several, partly contradictory ones, in a fashion characterized in poststructural theorization (e.g. Davies et al., 2004) as the fragile state of being constituted as a fragmented, contradictory subject that disrupts the normativity of becoming identified in accordance with predominant thought patterns. Just like our pasts that are never over (Ahmed, 2014a) but infiltrate the present (and get reshaped within it), my engagements with different theories and approaches are simultaneously present in my thought, even while my attachments to some may wane while others are getting a stronger hold, thus troubling the relative predominance of the prior ones.

The critical potential of poststructuralism is based on this trouble it brings to dominant notions of coherence that work to reduce complexity (Gannon & Davies, 2007). It means making propositions acknowledged as contingent about how, and with what kinds of affordances, things *come* to be, not how they *are*. Along with poststructural theorizations, approaches focusing on affectivity can guide towards envisioning social existence in ways that are less imbued with the violence of social practices such as rigid categorizations and dichotomizations. It is in the impossibilities of an autonomous subject highlighted in theorizations of affect, just as it is in the imperfections of gender performances (Morison & Macleod, 2013), that the possibilities for envisioning other kinds of orientations to subjecthood – which allow putting the subject *under erasure* (Davies, 2010) – lie. These theorizations are an inseparable part of the contingent conclusions I have made in the above sections about the ways in which ideals of autonomy, coherence and identifiability are reproduced, and tarnished, in tabloid news reports and in the imprisoned women’s narratives.

As for potential future directions in research on issues such as violence, gender and/or womanhood, I suggest that insights from new materialist thinking may yield highly fruitful analyses, the kinds in which the complexities of violence can be seen, and that focus on the entanglements of various actors, including non-human ones, instead of individualized acts or actors (see e.g. Davies, 2014; Søndergaard, 2016). In addition to a focus on the affectiveness of portrayals in tabloids and arenas similar to them, as suggested above, analyses focusing on the entanglements of affect(s) with violence and with ways of making sense of it in general may facilitate highly productive new kinds of engagements with the issue of violence. In sum, on the basis of the encounters this study process has allowed for, I suggest that a diffractive orientation that is attuned towards ways in which theoretical and methodological engagements entwine inseparably with what is seen and claimed in research may allow for actualizing aspirations to conduct research, on violence as well as other topics, that is world-building instead of world-mirroring (Gergen, 2015), and thus not only deconstructive (including of our own work) but also aimed at alternative conceptualizations and other practices.

## REFERENCES

- Aaltonen, Sanna & Honkatukia, Päivi (2002). Kovat kimmat otsikoissa ja otsikoiden takana [Tough girls in headlines and behind them]. In Sanna Aaltonen & Päivi Honkatukia (Eds.), *Tulkintoja tytöistä* (pp. 207–223). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Adler, Freda (1975). *Sisters in Crime: The Rise of the New Female Criminal*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ahmed, Sara (1997). It's a Sun-Tan, Isn't It? Auto-biography as an Identificatory Practice. In Heidi Safia Mirza (Ed.), *Black British Feminism* (pp. 153–167). London and New York: Routledge.
- Ahmed, Sara (2000). Embodying Strangers. In Avril Horner and Angela Keane (Eds.), *Body Matters: Feminism, Textuality, Corporeality* (pp. 85–97). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Ahmed, Sara (2008). Imaginary Prohibitions: Some Preliminary Remarks on the Founding Gestures of the 'New Materialism'. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 15(1), 23–39.
- Ahmed, Sara (2010). Orientations matter. In Diana Coole & Samantha Frost (Eds.), *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics* (pp. 234–257). Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Ahmed, Sara (2014a). *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ahmed, Sara (2014b). *Willful Subjects*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Ajzenstadt, Mimi (2009). The Relative Autonomy of Women Offender's Decision Making. *Theoretical Criminology*, 13(2), 201–225.
- Alaimo, Stacy & Hekman, Susan (Eds.) (2008). *Material Feminisms*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Allen, Christopher, T., Swan, Suzanne C., Raghavan, Chitra (2009). Gender Symmetry, Sexism, and Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(11), 1816–1834.
- Allen, Hilary (1998). Rendering Them Harmless: The Professional Portrayal of Women Charged with Serious Violent Crimes. In Kathleen Daly & Lisa Maher (Eds.), *Criminology at the Crossroads. Feminist Readings in Crime and Justice* (pp. 54–68). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Attenborough, Frederick (2015). A Forgotten Legacy? Towards a Discursive Psychology of the Media. In Cristian Tileagă & Elizabeth Stokoe (Eds.), *Discursive Psychology: Classic and Contemporary Issues* (pp. 224–240). London: Routledge.
- Baker, Carol (2000). Locating Culture in Action: Membership Categorisation in Texts and Talk. In Cate Poynton & Alison Lee (Eds.), *Culture & Text: Discourse and Methodology in Social Research and Cultural Studies* (pp. 99–113). Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Baker, Joanne (2010). Claiming Volition and Evading Victimhood: Post-Feminist Obligations for Young Women." *Feminism & Psychology*, 20(2), 186–204.

- Ballinger, Anette (2000). *Dead Woman Walking: Executed Women in England and Wales 1900-1955*. Socio-legal studies series. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Banwell, Stacy (2010). Gendered Narratives: Women's Subjective Accounts of Their Use of Violence and Alternative Aggression(s) within Their Marital Relationships. *Feminist Criminology*, 5(2), 116–134.
- Barad, Karen (2003). Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 28(3), 801–831.
- Barad, Karen (2007). *Meeting the Universe Halfway*. London: Duke University Press.
- Barnes, Barry (2000). *Understanding Agency. Social Theory and Responsible Action*. London: Sage.
- Barnett, Barbara (2005). Perfect Mother or Artist of Obscenity? Narrative and Myth in a Qualitative Analysis of Press Coverage of the Andrea Yates Murders. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 29(1), 9–29.
- Barnwell, Ashley (2016). Creative Paranoia: Affect and Social Method. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 20, 10–17.
- Barron, Christie & Lacombe, Dany (2005). Moral Panic and the Nasty Girl. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 42(1), 51–57.
- Bengtsson, Tea T. (2014). What Are Data? Ethnographic Experiences with Young Offenders. *Qualitative Research*, 14(6), 729–744.
- Benhabib, Seyla (1987). The Generalized Other and the Concrete Other: The Kohlberg-Gilligan Controversy and Feminist Theory. In Seyla Benhabib & Drucilla Cornell (Eds.), *Feminism as Critique: On the Politics of Gender* (pp. 77–95). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bennett, Tony (1982). Media, 'Reality', Signification. In Michael Gurevitch, Tony Bennett, James Curran & Janet Woollacott (Eds.). *Culture, Society and the Media* (pp. 287–308). London: Methuen.
- Benwell, Bethan & Stokoe, Elizabeth (2006). *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Berg, Päivi (2010). Ryhmärajoja ja hierarkioita: Etnografinen tutkimus peruskoulun yläasteen liikunnanopetuksesta [Group distinctions and hierarchies: An ethnographic study on physical education] (Social psychological studies 22). Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Department of Social Research.
- Berkowitz, Dan (2005). Suicide Bombers as Women Warriors: Making News through Mythical Archetypes. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82(3), 607–622.
- Berrington, Eileen & Honkatukia, Päivi (2002). An Evil Monster and a Poor Thing: Female Violence in the Media. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 3, 50–72.
- Billig, Michael (1987). *Arguing and Thinking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blackman, Lisa (2008). Affect, Relationality and the Problem of Personality. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 25(1), 23–47.
- Blackman, Lisa (2013). Habit and Affect: Revitalizing a Forgotten History. *Body & Society*, 19(2–3), 186–216.
- Blackman, Lisa (2014). Affect and Automaticity: Towards an Analytics of Experimentation. *Subjectivity*, 7(4), 362–384.
- Blackman, Lisa (2015). Researching Affect and Embodied Hauntologies: Exploring an Analytics of Experimentation. In Britta Knudsen & Carsten

- Stage (Eds.), *Affective Methodologies: Developing Cultural Research Strategies for the Study of Affect* (pp. 25–44). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Blackman, Lisa & Cromby, John (2007). Affect and Feeling. *International Journal of Critical Psychology*, 21, 5–22.
- Blackman, Lisa, Cromby, John, Hook, Derek, Papadopoulos, Dimitris & Walkerdine, Valerie (2008). Editorial: Creating Subjectivities. *Subjectivity*, 22, 1–27.
- Blackman, Lisa & Walkerdine, Valerie (2001). *Mass Hysteria: Critical Psychology and Media Studies*. London: Palgrave.
- Blackman, Lisa & Venn, Couze (2010). Affect. *Body & Society*, 16(1), 7–28.
- Boyle, Karen (2005). *Media and Violence: Gendering the Debates*. London: Sage.
- Brah, Avtar & Phoenix, Ann (2013). Ain't I a Woman? Revisiting Intersectionality. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 5(3), 75–86.
- Brown, Katherine E. (2011). Muriel's Wedding: News Media Representations of Europe's First Female Suicide Terrorist. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 14(6), 705–726.
- Brunila, Kristiina (2016). The Ambivalences of *Becoming* a Professor in Neoliberal Academia. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 22(5), 386–394.
- Burman, Michele, Batchelor, Susan & Brown, Jane (2001). Researching Girls and Violence. Facing the Dilemmas of Fieldwork. *British Journal of Criminology*, 41(3), 443–459.
- Burr, Vivien (2015). *Social Constructionism*. Third edition. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, Judith (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, Judith (1993). *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, Judith (1997a). *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, Judith (1997b). *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Butler, Judith (2004). *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London: Verso.
- Buttny, Richard & Ellis, Donald (2007). Accounts of Violence from Arabs and Israelis on *Nightline*. *Discourse & Society*, 18(2), 139–161.
- Campbell, Anne & Muncer, Steven (1994). Men and the Meaning of Violence. In John Archer (Ed.), *Male Violence* (pp. 332–351). London: Routledge.
- Carter, Cynthia (1998). When the 'Extraordinary' Becomes 'Ordinary'. In Stuart Allan, Gill Branston, & Cynthia Carter (Eds.), *News, Gender and Power* (pp. 219–232). London: Routledge.
- Carter, Cynthia & Steiner, Linda (2004). Mapping the Contested Terrain of Media and Gender Research. In Cynthia Carter & Linda Steiner (Eds.), *Critical Readings: Media and Gender* (pp. 11–35). Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Chesney-Lind, Meda (1986). Women and Crime: The Female Offender. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 12(1), 78–96.
- Chesney-Lind, Meda (1999). Media Misogyny: Demonizing Violent Girls and Women in Media. In Jeff Ferrell & Neil Websdale (Eds.), *Making Trouble:*

- Cultural Constructions of Crime, Deviance, and Control* (pp. 115–140). New York: Aldine Transaction.
- Chesney-Lind, Meda (2006). Patriarchy, Crime, and Justice: Feminist Criminology in an Era of Backlash. *Feminist Criminology*, 1(6), 6–26.
- Childers, Sara M. (2014). Promiscuous Analysis in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), 819–826.
- Childers, Sara M., Rhee, Jeong-eun & Daza, Stephanie L. (2013). Promiscuous (Use of) Feminist Methodologies: The Dirty Theory and Messy Practice of Educational Research beyond Gender. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(5), 507–523.
- Clarke, Kris (2011). The Paradoxical Approach to Intimate Partner Violence in Finland. *International Perspectives in Victimology*, 6(1), 9–19.
- Clough, Patricia T. with Jean Halley (Eds.) (2007). *The Affective Turn*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Clough, Patricia T. & Fine, Michelle (2007). Activism and Pedagogies: Feminist Reflections. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 35(3/4), 255–275.
- Collins, Rachael E. (2016). 'Beauty and Bullets': A Content Analysis of Female Offenders and Victims in Four Canadian Newspapers. *Journal of Sociology*, 52(2), 296–310.
- Comack, Elizabeth & Brickey, Salena (2007). Constituting the Violence of Criminalized Women. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 49(1), 1–36.
- Connell, Robert W. & Messerschmidt, James W. (2005). Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. *Gender & Society*, 19(6), 829–859.
- Coole, Diana & Frost, Samantha (Eds.) (2010). *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Corbin, Juliet & Morse, Janice M. (2003). The Unstructured Interactive Interview: Issues of Reciprocity and Risks When Dealing with Sensitive Topics. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9(3), 335–354.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299.
- Cronin, Anne (2000). Consumerism and 'Compulsory Individuality': Women, Will and Potential. In Sara Ahmed, Jane Kilby, Celia Lury, Maureen McNeil and Beverley Skeggs (Eds.), *Transformations: Thinking Through Feminism* (pp. 273–287). London: Routledge.
- Das Dasgupta, Shamita (2002). A Framework for Understanding Women's Use of Non-lethal Violence in Intimate Heterosexual Relationships. *Violence against Women*, 8(11), 1364–1389.
- Davies, Bronwyn (2010). The Implications for Qualitative Research Methodology of the Struggle between the Individualised Subject of Phenomenology and the Emergent Multiplicities of the Poststructuralist Subject: The Problem of Agency. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology*, 1(1), 54–68.
- Davies, Bronwyn (2014). Reading Anger in Early Childhood Intra-Actions: A Diffractive Analysis. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), 734–741.
- Davies, Bronwyn (2016a). Emergent Listening. In Norman K. Denzin & Michael D. Giardina (Eds), *Qualitative Inquiry through a Critical Lens* (pp. 73–84). New York: Routledge.
- Davies, Bronwyn (2016b). Ethics and the New Materialism: A Brief Genealogy of the 'Post' Philosophies in the Social Sciences. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, doi:10.1080/01596306.2016.1234682.

- Davies, Bronwyn (2017). Animating Ancestors: From Representation to Diffraction. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 23(4), 267–275.
- Davies, Bronwyn, Browne, Jenny, Gannon, Susanne, Honan, Eileen, Laws, Cath, Mueller-Rockstroh, Babette, & Petersen, Eva Bendix (2004). The Ambivalent Practices of Reflexivity. *Qualitative inquiry*, 10(3), 360–389.
- Davies, Bronwyn, Browne, Jenny, Gannon, Susanne, Hopkins, Leckie, McCann, Helen & Wihlborg, Monne (2006). Constituting the Feminist Subject in Poststructuralist Discourse. *Feminism & Psychology*, 16(1), 87–103.
- Davies, Bronwyn & Gannon, Susanne (2012). Collective Biography and the Entangled Enlivening of Being. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, 5(4), 357–376.
- Davies, Bronwyn & Harré, Rom (1990). Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 20(1), 43–63.
- Danielsson, Petri & Salmi, Venla (2013). *Suomalaisten kokema parisuhdeväkivalta 2012* [Domestic violence in Finland 2012]. Helsinki: National Research Institute of Legal Policy.
- DeKeseredy, Walter S. & Dragiewicz, Molly (2007). Understanding the Complexities of Feminist Perspectives on Woman Abuse: A Commentary on Donald G. Dutton's Rethinking Domestic Violence." *Violence against Women*, 13(8), 874–884.
- Dickson-Swift, Virginia, James, Erica L., Kippen, Sandra, & Liamputtong, Pranee (2009). Researching Sensitive Topics: Qualitative Research as Emotion Work. *Qualitative Research*, 9(1), 61–79.
- Dobash, Russell P. & Dobash, Rebecca E. (2004). Women's Violence to Men in Intimate Relationships: Working on a Puzzle. *British Journal of Criminology*, 44(3), 324–349.
- Downing, Lisa (2013). *The Subject of Murder: Gender, Exceptionality, and the Modern Killer*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press
- Dutton, Donald G. & Nichols, Tonia L. (2005). The Gender Paradigm in Domestic Violence Research and Theory: Part I – The Conflict of Theory and Data. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 10(6), 680–714.
- Easteal, Patricia, Bartels, Lorana, Nelson, Noni, & Holland, Kate (2015). How Are Women Who Kill Portrayed in Newspaper Media? Connections with Social Values and the Legal System. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 51, 31–41.
- Edley, Nigel (2001a). Analysing Masculinity: Interpretative Repertoires, Ideological Dilemmas and Subject Positions. In Margaret Wetherell, Stephanie Taylor, & Simon Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis* (pp. 189–228). London: Sage.
- Edley, Nigel (2001b). Unravelling Social Constructionism. *Theory & Psychology*, 11(3), 433–441.
- Edley, Nigel & Wetherell, Margaret (2001). Jekyll and Hyde: Men's Constructions of Feminism and Feminists. *Feminism & Psychology*, 11(4), 439–457.
- Edley, Nigel, & Wetherell, Margaret (2008). Discursive Psychology and the Study of Gender: A Contested Space. In Kate Harrington, Lia Litosseliti, Helen Saunston & Jane Sunderland (Eds.), *Gender and Language Research Methodologies* (pp. 161–173). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Edwards, Derek (1999). Emotion Discourse. *Culture and Psychology*, 5(3), 271–291.

- Edwards, Derek (2008). Intentionality and Mens Rea in Police Interrogations: The Production of Actions as Crimes. *Intercultural pragmatics*, 5(2), 177–199.
- Eglin, Peter (2002). Members' Gendering Work: 'Women', 'Feminists' and Membership Categorization Analysis. *Discourse & Society* 13(6), 819–825.
- Eglin, Peter & Hester, Stephen (1999). Moral Order and the Montreal Massacre: A story of Membership Categorization Analysis. In Paul L. Jalbert (Ed.), *Media Studies: Ethnomethodological Approaches* (pp. 195–230). Lanham: University Press of America.
- Enander, Viveka (2011). Violent Women? The Challenge of Women's Violence in Intimate Heterosexual Relationships to Feminist Analyses of Partner Violence. *NORA – Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 19(2), 10–123.
- Enosh, Guy & Buchbinder, Eli (2005). The Interactive Construction of Narrative Styles in Sensitive Interviews: The Case of Domestic Violence Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11(4), 588–617.
- Erickson, Richard, Baranek, Patricia & Chan, Janet (1987). *Visualizing Deviance: A Study of News Organization*. Milton Keynes: Open University.
- Eriksson, Maria & Pringle, Keith (2005). Introduction: Nordic Issues and Dilemmas. In Maria Eriksson, Marianne Hester, Suvi Keskinen & Keith Pringle (Eds.), *Tackling Men's Violence in Families: Nordic Issues and Dilemmas* (pp. 1–12). Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Falmagne, Rachel (2009). Subverting Theoretical Dualisms: Discourse and Mentalism. *Theory & Psychology*, 19(6), 795–815.
- Falmagne, Rachel Joffe (2016). Toward the Desegregation of Thought and Affect in Psychological Theorizing. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 10(1), 3–10.
- Faludi, Susan (1991). *Backlash: The Undeclared War against American Women*. New York: Crown.
- Ferraro, Kathleen J. (2006). *Neither Angels nor Demons: Women, Crime, and Victimization*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Ferraro, Kathleen & Moe, Angela (2003). Mothering, Crime, and Incarceration. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 32(1), 9–40.
- Fleetwood, Jennifer (2015). In Search of Respectability: Narrative Practice in a Women's Prison in Quito, Ecuador. In Lois Presser & Sveinung Sandberg (Eds.), *Narrative Criminology: Understanding Stories of Crime* (pp. 42–68). New York: New York University Press.
- Flick, Aune & Paavilainen, Eija (2010). Naisten kokemuksia omasta väkivaltaisuudesta parisuhteessa [Women's experiences of their own use of violence in intimate partner relations]. *Sosiaalilääketieteellinen aikakauslehti*, 47, 187–200.
- Fonow, Mary Margaret & Cook, Judith A. (2005). Feminist Methodology: New Applications in the Academy and Public Policy. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30(4), 2211–2236.
- Foucault, Michel (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.
- Foucault, Michel (1976). *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1: An Introduction*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Foucault, Michel (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Frieze, Irene H. (2005). Female Violence against Intimate Partners: An Introduction. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29, 229–237.

- Gannon, Susanne & Davies, Bronwyn (2007). Postmodern, Poststructural, and Critical Theories. In Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *Handbook of Feminist Research: Theory and Praxis* (pp. 71–106). London: Sage.
- Gavey, Nicola (2002). To and Beyond the Discursive Constitution of Subjectivity. *Feminism & Psychology*, 12(4), 432–438.
- Garfinkel, Harold (1984/1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Geiger, Brenda & Fischer, Michael (2003). Female Repeat Offenders Negotiating Identity. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 47(5), 496–515.
- Geiger, Brenda & Fischer, Michael (2005). Naming Oneself Criminal: Gender Difference in Offenders' Identity Negotiation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 49(2), 194–209.
- Gergen, Kenneth J. (2015). From Mirroring to World-Making: Research as Future Forming. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 45(3), 287–310.
- Gergen, Mary (2008). Qualitative Methods in Feminist Psychology. In Carla Willig & Wendy Stainton-Rogers (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology* (pp. 280–295). London: Sage.
- Gilbert, Paula A. (2002). Discourses of Female Violence and Societal Gender Stereotypes. *Violence against Women*, 8(11), 1271–1300.
- Gill, Rosalind (1998). Relativism, Reflexivity and Politics: Interrogating Discourse Analysis from a Feminist Perspective. In Sue Wilkinson & Celia Kitzinger (Eds.), *Feminism and Discourse: Psychological Perspectives* (pp. 165–186). London: Sage.
- Gill, Rosalind (2007). *Gender and the Media*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Gill, Rosalind (2008). Culture and Subjectivity in Neoliberal and Postfeminist Times. *Subjectivity*, 25(1), 432–445.
- Gill, Rosalind (2016). Post-feminism?: New Feminist Visibilities in Postfeminist Times. *Feminist Media Studies*, 16(4), 610–630.
- Gill, Rosalind & Arthurs, Jane (2006). Editors' Introduction: New Femininities? *Feminist Media Studies*, 6(4), 443–451.
- Gilligan, James (2003). Shame, Guilt, and Violence. *Social Research*, 70(4), 1149–1180.
- Graham-Kevan, Nicola (2007). The Re-Emergence of Male Victims. *International Journal of Men's Health*, 6(1), 3–6.
- Granfelt, Riitta (2007). Oppisin elämään riippuvuuteni kanssa. Tutkimus naisvankien päihdekuntoutuksesta Vanajan vankilassa. [“Learning to live with the dependence”: A study on drug rehabilitation for women inmates in Vanaja prison]. Helsinki: Rikosseuraamusviraston julkaisuja 2/2007.
- Greimas, Algirdas Julien (1987). *On Meaning: Selected Writings in Semiotic Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Greimas, Algirdas Julien & Courtés, Joseph (1982). *Semiotics and Language: An Analytical Dictionary*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Greimas, Algirdas Julien, Courtés, Joseph & Rengstorf, Michael (1989). The Cognitive Dimension of Narrative Discourse. *New Literary History*, 20(3), 563–579.
- Gruenewald, Jeff, Pizarro, Jesenia & Chermak, Steven M. (2009). Race, Gender, and the Newsworthiness of Homicide Incidents. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37(3), 262–272.

- Gueta, Keren & Chen, Gila (2016). "I Wanted to Rebel, But There They Hit Me Even Harder": Discourse Analysis of Israeli Women Offenders' Accounts of Their Pathways to Substance Abuse and Crime. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 60(7), 787–807.
- Guillemin, Marilyns & Gillam, Lynn (2004). Ethics, reflexivity, and "ethically important moments" in research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(2), 261–280.
- Gunnarsson, Lena (2017). Why We Keep Separating the 'Inseparable': Dialecticizing Intersectionality. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 24(2), 114–127.
- Hall, Stuart (1996). Who Needs Identity? In Stuart Hall & Paul du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity* (pp. 1-17). London: Sage.
- Halse, Christine & Honey, Anne (2005). Unraveling Ethics: Illuminating the Moral Dilemmas of Research Ethics. *Signs*, 30(4), New Feminist Approaches to Social Science Methodologies, 2141–2162.
- Haraway, Donna (1991). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. In Donna Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (pp. 183–202). New York: Routledge.
- Haraway, Donna (1992). The Promises of Monsters: A Regenerative Politics for Inappropriate/d Others. In Laurence Grossberg, Cary Nelsen & Paula Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural Studies* (pp. 295–337). New York: Routledge.
- Haraway, Donna (1994). A Game of Cat's Cradle: Science Studies, Feminist Theory, Cultural studies. *Configurations*, 2(1), 59–71.
- Harding, Sandra & Norberg, Kathryn (2005). New Feminist Approaches to Social Science Methodologies: An introduction. Special issue of *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30(4), 2009–2015.
- Harré, Rom & van Langenhove, Luk (Eds.) (1999). *Positioning Theory: Moral Contexts of Intentional Action*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Hart, Lynda (1994). *Fatal Women: Lesbian Sexuality and the Mark of Aggression*. London: Routledge.
- Hautanen, Teija (2005). Bypassing the Relationship between Fatherhood and Violence in Finnish Policy and Research. In Maria Eriksson, Marianne Hester, Suvi Keskinen & Keith Pringle (Eds.), *Tackling Men's Violence in Families: Nordic Issues and Dilemmas* (pp. 67–82). Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Hearn, Jeff (1998). *The Violences of Men. How Men Talk About and How Agencies Respond to Men's Violence to Women*. London: Sage.
- Hearn, Jeff & McKie, Linda (2010). Gendered and Social Hierarchies in Problem Representation and Policy Processes: "Domestic Violence" in Finland and Scotland. *Violence against women*, 16(2), 136–158.
- Heiskanen, Markku & Ruuskanen, Elina (2010). *Tuhansien iskujen maa: Miesten kokema väkivalta Suomessa* [The land of thousands of blows: Violence experienced by men in Finland]. Helsinki: Euroopan kriminaalipolitiikan instituutti, HEUNI [The European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control].
- Hekman, Susan (2008). Constructing the Ballast: An Ontology for Feminism. In Stacy Alaimo & Susan Hekman (Eds.), *Material Feminisms* (pp. 85-119). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Helkama, Klaus (2009). *Moraalipsykologia: Hyvän ja pahan tällä puolen* [Moral Psychology: This Side of Good and Evil]. Helsinki: Edita.
- Hemmings, Claire (2005). Invoking Affect: Cultural Theory and the Ontological Turn. *Cultural studies*, 19(5), 548–567.

- Hemmings, Claire (2011). *Why Stories Matter: The Political Grammar of Feminist Theory*. London: Duke University Press.
- Hemmings, Claire (2012). Affective Solidarity: Feminist Reflexivity and Political Transformation. *Feminist Theory*, 13(2), 147–161.
- Henriksen, Ann-Karina, & Miller, Jody (2012). Dramatic Lives and Relevant Becomings: Toward a Deleuze-and Guattari-inspired Cartography of Young Women’s Violent Conflicts. *Theoretical Criminology*, 16(4), 435–461.
- Henriques, Julian, Hollway, Wendy, Urwin, Cathy, Venn, Couze & Walkerdine, Valerie (1984). *Changing the Subject: Psychology, Social Regulation and Subjectivity*. London: Routledge.
- Herkman, Juha (2005). *Kaupallisen television ja iltapäivälehtien avoliitto: Median markkinoituminen ja televisioituminen* [The marriage of commercial television and popular press: Marketization and televisualization of the media]. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Hester, Stephen & Eglin, Peter (1992). *A Sociology of Crime*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hester, Stephen & Eglin, Peter (1997). *Culture in Action: Studies in Membership Categorization Analysis*. Lanham: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.
- Hinds, Hilary & Stacey, Jackie (2001). Imaging Feminism, Imaging Femininity: The Bra-Burner, Diana, and the Woman Who Kills. *Feminist Media Studies*, 1(2), 153–177.
- Hinton, Peta & van der Tuin, Iris (2014). Preface. *Women: A Cultural Review*, 25(1), 1–8. Special issue ‘Feminist Matters: The Politics of New Materialism’.
- Hochstetler, Andy, Copes, Heith & Williams, Patrick (2010). “That’s Not Who I Am:” How Offenders Commit Violent Acts and Reject Authentically Violent Selves. *Justice Quarterly*, 27(4), 492–516.
- Hollway, Wendy (1989). *Subjectivity and Method in Psychology: Gender, Meaning and Science*. London: Sage.
- Hollway, Wendy (2001). Gender Difference and the Production of Subjectivity. In Margaret Wetherell, Stephanie Taylor & Simon Yates (Eds.), *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader* (pp. 272–283). London: Sage.
- Hollway, Wendy (2010). Relationality: The Intersubjective Foundations of Identity. In Margaret Wetherell & Chandra Talpade Mohanty (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Identities* (pp. 216–231). London: Sage.
- Hollway, Wendy & Jefferson, Tony (2005). Panic and Perjury: A Psychosocial Exploration of Agency. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44(2), 147–163.
- Holstein, James A., & Gubrium, Jaber F. (1997). Active Interviewing. In David Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice* (pp. 113–129). London: Sage.
- Honan, Eileen, Knobel, Michele, Baker, Carolyn, & Davies, Bronwyn (2000). Producing Possible Hannahs: Theory and the Subject of Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 6(1), 9–32.
- Højgaard, Lis, & Søndergaard, Dorte Marie (2011). Theorizing the Complexities of Discursive and Material Subjectivity: Agential Realism and Poststructural Analyses. *Theory & Psychology*, 21(3), 338–354.
- Howard, Judith A. (2000). Social Psychology of Identities. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 367–393.

- Hughes, Judy, Corbally, Melissa & Chau, Shirley (2014). Over-Researched and Under-Theorized: Re-Imagining the Concept of Gender for Intimate Partner Violence Theory and Research. In Alexandra M. Columbus (Ed.), *Advances in Psychology Research* (pp. 109–130). New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Husso, Marita, Virkki, Tuija, Hirvonen, Helena, Notko, Marianne & Eilola, Jari (2017). A Spatial-Temporal, Intersectional and Institutional Approach to Interpersonal Violence. In Husso, Marita, Virkki, Tuija, Notko, Marianne, Hirvonen, Helena & Eilola, Jari (Eds.), *Interpersonal Violence: Differences and Connections* (pp. 1–6). London: Routledge.
- Huuki, Tuija (2016). Pinoa, pusua ja puserrusta: Vallan sukupuolistuneet virtaukset lasten leikissä [Piles, kisses and crushes: Historical, material and affective force relations in children's play]. *Sukupuolentutkimus*, 29(3), 11–24.
- Innes, Martin (2004). Signal Crimes and Signal Disorders: Notes on Deviance as Communicative Action. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 55(3), 335–355.
- Irni, Sari (2013). The Politics of Materiality: Affective Encounters in a Transdisciplinary Debate. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 20(4), 347–360.
- Jackson, Stevi (2001). Why a Materialist Feminism Is (Still) Possible – and Necessary. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 24(3/4), 283–293.
- Jayyusi, Lena (1984). *Categorization and the Moral Order*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Jayyusi, Lena (1993). Premeditation and Happenstance: The Social Construction of Intention, Action and Knowledge. *Human Studies*, 16(4), 435–454.
- Jewkes, Yvonne (2004). Media Misogyny: Monstrous Women. In Yvonne Jewkes (Ed.), *Media and Crime* (pp. 107–138). London: Sage.
- Johnson, Michael P. (2006). Conflict and Control: Gender Symmetry and Asymmetry in Domestic Violence. *Violence against Women*, 12(11), 1003–1018.
- Johnson, Michael P. & Leone, J.M. (2005). The Differential Effects of Intimate Terrorism and Situational Couple Violence: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(3), 322–349.
- Jokinen, Anniina (2011). *Female prisoners in Finland and Scandinavia—A Literature Review*. DAPHNE Strong Project. Retrieved from: [http://philipus.de/daphne-strong.eu/DOCS/final\\_material/literature\\_review\\_Finland.pdf](http://philipus.de/daphne-strong.eu/DOCS/final_material/literature_review_Finland.pdf).
- Jokinen, Arto (2017). Maskuliinisuus ja väkivalta [Masculinity and violence]. In Johanna Niemi, Heini Kainulainen & Päivi Honkatukia (Eds.), *Sukupuolistunut väkivalta: Oikeudellinen ja sosiaalinen ongelma* (pp. 36–50). Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Jones, Ann (2009). *Women Who Kill*. New York: Feminist Press at CUNY.
- Kantola, Johanna (2006). *Feminists Theorize the State*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Keskinen, Suvi (2005). *Perheammattilaiset ja väkivaltatyön ristiriidat. Sukupuoli, valta ja kielelliset käytännöt* [Family professionals and the discrepancies of working with violence: Gender, power and discursive practices]. Tampere: Tampere University Press.

- Kessler, Susanne & McKenna, Wendy (1978). *Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kilty, Jennifer (2010). Gendering Violence, Remorse, and the Role of Restorative Justice: Deconstructing Public Perceptions of Kelly Ellard and Warren Glowatski. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 13(2), 155–172.
- Kimmel, Michael S. (2002). “Gender Symmetry” in Domestic Violence: A Substantive and Methodological Research Review. *Violence against Women*, 8(11), 1332–1363.
- Kitzinger, Celia (2007). Is ‘Woman’ Always Relevantly Gendered? *Gender and Language*, 1(1), 39–49.
- Kitzinger, Celia & Wilkinson, Sue (1996). Theorizing Representing the Other. In Sue Wilkinson & Celia Kitzinger (Eds.), *Representing the Other: A Feminism and Psychology Reader* (pp. 1–32). London: Sage.
- Knudsen, Britta T. & Stage, Carsten (2015). Introduction: Affective methodologies. In Britta T. Knudsen & Carsten Stage (Eds.), *Affective Methodologies: Developing Cultural Research Strategies for the Study of Affect* (pp. 1–22). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Koivunen, Anu (2010). An Affective Turn? Reimagining the Subject of Feminist Theory. In Marianne Liljeström & Susanna Paasonen (Eds.), *Working with Affect in Feminist Readings: Disturbing Differences* (pp. 8–28). New York: Routledge.
- Koivunen, Anu (2013). Force of Affects, Weight of Histories in Love is a Treasure (2002). In Bettina Papenburg & Marta Zarzycka (Eds.), *Carnal Aesthetics: Transgressive Body Imagery and Feminist Politics* (pp. 89–101). London: I.B. Tauris.
- Kolehmainen, Marjo (2010). Normalizing and Gendering Affects: How the Relation to Porn is Constructed in Young Women's Magazines. *Feminist Media Studies*, 10(2), 179–194.
- Koro-Ljungberg, Mirka & MacLure, Maggie (2013). Provocations, Re-Visions, Death, and Other Possibilities of “Data”. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 13(4), 219–222.
- Koschmann, Timothy (2013). The Perils of Appropriation. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 10(3), 240–243.
- Kruttschnitt, Candace (2016). The Politics, and Place, of Gender in Research on Crime. *Criminology*, 54(1), 8–29.
- Kruttschnitt, Candace & Carbone-Lopez, Kristin (2006). Moving Beyond Stereotypes: Women’s Subjective Accounts of Their Violent Crime. *Criminology*, 44(2), 321–351.
- Kruttschnitt, Candace & Gartner, Rosemary (2008). Female Violent Offenders: Moral Panics or More Serious Offenders? *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 41(1), 9–35.
- Kurri, Katja & Wahlström, Jarl (2001). Dialogical Management of Morality in Domestic Violence Counselling. *Feminism & Psychology*, 11(2), 187–208.
- Kurri, Katja & Wahlström, Jarl (2007). Reformulations of Agentless Talk in Psychotherapy. *Text & Talk - An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse Communication Studies*, 27(3), 315–338.
- Kääriäinen, Juha, Danielsson, Petri & Salmi, Venla (2016). Naiset rikosten tekijöinä ja uhreina [Women as perpetrators and victims of crime]. In Rikollisuustilanne 2015: *Rikollisuuskehitys tilastojen ja tutkimusten valossa* (pp. 219–229). Helsinki: University of Helsinki: Institute of Criminology and Legal Policy.

- Laitinen, Pirjo (2006). Naisten väkivaltarikoksista mielentilalausuntojen valossa [About women's violent crimes in the light of forensic psychiatric examination statements]. In Mirva Lohiniva-Kerckelä (Ed.), *Väkivalta: Seuraamukset ja haavoittuvuus. Terttu Utraisen juhla kirja* (pp. 223–234). Helsinki: Talentum.
- Lather, Patti (2000). Against Voice, Authenticity and Empathy. *Kvinder, Kon & Forskning [Women, gender & research]*, 4, 16–25.
- Lather, Patti & St. Pierre, Elizabeth A. (2013). Post-Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6), 629–633.
- Lattu, Emmi (2016). *Naisten tekemä väkivalta* [Violence committed by women]. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Law, John (2004). *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. New York: Routledge.
- Lawler, Steph (2008). Stories and the Social World. In Michael Pickering (Ed.), *Research Methods for Cultural Studies* (pp. 32–49). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lawler, Steph (2014). *Identity: Sociological Perspectives* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lazar, Ruthy (2008). Reconceptualizing Victimization and Agency in the Discourse of Battered Women Who Kill. In Austin Sarat (Ed.), *Studies in Law, Politics, and Society* (pp. 3–45). Bingley: JAI Press.
- Lempiäinen, Kirsti (2002). Kansallisuuden tekeminen ja toisto [The making and reiteration of Nationality]. In Tuula Gordon, Katri Komulainen & Kirsti Lempiäinen (Eds.), *Suomineiton hei! Kansallisuuden sukupuoli* (pp. 19–36). Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Leppänen, Taru & Tiainen, Milla (2016). Feministisiä uusmaterialismeja paikantamassa: Materialian toimijuus etnografisessa taiteen- ja kulttuurintutkimuksessa [Localizing feminist new materialisms: Material agency in ethnographic studies of art and culture]. *Sukupuolentutkimus*, 29(3), 27–44.
- Leys, Ruth (2011). The Turn to Affect: A Critique. *Critical Inquiry*, 37(3), 434–472.
- Liebling, Alison & Stanko, Betsy (2001). Allegiance and Ambivalence: Some Dilemmas in Researching Disorder and Violence. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 41(3), 421–430.
- Lindberg, Odd (2005). Prison Cultures and Social Representations: The Case of Hinseberg, a Women's Prison in Sweden. *International Journal of Prisoner Health* 1(2/3/4,) 143–161.
- Lombroso, Caesar & Ferrero, William (1898). *The Female Offender*. New York: D. Appleton and Company.
- Lykke, Nina (2010a). *Feminist Studies: A Guide to Intersectional Theory, Methodology and Writing*. London: Routledge.
- Lykke, Nina (2010b). The Timeliness of Post-Constructionism. *NORA-Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 18(2), 131–136.
- Lyons, Antonia C. & Cromby, John (2010). Social Psychology and the Empirical Body: Rethinking the Relationship. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(1), 1–13.
- MacDonald, Morag (2013). Women Prisoners, Mental Health, Violence and Abuse. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 36(3), 293–303.
- Maclure, Maggie (2008). Classification or Wonder: Coding as an Analytic Practice in Qualitative Research. In Rebecca Coleman & Jessica Ringrose

- (Eds.), *Deleuze and Research Methodologies* (pp. 164–183). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Maclure, Maggie (2013). Researching without Representation? Language and Materiality in Post-Qualitative Methodology. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6), 658–667.
- Macmillan, Katie (1996). Giving Voice: The Participant Takes Issue. In Sue Wilkinson & Celia Kitzinger (Eds.), *Representing the Other: A Feminism & Psychology Reader* (pp. 141–146). London: Sage.
- Macmillan, Katie & Edwards, Derek (1999). Who Killed the Princess? Description and Blame in the British Press. *Discourse Studies*, 1(2), 151–174.
- Magnusson, Eva & Marecek, Jeanne (2010a). Sociocultural Means to Feminist Ends: Discursive and Constructionist Psychologies of Gender. In Suzanne Kirchner, & Jack Martin (Eds.), *The Sociocultural Turn in Psychology: Contemporary Perspectives on the Contextual Emergence of Mind and Self* (pp. 88–111). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Magnusson, Eva & Marecek, Jeanne (2010b). *Genus och Kultur i Psykologi: Teorier och Tillämpningar*. Stockholm: Natur & Kultur.
- Markkola, Pirjo (2002). Vahva nainen ja kansallinen historia [Strong woman and national history]. In Tuula Gordon, Katri Komulainen & Kirsti Lempiäinen (Eds.), *Suomineitonen hei! Kansallisuuden sukupuoli* (pp. 75–90). Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Markussen, Turid (2005). Practising Performativity: Transformative Moments in Research. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 12(3), 329–344.
- Markussen, Turid (2006). Moving Worlds: The Performativity of Affective Engagement. *Feminist Theory*, 7(3), 291–308.
- May, Vanessa (2008). On Being a 'Good' Mother: The Moral Presentation of Self in Written Life Stories. *Sociology*, 42(3), 470–486.
- Maynard, Mary (1994). Methods, Practice and Epistemology: The Debate about Feminism and Research. In Mary Maynard & June Purvis (Eds.), *Researching Women's Lives from a Feminist Perspective*. (pp. 10–26). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Mazzei, Lisa A. (2013). Desire Undone: Productions of Privilege, Power and Voice. In Rebecca Coleman & Jessica Ringrose (Eds.), *Deleuze and Research Methodologies* (pp. 96–111). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Mazzei, Lisa A. & Jackson, Alecia Y. (2012). Complicating Voice in a Refusal to “Let Participants Speak for Themselves”. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 18(9), 745–751.
- McAvoy, Jean (2015). From Ideology to Feeling: Discourse, Emotion, and an Analytic Synthesis. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 12(1), 22–33.
- McAvoy, Jean (2016). Discursive Psychology and the Production of Identity in Language Practices. In Siân Preece (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Identity* (pp. 98–112). London: Routledge.
- McCoy, Kate (2012). Towards a Methodology of Encounters: Opening to Complexity in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 18(9), 762–772.
- McKim, Allison (2008). “Getting Gut-Level”: Punishment, Gender, and Therapeutic Governance. *Gender & Society*, 22(3), 303–323.
- McKinlay, Andrew & McVittie, Chris (2008). Debates within the Discursive Tradition. In Andrew McKinlay & Chris McVittie (Eds.), *Social Psychology and Discourse* (pp. 238–253). Malden: John Wiley & Sons.

- McNay, Lois (2003). Agency, Anticipation and Indeterminacy in Feminist Theory. *Feminist Theory*, 4, 139–148.
- McNay, Lois (2008). *Against Recognition*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- McRobbie, Angela (2004). Post-feminism and Popular Culture. *Feminist Media Studies*, 4(3), 255–264.
- MediaAuditFinland (2014). Accessed: August 26, 2014. <http://mediaauditfinland.fi/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ReadershipFigures2013.pdf>.
- Meloy, Michelle, & Miller, Susan (2009). Words that Wound: Print Media's Presentation of Gendered Violence. In Drew Humphries (Ed.), *Women, Violence, and the Media: Readings in Feminist Criminology* (pp. 29–56). Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Menard, Rusten (2016). Doing Equality and Difference: Representation and Alignment in Finnish Identification. *Text & Talk*, 36(6), 733–755.
- Miller, Jody (2002). The Strengths and Limits of 'Doing Gender' for Understanding Street Crime. *Theoretical Criminology*, 6(4), 433–460.
- Miller, Jody, Carbone-Lopez, Kristin & Gunderman, Mikh V. (2015). Gendered Narratives of Self, Addiction, and Recovery among Women Methamphetamine Users. In Lois Presser & Sveinung Sandberg (Eds.), *Narrative Criminology: Understanding Stories of Crime* (pp. 69–95). New York: New York University Press.
- Miller, Leslie J. (2000). The Poverty of Truth-Seeking: Postmodernism, Discourse Analysis and Critical Feminism. *Theory & Psychology*, 10(3), 313–352.
- Miller, Leslie (2008). Foucauldian Constructionism. In James A. Holstein & Jaber F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Handbook of Constructionist Research* (pp. 251–274). New York: Guilford Press
- Miller, Susan L. & Meloy, Michelle L. (2006). Women's Use of Force: Voices of Women Arrested for Domestic Violence. *Violence against Women*, 12(1), 89–115.
- Moen, Elisabeth, Nygren, Lennart & Edin, Kerstin (2016). Volatile and Violent Relationships Among Women Sentenced for Homicide in Sweden Between 1986 and 2005. *Victims & Offenders*, 11(3), 373–391.
- Mol, Annemarie (2002). *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Morison, Tracy & Macleod, Catriona (2013). A Performative-Performance Analytical Approach: Infusing Butlerian Theory into the Narrative-Discursive Method. *Qualitative inquiry*, 19(8), 566–577.
- Morrissey, Belinda (2003). *When Women Kill. Questions of Agency and Subjectivity*. London: Routledge.
- Mäkinen, Katariina (2016). Uneasy Laughter: Encountering the Anti-Immigration Debate. *Qualitative Research*, 16(5), 541–556.
- Naiset näkyviksi [Making women visible] (2008). Työryhmän mietintö. Helsinki: Rikosseuraamusviraston julkaisu 3/2008.
- Naylor, Bronwyn (1990). Media Images of Women Who Kill. *Legal Service Bulletin*, 15(1), 4–8.
- Naylor, Bronwyn (2001a). The 'Bad Mother' in Media and Legal Texts. *Social Semiotics*, 11(2), 155–176.
- Naylor, Bronwyn (2001b). Reporting Violence in the British Print Media: Gendered Stories. *The Howard Journal*, 40(2), 180–194.

- Neroni, Hilary (2005). *The Violent Woman: Femininity, Narrative and Violence in Contemporary American Cinema*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Niemi, Johanna, Kainulainen, Heini & Honkatukia, Päivi (Eds.) (2017). *Sukupuolistunut väkivalta: Oikeudellinen ja sosiaalinen ongelma* [Gendered violence: A legal and social problem]. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Nightingale, David & Cromby, John (Eds.) (1999). *Social Constructionist Psychology: A Critical Analysis of Theory and Practice*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Nikander, Pirjo (2002). *Age in Action: Membership Work and Stage of Life Categories in Talk*. Vol. 321. Helsinki. Academia Scientiarum Fennica.
- Nikunen, Minna (2005). *Surman jälkeen itsemurha. Kulttuuriset luokitukset rikosuutisissa* [Murder-suicide: Cultural categorizations in the crime news]. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Nikunen, Minna (2006). Parenthood in Murder-Suicide News: Idealized Fathers and Murderous Mums. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 7(2), 164–184.
- Nikunen, Minna (2011). Murder-Suicide in the News: Doing the Routine and the Drama. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 14(1), 81–101.
- Noh, Marianne S., Lee, Matthew T. & Feltey, Kathryn M. (2010). Mad, Bad, or Reasonable? Newspaper Portrayals of the Battered Woman Who Kills. *Gender Issues*, 27(3–4), 110–130.
- Noppiari, Elina, Raittila, Pentti & Männikkö, Pirita (2015). *Syyliseksi kirjoitettu: Ulvilan surman uutisointia paperilla ja verkossa* [Written guilty: Reporting of the Ulvila killing on paper and online]. Tampere: University of Tampere, Research Center for Journalism, Media and Communication.
- O'Connor, Patricia E. (1995). Speaking of Crime: 'I don't Know what Made Me do it'. *Discourse & Society*, 6(3), 429–456.
- Ogle, Robbin S. & Jacobs, Susan (2002). *Self-Defence and Battered Women Who Kill: A New Framework*. Westport: Praeger Publishers.
- Opsal, T. D. (2011). Women Disrupting a Marginalized Identity: Subverting the Parolee Identity through Narrative. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 40(2), 135–167.
- Papenburg, Bettina & Zarzycka, Marta (2013). Introduction. In Bettina Papenburg & Marta Zarzycka (Eds.), *Carnal Aesthetics: Transgressive Body Imagery and Feminist Politics* (pp. 1–18). London: I.B. Tauris.
- Parker, Ian (Ed.) (1998). *Social Constructionism, Discourse and Realism*. London: Sage.
- Partanen, Terhi & Wahlström, Jarl (2003). The Dilemma of Victim Positioning in Group Therapy for Male Perpetrators of Domestic Violence. In Christopher Hall, Kirsi Juhila, Nigel Parton & Tarja Pösö (Eds.), *Constructing Clienthood in Social Work and Human Services: Interaction, Identities and Practices* (pp. 129–144). London and New York: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Pearson, Patricia (1998). *When She Was Bad: How and Why Women Get Away With Murder*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Pedwell, Carolyn (2012). Affective (Self-) Transformations: Empathy, Neoliberalism and International Development. *Feminist Theory*, 13(2), 163–179.
- Peelo, Moira & Soothill, Keith (2000). The Place of Public Narratives in Reproducing Social Order. *Theoretical Criminology*, 4(2), 131–148.

- Petersen, Eva Bendix (2008). Passionately Attached: Academic Subjects of Desire. In Bronwyn Davies (Ed.), *Judith Butler in Conversation: Analysing Texts and Talk of Everyday Life* (pp. 69–86). New York: Routledge.
- Petersen, Eva Bendix (2015). What Crisis of Representation? Challenging the Realism of Post-Structuralist Policy Research in Education. *Critical Studies in Education*, 56(1), 147–160.
- Petersen, Eva Bendix (2016). Turned on, Turned off: On Timely and Untimely Feminist Knowledge Production. *NORA-Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 24(1), 5–17.
- Peterson, Eric E. & Langellier, Kristin M. (2006). The Performance Turn in Narrative Studies. *Narrative Inquiry*, 16(1), 173–180.
- Pickering, Sharon (2001). Undermining the Sanitized Account: Violence and Emotionality in the Field in Northern Ireland. *British Journal of Criminology*, 41(3), 485–501.
- Piispa, Minna & Heiskanen, Markku (2017). Sukupuoli ja väkivalta tilastoissa: Miksi tarvitaan tietoa väkivallan yleisyydestä? [Gender and violence in the statistics: Why is the knowledge about the prevalence of violence necessary?]. In Johanna Niemi, Heini Kainulainen & Päivi Honkatukia (Eds.), *Sukupuolistunut väkivalta: Oikeudellinen ja sosiaalinen ongelma* (pp. 68–86). Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Phoenix, Ann (1990). Social Research in the Context of Feminist Psychology. In Erica Burman (Ed.), *Feminists and Psychological Practice* (pp. 89–103). London: Sage.
- Phoenix, Ann (1994). Practicing Feminist Research: The Intersections of Gender and 'Race' in the Research Process. In Mary Maynard & June Purvis (Eds.), *Researching Women's Lives from a Feminist Perspective* (pp. 49–71). London and Bristol: Taylor & Francis.
- Pollack, Shoshana (2007). "I'm Just Not Good in Relationships": Victimization Discourses and the Gendered Regulation of Criminalized Women. *Feminist Criminology*, 2(2), 158–174.
- Pollack, Shoshana (2013). An Imprisoning Gaze: Practices of Gendered, Racialized and Epistemic Violence. *International Review of Victimology*, 19(1), 103–114.
- Pollak, Otto (1950). *The Criminality of Women*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Pollock, Joycelyn M. & Davis, Sareta M. (2005). The Continuing Myth of the Violent Female Offender. *Criminal Justice Review*, 30(1), 5–29.
- Potter, Jonathan & Wetherell, Margaret (1987). *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Presser, Lois (2004). Violent Offenders, Moral Selves: Constructing Identities and Accounts in the Research Interview. *Social problems*, 51(1), 82–101.
- Presser, Lois (2005). Negotiating Power and Narrative in Research: Implications for Feminist Methodology. *Signs*, 30(4), 2067–2090.
- Presser, Lois (2010). Collecting and Analyzing the Stories of Offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 21(4), 431–446.
- Presser, Lois & Sandberg, Sveinung (2015): Introduction: What is the Story? In Lois Presser & Sveinung Sandberg (Eds.), *Narrative Criminology: Understanding Stories of Crime* (pp. 1–20). New York: New York University Press.
- Putkonen, Hanna (2003). *Homicidal Women in Finland 1982-1992*. Helsinki: Kansanterveyslaitos.

- Putkonen, Hanna, Weizmann-Henelius, Ghitta, Lindberg, Nina, Rovamo, Tuija, Häkkänen, Helinä (2008). Changes over Time in Homicides by Women: A Register-Based Study Comparing Female Offenders from 1982 to 1992 and 1993 to 2005. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 18, 268–278.
- Quintero Johnson, Jessie M. & Miller, Bonnie (2016). When Women “Snap”: The Use of Mental Illness to Contextualize Women's Acts of Violence in Contemporary Popular Media. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 39(2), 211–227.
- Rajah, Valli (2006). Respecting Boundaries: The Symbolic and Material Concerns of Drug-Involved Women Employing Violence against Violent Male Partners. *British Journal of Criminology*, 46(5), 837–858.
- Ramazanoglu, Caroline & Holland, Janet (2000). Still Telling It Like It Is? Problems of Feminist Truth Claims. In Sara Ahmed, Jane Kilby, Celia Lury, Maureen McNeil and Beverley Skeggs (Eds.), *Transformations: Thinking Through Feminism* (pp. 207–220). London: Routledge.
- Rapley, Mark, McCarthy, David & McHoul, Alec (2003). Mentality or Morality? Membership Categorization, Multiple Meanings and Mass Murder. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(3), 427–444.
- Rapley, Tim (2012). The (Extra)Ordinary Practice of Qualitative Interviewing. In Jaber F. Gubrium, James A. Holstein, Amir B. Marvasti & Karyn D. McKinney (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Interview Research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 541–554). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Reynolds, Jill & Taylor, Stephanie (2004). Narrating Singleness: Life Stories and Deficit Identities. *Narrative Inquiry*, 1(2), 197–215.
- Reynolds, Jill, Wetherell, Margaret, & Taylor, Stephanie (2007). Choice and Chance: Negotiating Agency in Narratives of Singleness. *The Sociological Review*, 55(2), 331–351.
- Richards, Tara N., Gillespie, Lane Kirkland & Smith, M. Dwayne (2011). Exploring News Coverage of Femicide: Does Reporting the News Add Insult to Injury? *Feminist Criminology*, 6(3), 178–202.
- Richardson, Laurel & St. Pierre, Elizabeth Adams (2005). Writing: A Method of Inquiry. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonne S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd. Ed.) (pp. 959–978). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Ringrose, Jessica (2006). A New Universal Mean Girl: Examining the Discursive Construction and Social Regulation of a New Feminine Pathology. *Feminism & Psychology*, 16(4), 405–424.
- Ringrose, Jessica & Renold, Emma (2014). “F\*\* k Rape!” Exploring Affective Intensities in a Feminist Research Assemblage. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), 772–780.
- Ringrose, Jessica & Walkerdine, Valerie (2008). Regulating the Abject: The TV Make-Over as Site of Neo-Liberal Reinvention toward Bourgeois Femininity. *Feminist Media Studies*, 8(3), 227–246.
- Ronkainen, Suvi (1999a). *Ajan ja paikan merkitsemät: Subjektiviteetti, tieto ja toimijuus* [Marked by time and space: Subjectivity, knowledge and agency]. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Ronkainen, Suvi (1999b). Subjektius, häpeä ja syllisyys parisuhdeväkivallan elementteinä. [Subjecthood, shame and guilt as elements of intimate partner violence]. In Sari Näre (Ed.), *Tunteiden sosiologiaa I: Elämyksiä ja läheisyyttä* (pp.131–154). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

- Ronkainen, Suvi (2001). Sukupuolittunut väkivalta ja uhriutumisen paradoksit [Gendered violence and the paradoxes of victimization]. *Sosiaalilääketieteellinen aikakauslehti*, 38(2), 138–151.
- Ronkainen, Suvi (2002). Genderless gender as victimizing context: The Finnish case. In Maria Eriksson, Aili Nenola, & Marika Muhonen Nilssen (Eds.), *Gender and Violence in the Nordic Countries: Conference report* (pp. 95–105). Copenhagen: TemaNord.
- Ronkainen, Suvi (2004). Kvantitatiivisuus, tulkinallisuus ja feministinen tutkimus [Quantitativeness, interpretativeness and feminist research] In Marianne Liljeström (ed.), *Feministinen tietäminen: Keskustelua metodologiasta* (pp. 44–69). Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Ronkainen, Suvi (2008). Kenen ongelma väkivalta on? Suomalainen hyvinvointivaltio ja väkivallan toimijuus [Violence – whose problem? The Finnish welfare state and the agency of violence]. *Yhteiskuntapolitiikka* 73(4), 388–401.
- Ronkainen, Suvi (2017). Mitä väkivalta on? [What is violence?]. In Johanna Niemi, Heini Kainulainen & Päivi Honkatukia (Eds.), *Sukupuolistunut väkivalta: Oikeudellinen ja sosiaalinen ongelma* (pp. 19–35). Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Ronkainen, Suvi & Näre, Sari (2008). Intiimin haavoittava valta [The wounding power of intimacy]. In Sari Näre & Suvi Ronkainen (Eds.), *Paljastettu Intiimi: Sukupuolistuneen väkivallan dynamiikka* (pp. 7–40). Rovaniemi: Lapin yliopistokustannus.
- Ruuskanen, Minna (2001). The “Good Battered Woman”: A Silenced Defendant. In Kevät Nousiainen, Gunnarsson, Åsa, Lundström, Karin & Niemi-Kiesiläinen, Johanna (Eds.), *Responsible Selves: Women in the Nordic Legal Culture* (pp. 311–329). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Ruuskanen, Minna (2005). *Hätävarjelu ja parisuhdeväkivalta* [Justifiable defence and domestic violence]. Helsinki: Suomalainen lakimiesyhdistys.
- Ruusuvuori, Johanna (2010). Vuorovaikutus ja valta haastattelussa – keskusteluanalyttinen näkökulma [Interaction and power in interviews – a conversation-analytic view]. In Johanna Ruusuvuori, Pirjo Nikander & Matti Hyvärinen (Eds.), *Haastattelun analyysi* [pp. 269–299]. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Sacks, Harvey (1992). *Lectures on Conversation*, vols. I and II, Gail Jefferson (Ed.). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Sandberg, Sveinung (2009). A Narrative Search for Respect. *Deviant Behavior*, 30(6), 487–510.
- Scharff, Christina (2011). Towards a Pluralist Methodological Approach: Combining Performativity Theory, Discursive Psychology and Theories of Affect. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 8(2), 210–221.
- Scharff, Christina (2012). *Repudiating Feminism: Young Women in a Neoliberal World*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Schlosser, Jennifer A. (2008). Issues in Interviewing Inmates: Navigating the Methodological Landmines of Prison Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14(8), 1500–1525.
- Schwartz, Jennifer, Steffensmeier, Darrell J. & Feldmeyer, Ben (2009). Assessing Trends in Women’s Violence via Data Triangulation: Arrests, Convictions, Incarcerations, and Victim Reports. *Social Problems*, 56(3), 494–525.
- Scott, Marvin & Lyman, Stanford (1968). Accounts. *American Sociological Review*, 33:1, 46–62.

- Seal, Lizzie (2009). Issues of Gender and Class in the Mirror Newspapers' Campaign for the Release of Edith Chubb. *Crime, Media, Culture*, 5(1), 57–78.
- Seal, Lizzie (2010). *Women, Murder and Femininity: Gender Representations of Women Who Kill*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Seal, Lizzie (2012). Emotion and Allegiance in Researching Four Mid 20th-Century Cases of Women Accused of Murder. *Qualitative Research*, 12(6), 686–701.
- Shields, Stephania A. (2002). *Speaking from the Heart: Gender and the Social Meaning of Emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shildrick, Margrit (2000). Monsters, Marvels, and Metaphysics: Beyond the Powers of Horror. In Sara Ahmed, Jane Kilby, Celia Lury, Maureen McNeil and Beverley Skeggs (Eds.), *Transformations: Thinking Through Feminism* (pp. 303–315). London: Routledge.
- Shildrick, Margrit (2002). *Embodying the Monster: Encounters with the Vulnerable Self*. London: Sage.
- Sipilä, Noora & Honkatukia, Päivi (2010). Naiset rikoksen tekijöinä ja uhreina [Women as perpetrators and victims of crime]. In *Rikollisuustilanne 2009. Rikollisuus ja seuraamusjärjestelmä tutkimusten valossa* (pp. 253–269). Helsinki: Oikeuspoliittinen tutkimuslaitos.
- Sjöberg, Laura & Gentry, Caron E. (2008). Reduced to Bad Sex: Narratives of Violent Women from the Bible to the War on Terror. *International Relations*, 22(5), 5–23.
- Skeggs, Beverley (1997). *Formations of Class and Gender. Becoming Respectable*. London: Sage.
- Skeggs Beverley (2010). Class, Culture and Morality: Legacies and Logics in the Space for Identification. In Wetherell Margaret & Chandra Talpade Mohanty (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Identities* (pp. 339–359). London: Sage.
- Skilbrei, May-Len (2013). Sisters in Crime: Representations of Gender and Class in the Media Coverage and Court Proceedings of the Triple Homicide at Orderud Farm. *Crime, Media, Culture*, 9(2), 136–152.
- Skoger, Ulrika Eskner, Lindberg, Lene & Magnusson, Eva (2011). Neutrality, Gender Stereotypes, and Analytical Voids: The Ideals and Practices of Swedish Child Psychologists. *Feminism & Psychology*, 21(3), 372–392.
- Smolej, Mirka (2011). *News Media, Crime and Fear of Violence*. Helsinki: Oikeuspoliittisen tutkimuslaitoksen tutkimuksia.
- Sointu, Eeva (2015). Discourse, Affect and Affliction. *The Sociological Review*, 64, 312–328.
- Speer, Susan A. (2000). Let's Get Real? Feminism, Constructionism and the Realism/Relativism Debate. *Feminism & Psychology*, 10(4), 519–530.
- Speer, Susan A. (2002). What Can Conversation Analysis Contribute to Feminist Methodology? Putting Reflexivity into Practice. *Discourse & Society*, 13(6), 783–803.
- Speer, Susan A. & Stokoe, Elizabeth (2011). An Introduction to Conversation and Gender. In Susan A. Speer & Elizabeth Stokoe (Eds.), *Conversation and Gender* (pp. 1–27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternadori, Miglena (2014). The Witch and the Warrior. *Feminist Media Studies*, 14 (2), 301–317.
- Steward, Kathleen (2007). *Ordinary Affects*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

- Stokoe, Elizabeth (2003). Mothers, Single Women and Sluts: Gender, Morality and Membership Categorization in Neighbour Disputes. *Feminism & Psychology*, 13(3), 317–344.
- Stokoe, Elizabeth (2004). Gender and Discourse, Gender and Categorization: Current Developments in Language and Gender Research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 1, 107–129.
- Stokoe, Elizabeth (2006). On Ethnomethodology, Feminism, and the Analysis of Categorical Reference to Gender in Talk-in-Interaction. *The Sociological Review*, 54(3), 467–494.
- Stokoe, Elizabeth (2010). 'I'm Not Gonna Hit a Lady': Conversation Analysis, Membership Categorization and Men's Denials of Violence towards Women. *Discourse & Society*, 21(1), 59–82.
- Stokoe, Elizabeth & Smithson, Janet (2001). Making Gender Relevant: Conversation Analysis and Gender Categories in Interaction. *Discourse & Society*, 12(2), 217–244.
- St. Pierre, Elizabeth A. (2011). Post Qualitative Research: The Critique and the Coming After. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonne S. Lincoln (Eds.), *SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.) (pp. 611–635). Los Angeles: Sage.
- St. Pierre, Elizabeth A. & Jackson, Alecia Y. (2014). Qualitative Data Analysis after Coding. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), 715–719.
- St. Pierre, Elizabeth A., Jackson, Alecia Y. & Mazzei, Lisa A. (2016). New Empiricisms and New Materialisms: Conditions for New Inquiry. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 16(2), 99–110.
- Straus, Murray A. (2005). Women's Violence toward Men is a Serious Social Problem. In Donileen R. Loseke, Richard J. Gelles & Mary M. Cavanaugh (Eds.), *Current Controversies on Family Violence* (2nd ed.) (pp. 55–77). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Straus, Murray A (2008). Dominance and Symmetry in Partner Violence by Male and Female University Students in 32 Nations. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 30(3), 252–275.
- Sulkunen, Pekka (2007). Images of Addiction: Representations of Addictions in Films. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 15(6), 543–559.
- Sulkunen, Pekka, & Törrönen, Jukka (1997a). The Production of Values: The Concept of Modality in Textual Discourse Analysis. *Semiotica: Journal of the International Association for Semiotic Studies*, 113(1/2), 43–69.
- Sulkunen, Pekka, and Jukka Törrönen (1997b). Constructing Speaker Images: The Problem of Enunciation in Discourse Analysis. *Semiotica* 115(1-2), 121–146.
- Sulkunen, Pekka & Törrönen, Jukka (Eds.) (1997c). *Semioottisen sosiologian näkökulmia: Sosiaalisen todellisuuden rakentuminen ja ymmärrettävyys* [Perspectives to Sociological Semiotics: Construction and Understanding of Social Reality]. Tampere: Gaudeamus.
- Syrjälä, Hanna (2007). *Väkivalta lööppijulkisuudessa* [Violence in the contents bills of tabloids]. Journalismin tutkimusyksikkö, Tiedotusopin laitos. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto.
- Swan, Suzanne C., Snow, David L. (2006). The Development of a Theory of Women's Use of Violence in Intimate Relationships. *Violence against Women*, 12(11), 1026–1045.
- Søndergaard, Dorte Marie (2002). Poststructuralist Approaches to Empirical Analysis. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 15(2), 187–204.

- Søndergaard, Dorte Marie (2015): The Dilemmas of Victim Positioning. *Confero: Essays on Education, Philosophy and Politics*, 3(2), 36–79.
- Søndergaard, Dorte Marie (2016). New Materialist Analyses of Virtual Gaming, Distributed Violence, and Relational Aggression. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 16(2), 162–172.
- Taylor, Stephanie (2015). Discursive and Psychosocial? Theorising a Complex Contemporary Subject. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 12(1), 8–21.
- Taylor, Stephanie (2006). Narrative as Construction and Discursive Resource. *Narrative Inquiry*, 16(1), 94–102.
- Taylor, Stephanie & Littleton, Karen (2006). Biographies in Talk: A Narrative-Discursive Research Approach. *Qualitative Sociology Review*, 2(1), 22–38.
- Trivelli, Elena (2015). Exploring a ‘Remembering Crisis’: ‘Affective Attuning’ and ‘Assemblaged Archive’ as Theoretical Frameworks and Research Methodologies. In Britta T. Knudsen & Carsten Stage (Eds.), *Affective Methodologies: Developing Cultural Research Strategies for the Study of Affect* (pp. 119–139). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Törrönen, Hannele (Ed.) (2009). *Vaiettu Naiseus: Ajatuksia naisen väkivallan tunnistamisesta, nimeämisestä ja hoitamisesta* [Untold womanhood: thoughts about recognizing, naming and treating woman’s violence]. Helsinki: Ensi- ja turvakotien liitto.
- Törrönen, Jukka (2001). The Concept of Subject Position in Empirical Social Research. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 31(3), 313–329.
- Törrönen, Jukka (2014). Situational, Cultural and Societal Identities: Analysing Subject Positions as Classifications, Participant roles, Viewpoints and Interactive Positions. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 44(1), 80–98.
- Ussher, Jane (1999). Women’s Madness: A Material-Discursive-Intrapsychic Approach. In Dwight Fee (ed.), *Pathology and the Postmodern* (pp. 207–230). London: Sage.
- Ussher, Jane (2008). Reclaiming Embodiment within Critical Psychology: A Material-Discursive Analysis of the Menopausal Body. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(5), 1781–1798.
- Venäläinen, Satu (2011). Sukupuolen rakentuminen väkivaltakertomuksissa [The construction of gender in narratives about violence]. Unpublished Master’s thesis, University of Helsinki. Available at: [https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/24884/Satu%20Venalainen\\_gradu.pdf?sequence=3](https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/24884/Satu%20Venalainen_gradu.pdf?sequence=3).
- Venäläinen, Satu (2012). Viaton uhri vai vahva nainen? Väkivallan uhreina olleiden naisten sukupuolistunut identiteetti väkivaltakertomuksissa [An innocent victim or a strong woman? Gendered identity of female victims in narratives about violence]. *Naistutkimus –Kvinnoforskning*, 25(2), 5–16.
- Venäläinen, Satu (2013). Väkivallan sukupuoli iltapäivälehdissä [The gender of violence in afternoon papers]. *Media & Viestintä*, 36(3–4), 23–39.
- Venäläinen, Satu (2017). Affektiivisuus ja diskursiivisuus. Identiteettityötä ja kevytkenkäisyyttä eri suuntausten rajapinnoilla [Affectivity and discursivity: Identity work and promiscuity at the boundaries between approaches]. *Sukupuolentutkimus–Genusforskning*, 30(1), 82–86.
- Vesala, Kari (2012). Toimijuuden kehukset ja relationistinen sosiaalipsykologia [The frames of agency and relational social psychology]. In Anja Riitta Lahikainen, Eero Suoninen, Irmeli Järventie & Marko Salonen (Eds.), *Sosiaalipsykologian sukupolvet* (pp. 179–197). Tampere: Vastapaino.

- Violence against Women (2014). European Union-Wide Survey. Main Results Report. Available at: <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2014/violence-against-women-eu-wide-survey-main-results-report> (accessed 31 January 2017).
- Virkki, Tuija (2004). Vihan voima: Toimijuus ja muutos vihakertomuksissa [The power of anger: Agency and change in narratives about anger]. Jyväskylä: Atena.
- Virkki, Tuija (2007). Gender, Care, and the Normalization of Violence: Similarities between Occupational Violence and Intimate Partner Violence in Finland. *Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*, 15(4), 220–232.
- Virkki, Tuija (2017). At the Interface of National and Transnational: The Development of Finnish Policies against Domestic Violence in Terms of Gender Equality. *Social Sciences*, 6(1), 1–17.
- Virkki, Tuija & Jäppinen, Maija (2017). Gendering Responsibility: Finnish and Russian Helping Professionals' Views on Responsible Agency in the Context of Intimate Partner Violence. In Marita Husso, Tuija Virkki, Marianne Notko, Helena Hirvonen & Jari Eilola (Eds.), *Interpersonal Violence: Differences and Connections* (pp. 107–121). London: Routledge.
- Walker, Lenore E. A. (2000). *The Battered Woman Syndrome* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Walkerdine, Valerie & Bansel, Peter (2010). Neoliberalism, Work and Subjectivity: Towards a More Complex Account. In Wetherell Margaret & Chandra Talpade Mohanty (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Identities* (pp. 492–507). London: Sage.
- Walkerdine, Valerie, Olsvold, Aina & Rudberg, Monica (2013). Researching Embodiment and Intergenerational Trauma Using the Work of Davoine and Gaudillière: History Walked in the Door. *Subjectivity*, 6(3), 272–297.
- Watson, Rod (1997). Ethnomethodology and Textual Analysis. In David Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice* (pp. 80–98). London: Sage.
- Weare, Siobhan (2013). “The Mad”, “The Bad”, “The Victim”: Gendered Constructions of Women Who Kill within the Criminal Justice System. *Laws*, 2(3), 337–361.
- Weatherall, Ann (2012). Discursive Psychology and Feminism. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 51(3), 463–470.
- Weedon, Chris (1987). *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Weizmann-Henelius, Ghitta (2006). Violent Female Perpetrators in Finland: Personality and Life Events. *Nordic Psychology*, 58(4), 280–297.
- Weizmann-Henelius, Ghitta, Viemerö, Vappu & Eronen, Markku (2003). The Violent Female Perpetrator and her Victim. *Forensic Science International*, 133(3), 197–203.
- Weizmann-Henelius, Ghitta, Putkonen, Hanna, Naukkarinen, Hannu & Eronen, Markku (2009). Intoxication and Violent women. *Archives of Women's Mental Health*, 12(1), 15–25.
- Weizmann-Henelius, Ghitta, Grönroos, Matti, Putkonen, Hanna, Eronen, Markku, Lindberg, Nina & Häkkänen-Nyholm, Helinä (2012). Gender-Specific Risk factors for Intimate Partner Homicide – A Nationwide Register-Based Study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(8), 1519–1539.

- Wells, Elisabeth C. (2012). "But Most of All, They Fought Together": Judicial Attributions for Sentences in Convicting Battered Women Who Kill. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 36(3), 350–364.
- Wesely, Jennifer K. (2006). Considering the Context of Women's Violence: Gender, Lived Experiences, and Cumulative Victimization. *Feminist Criminology*, 1(4), 303–328.
- West, Candace & Fenstermaker, Sarah (1992). Power, Inequality, and the Accomplishment of Gender. In Paula England (Ed.), *Theory on Gender/ Feminism on Theory* (pp. 151–174). New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- West, Candace & Fenstermaker, Sarah (1995). Doing Difference. *Gender & Society*, 9(1), 8–37.
- West, Candace & Fenstermaker, Sarah (2002). Accountability in Action: The Accomplishment of Gender, Race and Class in a Meeting of the University of California Board of Regents. *Discourse & Society*, 13(4), 537–563.
- West, Candace & Zimmerman, Don (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender and Society*, 1(2), 125–151.
- West, Candace, & Zimmerman, Don (2009). Accounting for Doing Gender. *Gender & Society*, 23(1), 112–122.
- Wetherell, Margaret (1998). Positioning and Interpretative Repertoires: Conversation Analysis and Post-Structuralism in Dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, 9(3), 387–412.
- Wetherell, Margaret (2003a). Paranoia, Ambivalence, and Discursive Practices: Concepts of Position and Positioning in Psychoanalysis and Discursive Psychology. In Rom Harré & Fathali Moghaddam (Eds.), *The Self and Others: Positioning Individuals and Groups in Personal, Political, and Cultural Contexts* (pp. 99–120). Westport: Praeger.
- Wetherell, Margaret (2003b). Racism and the Analysis of Cultural Resources in Interviews. In Harry Van den Berg, Margaret Wetherell, & Hanneke Houtkoop-Steenstra (Eds.), *Analyzing Race Talk: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on the Research Interview* (pp.11–30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wetherell, Margaret (2005). Unconscious Conflict or Everyday Accountability?. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44(2), 169–173.
- Wetherell, Margaret (2007). A Step Too Far: Discursive Psychology, Linguistic Ethnography and Questions of Identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(5), 661–681.
- Wetherell, Margaret (2008). Subjectivity or Psycho-Discursive Practices? Investigating Complex Intersectional Identities. *Subjectivity*, 22(1), 73–81.
- Wetherell, Margaret (2010). The Field of Identity Studies. In Wetherell Margaret & Chandra Talpade Mohanty (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Identities* (pp. 3–26). London: Sage.
- Wetherell, M. (2012). *Affect and Emotion: A New Social Science Understanding*. London: Sage.
- Wetherell, Margaret (2013). Affect and Discourse—What's the Problem? From Affect as Excess to Affective/Discursive Practice. *Subjectivity*, 6(4), 349–368.
- Wetherell, Margaret (2015). Trends in the Turn to Affect: A Social Psychological Critique. *Body & Society*, 21(2), 139–166.
- Wetherell, Margaret & Edley, Nigel (1999). Negotiating Hegemonic Masculinity: Imaginary Positions and Psycho-Discursive Practices. *Feminism & psychology*, 9(3), 335–356.

- White, Jacquelyn W. & Kowalski, Robin M. (1994). Deconstructing the Myth of the Nonaggressive Woman. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 18(4), 487–508.
- Wilczynski, Ania (1997). Mad or Bad? Child-Killers, Gender and the Courts. *British Journal of Criminology*, 37(3), 419–436.
- Worcester, Nancy (2002). Women's Use of Force: Complexities and Challenges of Taking the Issue Seriously. *Violence Against Women*, 8(11), 1390–1415.
- Worth, Anna, Martha Augoustinos, and Brianne Hastie (2016). "Playing the Gender Card": Media Representations of Julia Gillard's Sexism and Misogyny Speech. *Feminism & Psychology*, 26(1), 52–72.

## APPENDIX I

### An invitation for written accounts and the research contract in Finnish

#### TUTKIMUS NAISISTA VÄKIVALLAN TEKIJÖINÄ

##### Osallistu tutkimukseen

Teen väitöskirjatutkimusta naisista väkivallan tekijöinä Helsingin yliopiston valtiotieteellisessä tiedekunnassa, sosiaalitieteiden laitoksella. Kerään tutkimusaineistoksi **kirjoituksia vankilatuomiota suorittavilta naisilta**, joilla on kokemuksia väkivallan tekemisestä. Tutkimuksen tarkoituksena on tarkastella kirjoitusten lisäksi naisten tekemän väkivallan esittämistä iltapäivälehdissä.

Pyydän sinua osallistumaan tutkimukseen ja kirjoittamaan väkivallan tekemiseen liittyvistä kokemuksistasi. Tutkimukseen voi osallistua **nimettömänä**. Tutkimukseen osallistuvista ei kerätä muita tietoja kuin mitä he itse kertovat kirjoituksissaan. Voit kertoa kirjoituksessasi väkivallasta omin sanoin vapaamuotoisesti, niin pitkästi tai lyhyesti kuin haluat. Voit kertoa joko vankilatuomioon liittyvästä väkivallasta tai muista tilanteista, joissa olet päätnyt käyttämään väkivaltaa. Halutessasi voit kertoa myös laajemmin elämästäsi, väkivallasta ja siihen liittyvistä ajatuksistasi. Kirjoittamisen apuna voit käyttää halutessasi myös seuraavia kysymyksiä:

- Mitä väkivaltatilanteessa tapahtui?
- Ketkä olivat väkivaltatilanteen osapuolia?
- Minkälaisia seurauksia väkivallalla on ollut?
- Miten väkivalta on vaikuttanut elämäsi?

Kerro mielellään myös oma ikäsi ja perhesuhteesi.

**Lähetä kirjoituksesi oheisessa kirjekuoressa**, jonka postimaksu on jo maksettu ja jossa on valmiina vastausosoite. Kirjoitukseen **tulee liittää suostumuksen ilmaisu** tutkimukseen osallistumisesta joko niin, että kirjoittaa seuraavan lauseen kirjoituksen alkuun tai loppuun: ”kirjoitustani saa käyttää Satu Venäläisen tutkimuksen aineistona”, **tai** vaihtoehtoisesti voi allekirjoittaa oheisen tutkimussopimuksen ja lähettää sen kirjoituksen mukana. Oheissa on kaksi kopiota tutkimussopimuksesta. Jos lähetät allekirjoitetun tutkimussopimuksen kirjoituksesi mukana, jää toinen kappale sinulle.

Kirjoituksia käytetään ainoastaan allekirjoittaneen tutkimustarkoituksiin. Niitä käsitellään luottamuksellisesti ja ne säilytetään siten, etteivät ne ole ulkopuolisten saatavilla. Tutkimukseen osallistuneita ei voi tunnistaa sen tuloksia käsittelevistä tieteellisistä julkaisuista. Väitöskirja, jonka aineistona kirjoituksia käytetään, tulee olemaan luettavissa arviolta vuonna 2015 internet-osoitteessa [www.helsinki.fi/openaccess/helda](http://www.helsinki.fi/openaccess/helda), josta se löytyy allekirjoittaneen nimellä.

Naisista väkivallan tekijöinä ei tiedetä paljon, eikä aihetta ole käsitelty tutkimuksissa eri näkökulmista. **Auta laajentamaan aiheen ymmärrystä ja osallistu kertomalla omista kokemuksistasi!**

Vastaa mielelläni tutkimusta koskeviin kysymyksiin.

Yhteistyöstä kiittäen

Satu Venäläinen

Sosiaalitieteiden laitos

PL 54, 00014 Helsingin yliopisto

[satu.venalainen@helsinki.fi](mailto:satu.venalainen@helsinki.fi)

## TUTKIMUSSOPIMUS

### Osallistuja

Suostun osallistumaan Satu Venäläisen naisia väkivallan tekijöinä käsittelevään tutkimukseen. Olen saanut tietoa tutkimuksesta ja suostun siihen, että haastattelussa kertomaani/kirjoitustani tullaan käyttämään tutkimusaineistona.

### Tutkimuksen tekijä

Tutkimuksen tekijä Satu Venäläinen sitoutuu hyviä tutkimuseettisiä sääntöjä noudattaen analysoimaan tutkimusaineistoa nimettömänä ja suojelemaan tutkimukseen osallistujia niin, ettei heitä välittömästi tunnisteta. Aineistoa säilytetään lukitussa tilassa.

Venäläinen sitoutuu käyttämään tutkimusaineistoksi kerättyjä haastatteluita/kirjoituksia vain tutkimuksensa aineistona. Venäläinen ei luovuta tietoja viranomaisille eikä muille ulkopuolisille. Tutkija on lain mukaan velvoitettu kertomaan viranomaisille ainoastaan estettävissä olevista vakavista rikoksista.

Tätä tutkimussopimusta tehdään kaksi samansisältöistä kappaletta. Toinen jää tutkimuksen tekijälle ja toinen osallistujalle.

Aika ja paikka

---

Osallistujan allekirjoitus ja nimenselvennys

---

Tutkimuksen tekijä Satu Venäläinen

## APPENDIX II

### **An invitation for written accounts and the research contract (translated from Finnish)**

A STUDY ABOUT WOMEN AS PERPETRATORS OF VIOLENCE

#### **An invitation to participate in research**

I am conducting a PhD study about women as perpetrators of violence in the Department of Social Research at the University of Helsinki. I am planning to collect data in the form of **written accounts from women who are serving a prison sentence** and who have experiences of doing violence. The purpose of the study is to look at both written accounts as well as representations of violence committed by women in the afternoon papers, which is also compared to representations of violence committed by men in these newspapers.

I am kindly asking you to participate in the study by writing about your experiences related to doing violence. You can participate **anonymously**. No other information about the participants will be collected apart from what you write about in your account. You can write about violence freely, in your own words, as lengthily or as briefly as you like. You may write about the violence that led to your prison sentence or about other instances when you ended up doing violence. If you wish, you can also write more broadly about your life, or about violence and your thoughts related to it. If it helps, you may use the following questions as guidance for your writing:

- What happened in the situation where you used violence?
- Who were the people involved in the situation?
- What kind of consequences has the violence led to?
- What impact has violence had on your life?

I would be grateful if you could also disclose your age and family relations.

**Please send your written account in the attached postage-paid return-addressed envelope.** Please note, also, that what is needed along with your written account is **your consent to participate** in this research. You may give your consent either by merely writing the following sentence before or after your account: “My written account may be used as data for a study conducted by Satu Venäläinen”, **or** you can sign the attached research contract and send it along with the written account. There are two copies of the contract, so if you decide to sign it and send it back, the other copy is for you.

The written accounts will be used only for research purposes in the study conducted by the researcher. They will be handled confidentially and will be retained so that no other people apart from the researcher will have access to them. The identity of the participants will not appear in reports on the results of the study. The PhD dissertation in which the accounts are used as data will be available in 2015, or thereabouts, at the internet address [www.helsinki.fi/openaccess/helda/](http://www.helsinki.fi/openaccess/helda/), where it is to be found under the name of the author.

There is a shortage of knowledge about women as perpetrators of violence, and the subject has not been approached from various viewpoints before.  
**Please help us to broaden understanding about this subject area, and participate by telling me about your experiences!**

I will gladly answer any questions you may have.  
A sincere thank you for your cooperation,

Satu Venäläinen  
Department of Social Research  
PL 54, 00014 University of Helsinki  
email: [satu.venalainen@helsinki.fi](mailto:satu.venalainen@helsinki.fi)

## RESEARCH CONTRACT

### The Participant

I agree to participate in a study conducted by Satu Venäläinen about women as perpetrators of violence. I have been given information about the study and I give my consent for the use of my written account as data for the study.

### The Researcher

The researcher Satu Venäläinen commits to following ethical guidelines, to analysing the data anonymously and to protecting the participants so as not to allow their identification. Venäläinen commits to using the written account collected for data only for her research. Venäläinen will not release any information to the authorities or any other third parties. The data will be retained in a locked office.

There are two identical copies of this contract. One is sent to the researcher and the other remains with the participant.

Time and place

---

The signature of the participant and the printed name

---

The signature of the researcher Satu Venäläinen

---

## APPENDIX III

### The request for participation in an interview in Finnish

#### Tutkimus naisista väkivallan tekijöinä

Olen sosiaalipsykologian jatko-opiskelija Helsingin yliopiston sosiaalitieteiden laitokselta, jonne teen väitöskirjatutkimusta naisista väkivallan tekijöinä. Tarkastelen tutkimuksessani vankilatuomiota suorittavien naisten kertomuksia väkivallasta sekä naisten tekemän väkivallan esittämistä iltapäivälehdissä. Olen tähän saakka kerännyt tutkimuksen aineistoksi kirjoitettuja kertomuksia vankilatuomiota suorittavilta naisilta, joiden lisäksi teen nyt myös haastatteluita.

Pyydän sinua osallistumaan tutkimukseen suostumalla haastateltavaksi. Osallistumalla voit edesauttaa tiedon kartuttamista aihealueesta, jota ei juuri ole aikaisemmin tutkittu. Toivon kuulevani tutkimuksessani erilaisista kokemuksista ja näkökulmista väkivaltaan, jotta käsitykset naisista väkivallan tekijöinä täydentyisivät. Kertomalla omista kokemuksistasi osallistut tiedon tuottamiseen, joka voi myös hyödyttää väkivaltaa koskevien ammattikäytäntöjen kehittämistä.

Haastatteluissa on tarkoitus keskustella väkivallasta vapaassa muodossa. Haluaisin erityisesti kuulla haastatteluissa siitä, millainen oli se tilanne (yksi tai useampi), jossa olet käyttänyt väkivaltaa, ja millaista osaa väkivalta on näytellyt elämässäsi. Haastatteluihin osallistumisen edellytyksenä ei ole tämänhetkinen vankilatuomio väkivaltarikoksesta. Haastattelun yhteydessä pyydän allekirjoittamaan tutkimussopimuksen. En kerää muita tietoja osallistujista kuin mitä itse haluat haastattelussa kertoa, ja tutkimustuloksista raportoidessani pidän huolta siitä, ettei tutkimukseen osallistujia voi tunnistaa.

Vastaan mielelläni tutkimustani koskeviin kysymyksiin.  
Yhteistyöstä lämpimästi kiittäen!

Satu Venäläinen  
Sosiaalitieteiden laitos  
PL 54, 00014 Helsingin yliopisto  
satu.venalainen@helsinki.fi

## **APPENDIX IV**

### **A request for participation in an interview (translated from Finnish)**

#### **A study about women as perpetrators of violence**

I am a graduate student at the department of social research, University of Helsinki, where I am doing a PhD study about women as perpetrators of violence. I am looking at narratives about violence perpetrated by women serving a prison sentence, as well as how violence committed by women is presented in the afternoon papers. So far I have I have collected written narratives in prisons, in addition to which I am now conducting interviews.

I am asking you to participate in my study by consenting to be interviewed. By participating you can help to accumulate knowledge about a subject area that has not been studied very much. I would like to hear about different experiences and perspectives concerning violence, so that I can put forward more multidimensional views about women as perpetrators of violence. By telling me about your experiences you can contribute to the production of knowledge that may also be helpful in developing professional practices concerning violence.

The interviews will involve discussing violence freely. I would especially like to hear about the incident (one or more) in which you used violence, and what kind of role violence has played in your life. You may participate in the interview even if your prison sentence is not for a violent crime. I will ask you to sign a research contract. I am not collecting any other information about you other than what you wish to say about yourself in the interview. When I report the results of the study I will make sure that no participants will be identifiable.

I will gladly answer any questions concerning my research.  
A warm thank you for your cooperation!

Satu Venäläinen  
Sosiaalitieteiden laitos  
PL 54, 00014 Helsingin yliopisto  
satu.venalainen@helsinki.fi

## APPENDIX V

### The interview questions in Finnish

- Taustoitus

Mitä haluaisit kertoa itsestäsi ja elämästäsi?

Minkä ikäinen olet?

Millainen perhetilanne sinulla on nyt tai oli ennen tänne tuloa?

Kuinka kauan olet ollut täällä vankilassa?

Minkälainen tuomio sinulla on?

Miten vankeusaikasi on mennyt?

- Väkivaltatapahtuma

Kertoisitko siitä tapahtumasta, minkä takia sinulle tuli tuomio?/ Kuvailisitko yhtä tai useampaa tilannetta, jossa käytit väkivaltaa?

Millainen suhde sinulla oli väkivallan kohteeseen?

Mitä siinä tilanteessa tapahtui?

Mihin tilanne päättyi/mitä siitä seurasi?

Muistatko millaisia tunteita sinulla oli siinä tilanteessa tai sen jälkeen?

- Väkivallan merkitys elämässäsi

Millaista roolia väkivalta on näytellyt elämässäsi?

Millaisiin elämäsi vaiheisiin väkivalta on liittynyt?

Onko sinua kohtaan jossain elämänvaiheessa tehty väkivaltaa?

Mitä väkivalta sinulle merkitsee?

Millaisia tunteita väkivalta sinussa herättää?

Millaisia seurauksia väkivallan tekemisellä on sinulle ollut?

Koetko, että se, että olet nainen, vaikuttaa siihen kuinka sinuun ja tekemääsi väkivaltaan suhtaudutaan?

- Vankeuden jälkeen

Minkälaisia haaveita tai toiveita sinulla on vankilan jälkeiselle elämälle?

- Lopuksi

Tuleeko sinulle mieleen vielä jotain, jota emme ole käsitelleet?

Miten koit tämän haastattelun?

## APPENDIX VI

### **The interview questions (translated from Finnish)**

#### - Background

What would you like to tell me about yourself and your life?

How old are you?

What is your family situation, or what was it before coming here?

How long have you been here in prison?

What kind of sentence do you have?

How has your time in prison been?

#### - The violent incident

Could you tell me about the incident that led to your sentence/ Could you describe one or more situations in which you have used violence?

What kind of relationship did you have with the person you were violent towards?

What happened in that situation?

What happened after the situation/ what did it lead to?

Do you remember what kind of feelings you had during or after the incident?

#### - The role of violence in your life

What kind of role has violence played in your life?

What kind of phases of your life has violence been part of?

Have you been a target of violence at some point in your life?

What does violence mean to you?

What kind of feelings does violence arouse in you?

What kind of consequences has doing violence had for you?

Do you feel that being a woman influences how people relate to you and the violence you have done?

#### - After imprisonment

What kind of dreams or hopes do you have for your life after prison?

#### - Ending

Is there anything that we have not covered that you would like to discuss?

How did you feel about this interview?

