

Endorsing Hegemonic Masculinities among the Bukusu through *Khuvita* Ritual

¹Josephine Mulindi Khaemba, ²Felicia Yieke, ³James Onyango Ogola

¹Egerton University, Kenya

^{2,3}Laikipia University, Kenya

***Corresponding Author:**

Josephine Mulindi Khaemba

Email: kmulindi@yahoo.com

Abstract: Ritual is a cultural system of symbolic communication. Rituals have a binding effect of the person and the ritual content. This paper looks at ritual discourse and the construction of hegemonic masculinities with a specific focus on the use of language in *Khuvita*; a ritual amongst the Bukusu community of Western Kenya. Using the discourse historical approach, the study is concerned with analysing the ways in which dominant thinking and structures of inequality between men and women inflect and are reproduced and naturalised through discourse. The study explored the fine details of content and discursive strategies in the discourse of the ritual *Khuvita* among the Bukusu of Kenya, which involves both the context of use and the genres. Using video recording and interviews, the researcher focused on how particular episodes position the oral artists and the audience, what they include and exclude and how the audience try to understand events, individuals, identities and social roles. The findings reveal that *Khuvita* ritual supports the elaboration and magnification of the differences between male and female. The women's role in Bukusu community is seen as subordinate to men. Hegemonic masculinity can be identified as a risk and a limiting factor for both men and women. The findings may be used in practical applications to combat all forms of social discrimination through language.

Keywords: Hegemonic masculinities, Ideology, Power, Masculinity, Ritual, *Khuvita*

Introduction

Ritual discourses have deeper social values that they articulate. Such values may have important relationship with social power and even oppression. Ritual is constituted of patterned and ordered sequences of words and acts expressed in multiple media, whose contents are characterised by conventionality, stereotype and condensation [1]. Rituals are instructive and formative; they convey knowledge, moral values, solidarity and tradition [2]. The purpose of this paper is to make a point about the nature of texts in ritual discourse and the ideas they present. These texts are all around us in everyday life and are quite rich in conveying certain ways of seeing the world. Beliefs, worldviews and social structures are embedded in and reinforced in the use of verbal language [3]. The realities we experience are constructed by the discourses we use to describe and understand them and, such discourses and the realities they construct are closely intertwined with relations of power [4].

Ritual practice continues to serve as a focal point of fascination and as a source of knowledge. Ritual is a psychological and sacred process; it is a source of motivation for inculcating societal ethos and philosophies in the members of the community. Ritual in Bukusu community is an instrument for the

regulation of human relations; it provides effective stimuli to produce approved sentiments of loyalty and solidarity. It is a sophisticated, dynamic, rational and well structured process that is central to the construction of hegemonic masculinities. Argumentation strategies are used to highlight hierarchies of power that form hegemonic relationships of dominance and subordination. The males are empowered by the community. They give directives, they are the principals and authors of ritual discourse; they raise opinions and endorse ideologies. Bukusu women have internalised their subordination that is constructed through the beliefs about power that men grow up with concerning their essential authority over women. The women have the abilities that ordinarily remain dormant. The challenge is to enable them to exercise their talents for the benefit of the community.

This study looks at ritual discourse and the construction of hegemonic masculinities with a specific focus on the use of language in the ritual *Khuvita*. The Bukusu *Khuvita* ritual is an instrument to regulate human relationships. In *Khuvita* a situated person, deploy signs and structures within the community to emphasize reflection on issues such as male sexual identity. Within ritual practice, hegemonic masculinities are socially constructed and these have a strong

influence on how men are socialised. Using the discourse historical approach, the study is concerned with analysing the ways in which dominant ways of thinking and structures of inequality between men and women inflect and are reproduced and naturalised through discourse. Masculinity is cultural, exists as a social ideology and can be traced to history.

Hegemonic masculinity in Bukusu community is realised in the allocation of rights, obligations, freedoms and constraints, power and subordination. Hegemony, a pivotal concept in Gramsci's prison notebooks, is about winning and holding of power and the formation (and destruction) of social groups in that process. In this sense, it is importantly about the ways in which the ruling class establishes and maintains its domination [5]. The oral artists and those who control ritual are the weavers of the fabric of hegemony; they are its organizing intellectuals. They regulate and manage gender regimes: articulate experiences, fantasies and perspectives. They create and perpetuate cultural ideals, which may not correspond with people's actual personalities.

The study aimed to explore the fine details of content and discursive strategies in the discourse of the ritual *Khuvita* among the Bukusu of Kenya, which involves both the context of use and the genres. The specific objectives were to explore the construction of hegemonic masculinities in the Bukusu ritual *Khuvita* and to highlight the strategies employed in the representation of women in ritual discourse.

The Bukusu community of Kenya formed the population of the study. Sampling was purposive. Subjects were chosen who were relevant to the study [6]. Ten respondents from the Bukusu community involved in the ritual *Khuvita* were selected. Using video recording, observation and interviews, the researcher focuses on how particular episodes position the oral artists and the audience, what they include and exclude and how the audience try to understand events, individuals, identities and social roles. The study was ethnographic locating the researcher in the field. Ethnographic study is qualitative research, which helps provide detailed information about the phenomenon in order to establish patterns, trends and relationships [7]. Data analysis was informed by the discourse historical approach, which is an approach of critical discourse analysis.

Discourse Historical Approach in Framing Ritual Discourse

Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) informed this study. DHA is an approach of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). DHA is problem oriented. It incorporates fieldwork and ethnography to explore the object under investigation. It is a qualitative, interdisciplinary research with specific focus on

critique, ideology and power. The discourse historical approach is committed to CDA. It embraces three interconnected aspects; two are related to the dimensions of cognition and one to the dimension of action [8]. First, text or discourse immanent critique aims at discovering inconsistencies, paradoxes and dilemmas of discourse internal structures. Secondly, the social diagnostic critique is concerned with the demystifying exposure, the manifest persuasive or manipulation character of discursive practices. Here the analyst makes use of background and contextual knowledge and embeds the communicative structures of a discursive event in a wider frame of social and political relations, processes and circumstances. Finally, the prognostic critique contributes to the transformation and improvements of communication by providing guidelines for reducing language barriers within institutions as well as guidelines for avoiding sexist language use.

One distinguishing feature of DHA is that it follows the principle of triangulation. It endeavours to work with different approaches based on a variety of empirical data as well as background information. Further, it analyses the historical dimension of discursive actions by exploring the ways in which particular genres of discourse are subject to diachronic change [9]. Finally, it integrates social theories to be able to explain context. Thus, triangulation approach takes into account four levels listed below:

- 1) The immediate language or text, internal context;
- 2) The inter-textual and inter-discursive relationship between utterance, text, genres and discourses;
- 3) The extra linguistic, social/sociological variables and institutional frames of a specific context of situation;
- 4) The broader socio-political and historical contexts, which the discursive practices are embedded in and related to.

The relevance of this theory to the present study was that its tenets provided the basis for the analysis of the different linguistic or rhetorical means by which, women in Bukusu community are discriminated against. For example, how are women referred to linguistically in ritual discourse? What traits, qualities, characteristics, features, are attributed to them? By means of what arguments do specific persons, try to justify and legitimize the discrimination, suppression and exploitation of women? Who talks? Who has power? What ideologies do men use to retain power? Within ritual practices, who gives and who takes directives? Who leads meetings? Who is expected to raise their opinion and who is expected not to? Whose opinions get picked up and cited on approvingly by others?

The study utilized the following in its analysis. That we can understand society as a totality; that any particular phenomenon must be analyzed against the background of its wider social context; that in producing knowledge of society critical research reveals what is obscured by ideology, such ideology being seen as pervasive and as playing an essential role in preserving the status quo. That a critical approach not only produces knowledge that enables us to understand how society is, but also how it can and ought to be. That by acting on the basis of critical theory, we can change the world for the better; that the change produced will be fundamental in character, such as to eradicate oppression and emancipate all human beings [10].

Of great significance to this study is that of altering inequitable distributions of economic, cultural and political goods in contemporary Bukusu community. This can be through bringing a system of excessive inequalities of power into crisis by uncovering its workings and its effects through analysis of potent cultural objects, texts, and thereby to help in achieving a more equitable social order. The issue is thus, one of transformation, unsettling the existing order, and transforming its elements into an arrangement less harmful to some, and perhaps more beneficial to all members of a society [11]. The strength of the DHA include: interdisciplinary orientation, the principle of triangulation, the historical analysis and the practical application of the results for emancipatory and democratic purposes.

Discourse Historical Approach is a method intent on tracing the inter-textual history of phrases and arguments as employed in this study [12][13]. The framework includes concepts of genre, field study and socio-semantic representation of social actors. Our analysis was basically linguistic discursive of textual structures that are attributed a crucial function in the social production of inequality, power, ideology, authority or manipulation [14].

Ideology and Power in Ritual Discourse

Ideology is a set of shared ideas that seem, to those who hold them, to be natural and unquestionable. They spring up as fundamental components of the reality of the world. They are ideas presented or hidden as truths. This suggests that what we take for truths can be problematic or contentious upon closer inspection. In most societies there seem to be a wide acceptance that some people have a right to greater wealth or power than others. To accept this state of affairs as in some way natural or inevitable is to think under the weight of ideology, as is the case of male power in Bukusu community.

Ideology means literally the study of ideas, which is how it began as a philosophical subject across Europe at the time of the French revolution. Ideology

developed into a particular way of thinking. The concept of ideology informs our understanding that there is a dynamic mechanism at work within power structures, by which they become self justifying and natural to a point where they are unquestionable. The powerful would easily be convinced by ideas justifying their greater power and wealth. The ideology of the powerful as argued by Karl Marx (1818-83) would be unquestionably accepted by both the powerful themselves and those they exercise the power over, simply because it acquired the status of truth. This idea of acceptance is very important with regard to hegemonic masculinity.

Power is the ability to determine the actions of others, as well as our ability to determine our own actions [15]. Individuals or groups who hold and exercise power are termed the dominant individuals or groups. In addition, those over whom power is exercised are subordinate individuals or groups. Power may be exercised in two main ways: through force and through ideas. Individuals often use violence to get others to do what they want, and the threat of violence is enough to make people obey the directions of others. Individuals could also use the force of ideas to get the subordinates accept their own subjugation, believing it to be natural.

Historically, societies acquiesced to the rule of monarchs on the basis that such rulers were thought to be divinely appointed, and their power was believed to be an immutable aspect of the structure of the universe. According to Wall and Wall [16], power is not simply a matter of overt party politics but it is a thing of everyday life, of personal relationships, of the work place, and occurs in the home, in education and in the operations of media organizations.

Power can be located in class. Social classification identifies different people as belonging to different groups, with different amounts of social power, measured in terms of economic status. Class is a way of categorizing social groups according to hierarchies of wealth, occupation and culture. Those lower down the hierarchy often display discontent. There are many historical examples of attempts by the lower in the hierarchy to throw off the York of oppression. For example, among the women who went to Beijing believing that things would be better for them was the upper class who had inherited position and wealth.

The middle class are those entrepreneurs, capitalists and professionals who are defined by the generation of their own wealth, ownership of property and culture. On the other hand, the working class who are interchangeable with the lower class are the majority of individuals defined by their labour power.

These are people required for the manufacturing process.

The force of power is seen as operating at an emotional, psychological and physiological level, affecting behaviour in some manner. Its influence is strongest on vulnerable individuals such as women in Bukusu community. The source of power is usually identified as deriving from the ability of those who control the community's institutions such as the men, the elders and the oral artists who are custodians of the community's culture. Ritual in Bukusu community acts as an agent-part of a wider social process, in which the powerful groups of the community make their interests the dominant ones, to which all other groups acquiesce [17].

Ideology is tied to the concept of power as authority [18]. Its relationship to power is that it legitimises the differential power that groups hold and as such, it distorts the real situation that people find themselves in. Hegemony incorporates both ideological control and consent. Discourse communities, in order to sustain authoritative structures must have popular support and legitimacy in order to maintain stability as evidenced in *Khuvita* ritual. Using the discourse historical approach, we can understand society as a totality. In addition, any particular phenomenon must be analysed against the background of its wider social context. In producing knowledge of society, critical research reveals what is obscured by ideology, such ideology being seen as pervasive and as playing an essential role in preserving the status quo as the case is in *Khuvita* ritual.

Hegemonic Masculinities in *Khuvita*

In this section, we analyse *Khuvita* as a Bukusu ritual within which language plays a major role. *Khuvita* means initiation into the ways of the Bukusu community. This ritual is conducted when a boy has been healed after circumcision. It is done two to three months after seclusion and healing. This paper presents the analysis of hegemonic masculinities, ideologies, power connotations and discursive strategies employed by the main actor in the ritual *Khuvita*. The actor is basically, the circumciser who is entrusted with the responsibility of concluding the circumcision process by initiating the young boys into manhood and into the ways of the community. Culturally the circumciser is regarded as a boy's grandfather; he is one of the grandfathers. The others are the paternal and maternal grandparents. However, the one with authority is the circumciser. Therefore, his word is law. He derives his power from the community and whatever he tells the boy is binding. In the next subsections, we discuss *Khuvita* as conclusion of circumcision, Boy's company and role, Changing values and Transition into manhood. In these subsections, we present the discursive

construction of hegemonic masculinity in *Khuvita* ritual.

***Khuvita* as Conclusive rite**

Circumcision in Bukusu community is a transition rite for boys and this is important in making differences with women. The elderly men rigidly established and generally performed the *Khuvita* ritual. Boys have to accept what they are told during this rite as deserving merit. A boy is told 'You are now a man'- this has a lasting effect on boys. The boys feel empowered during the process of socialization.

Hegemonic Masculinities are a strong influence on the ways in which boys in this community are socialised. They are socio-culturally constructed and function through an array of representations, thoughts and feelings, which are difficult to change [19]. These structures of perceptions determine the way in which the men perceive the world, understand and act in it. By the time of completion of transition rites, most boys have learnt lessons that shape masculine behaviour and reproductive health leading men to violate women's rights. The boy is advised to go for a mature woman and if he makes her pregnant, he can as well deny it. Such privileges lead them to believe they are entitled to greater rights and authority, and services from women. Within the Bukusu culture, women also internalize their subordination. Thus, masculinities are the construction of the culture.

Boy's Company and Role

During *Khuvita* the boy is directed to avoid the mother's company. Previously he used to warm at his mother's fireplace, but henceforth not anymore dwelling with his mother. He is now an adult and should keep in his father's company. The social actor uses relational identification of mother and son as a strategy to bar the boy from women's company. The argument here is that if the boy continues dwelling with his mother, she may have a negative influence on him.

The boy is advised to do boy activities and to dwell with the male members of the community. However, the boy is advised to assist his grandmother who has brought him up. He can help fetch water for her so that he can be regarded as a good boy. This action can help attract assistance from the aunt who is a teacher. The aunt can help pay his school fees if his father doesn't have enough money. Focus here is on women's special abilities. The grandmother has taken care of the boy by bringing him up. The grandmother lived with the boy. We notice the gendering of certain skills and this reinforces the gendering of women's place in society; their nurturing skills.

As women move into positions at work places, their value is seen in their cooperative ways that they bring along such as the aunt who is a teacher helping

pay the school fees for the nephew. Otherwise, all along the boy is advised to keep away from the women. We note the views about women embedded in our institutions of knowledge and the ways we talk about them. The family is at the core of gender issues since the family is the primary legitimized site for biological and social reproduction. The force of gender categories makes it impossible to move through life in a non-gendered way, and impossible not to behave in a way that brings out gendered behaviour. As people behave in this way, they reproduce the existing social order.

Changing Values

*Today I am telling you this
You are a man
Early in time, once you got
circumcised
You would be given a spear and a
shield to go and steal cattle...
Today I give you a pen, in your right
hand, and a book in your left...*

The boy is told about values that were previously highly respected but which are no longer there. Such values as being given a spear and a shield to go and steal cattle are no longer embraced. Now, focus has shifted to education; the boy is advised to acquire education. The boy is also advised to show respect to the people who brought him up: the grandfather, grandmother, the father and mother. The boy is reminded of being a man. To be a man is to be a grown up and to be independent and, to be held responsible for your actions.

During this time, a girl, his sister, who sits at the doorway facing outside, accompanies the boy. The boy is advised to respect the girl and especially at the time of marriage. The girl faces outside because she will leave home to get married while the boy will marry and bring the woman home. The boy is advised to respect the girl because when she gets married, they will bring in wealth in form of dowry. The boy to pay dowry for his wife in turn will use this. So here we notice gender hegemony, that the woman is only respected and valued based on the contribution she brings towards economic success. People's beliefs and view of the world are based in their position in society. Gramsci [20] argues that hegemony focuses on the location of power in everyday routine structures, which lead to the assimilation of the wider population into the dominating person's worldview.

We take cognizant of gender asymmetries in institutional authority. Gender emerges in the balances of activities that take place: such as who gives directives, it is the male empowered by the community. The circumciser acting as principal and author in the ritual *Khuvita*, leads the ritual discourse; he raises his opinions and endorses ideologies. He raises the dos and

don'ts of the community acting within the laws of Bukusu community. The oral performer brings out the oppositions of gender meanings, which are strongly embedded in the ritual *Khuvita*. The boy is told to open his eyes, to listen to the teacher at school and to ask questions about things he does not understand. He is asked to emulate the teacher who has acquired a teaching certificate because he worked hard and went up to University of Nairobi to get the certificate. With education, he will be able to help his family and the community. All the sound advice is directed to the boy, it is what is expected of him. As a circumcised boy, he is advised against such practices as gambling, stealing, and catapulting as these have negative consequences. They can attract fines and penalties, which can lead to losing family wealth. Family wealth is solely in the hands of male members of the community. They have the responsibility to protect it. The value of the girl is viewed as based in the qualities they bring to the table; the ability to improve the family wealth by bringing in dowry. The boy is consistently reminded that now he is a man and has to behave accordingly, thus the dichotomy of male and female is the ground upon which selves are built. This early linguistic acts set up the child for life; launching a gradual process of learning to be a boy or a girl, a man or a woman, and to see all others as boys or girls, men or women as well [21]. It is from this early stage, that gender is seen as a collaborative affair, that one must learn to perform as a male or a female, and that these performances require support from one's surroundings as is the case in circumcision.

Language is intricately connected to how we think about and make sense of the world. Language then is central to hegemony, philosophy and commonsense. We see the exercise of power and authority by a situated person who takes it upon himself to propound on the fundamental ethos of Bukusu community. However, in doing this we also note the cultural devaluation of women and of the feminine who remain passive in such rituals. Most boy things and boy activities are more highly valued than girls are; and boys are strongly discouraged from having interests or activities that are associated with girls. Most boys and girls learn that it is primarily men and not women who do important things as adults, have opinions that count, and direct events in the public world. The pressure towards gender conformity is asymmetry.

It is clear that hegemony is situated in the circumcision ritual, and in the initiation ritual *Khuvita*. Ritual itself is binding; it engages the totality of the heart, soul and the mind to produce effects within the social and mental worlds of the participants. The role of a woman clearly emerges here as that of, tilling the land. Implements like a hoe, a broom, are her tools of labour. Discourse is about the production of knowledge through language. In a social practice like the ritual

Khuvita, meaning is realized through a discursive aspect that shapes and influences what people do in Bukusu community and how they conduct themselves.

The boy is told not to play with young girls; when he marries, he should give his wife a hoe so she can till the land; he is also advised not to dwell with his mother. This amounts to proper conduct in Bukusu community. We notice how hegemonic masculinities are constructed in this community. Men are given privileges that lead them to believe they are entitled to greater rights and authority. Within the culture, women also internalize their subordination. Thus, Masculinities are the construction of the culture as a whole [22]. Masculinity and the denial of femininity is something that men have constantly to demonstrate both to women and to the other men.

The dominance of men and the subordination of women constitute a historical process. Masculine domination requires considerable effort to maintain and in Bukusu community, one of the strategies used to maintain it is through the exclusion of women. To sustain a given pattern of hegemony requires the policing of men as well as the exclusion or discrediting of women. The boy is also advised to avoid bad social places such as video houses, which have become a common practice at the market place. He is told that there are girls there who can mislead him. For him to get a good girl, he should first acquire education. With education, girls will come looking for him. The artist uses predication strategies to assign the qualities of 'misleading' to girls, that they can mislead boys. He also says that girls go after educated boys because of the promise of good life; they go after wealth. The issue here is that, education is for boys; girls do not get education but go after the educated boys. He goes ahead to argue that girls are carriers of bad diseases, therefore the boys should avoid them. Several negative traits are predicated to the discriminated group- the girls; women are misleading, they are unreasonable; they go after men's wealth, they have negative influence on men, thus they must be led. By use of such linguistic means and forms employed to realize these discriminatory predications, which combined with the desired positive ascriptions to the men- very often, result in polarizations dividing people into the leaders and the led, weak and strong, etc. [23].

Linguistic forms are used in the manipulations of power. Power is discursively exerted by the artist's control of the social occasion and the means of the genre *Khuvita* as ritual. Ritual activities can become a forum for contesting power equations and claiming the right to dominate the ritual order. The artist says that the boy will not find another person who will tell him these; this is because he has already done that. Hegemony emphasizes the importance of ideology in achieving and maintaining relations of domination [24].

Transition into Adulthood

After circumcision, the boy has to now act like a man. The ritual *Khuvita* is so significant in that, this is the time the boy is reminded of the change in his roles in society. The artist says, "We have come to get you out of your mother's cloth". Initiating a boy into adulthood is a collective responsibility of the members of the Bukusu community. The artist in his linguistic acts uses referential strategies. He uses the pronoun 'We' to make it all-inclusive and to gain support or consent from the other members of the community. The boy is told that they have come to get him out of his mother's cloth. - The artist constructs hegemonic masculinity by making a distinction between males and females and by assigning roles. We see the boy being submitted to gender policing as he crosses from childhood to adulthood. Masculinity and the denial of femininity is something that the boy and the men have to demonstrate constantly.

The artist's use of 'We' could be read to have a disguising or averting function in that, this ritual is performed by a man for a younger person-mainly male. The female members remain passive in the entire process, therefore the use of 'We' hides the fact that a specific treatment only concerns a sub-group of the people included in the 'We' and pretends there is equal treatment, whereas inequalities and injustices remain in effect.

The artist further says that the boy is now clothed in his father's cloth, and that he should keep in the company of his father. Women are often viewed in Bukusu community as having negative influence on men's socialization. In their child rearing responsibilities, they are often supervised by men or by older women who are dedicated to upholding male superiority. Therefore, although the females bring up the children, the process is embedded in a social system that changes slowly and that supports the persistence of patriarchal values [25]. The boy is told to embody masculinity by means of disowning femininity and getting involved in masculine activities. He is told not to dwell in the kitchen, not to be in the company of his mother and to avoid the girls' company. Such activities are contextually available masculine resources, which can be drawn on to accomplish masculinity [26].

We notice the oral artist making an ideological theme relating to social inequality. This is deeply rooted into the language and thereby into the consciousness of the Bukusu community. Such themes are taken to be natural and common sense. The girl child is being taken for granted. From the oral artist's discussion and argument, he discursively endorses the boy's supremacy without challenge. The only time when he mentions the girl is when he advises the boy to respect the girl because she will go out, to a foreign home, the

reason she is present during the ritual. When the girl goes away to the foreign home, (read to get married) she will make it possible for the boy to bring a wife home. This is because the boy will fetch bride price from the girl's husband.

We note the binding effect of rituals. Rituals are thought to act as powerful mechanisms for the construction of the self and the other, of personal and collective identities [27]. The oral artist tells the boy, 'now you have been initiated into the right ways... and whatever I have told you, do not ever tell someone else; this is between you and me'. Rituals have a binding effect on the person and the ritual content. Ritual can be read as a technique of mystification by which cultural authority can be produced and reproduced by participants to get the people accept these authority structures as natural, given and ideal.

The boy is told to produce boys for the world of work, and to produce girls too so they can get married and bring many cattle in the home. Here again we note the oral artist's use of referential and predication strategies to construct and objectivise the women; they are objects for the acquisition of wealth which comes in the form of dowry. Ritual in Bukusu community is an instrument for the regulation of human relationships. Rituals provide effective stimuli to produce the approved sentiments of loyalty and solidarity.

Conclusion

This paper has shown that Hegemonic masculinities are socially constructed in the Bukusu ritual *Khuvita*. At the same time, various strategies are employed in the representation of women in ritual discourse. Hegemonic masculinities are discursively constructed in ritual discourse. In preparing boys to become men during circumcision and as part of the process, gender inequality is sustained and reproduced. The Bukusu concept of masculinity is based on the proscription against being feminine. Boys and girls are raised differently from the beginning of their lives. Masculine ideals project boys out of and away from the family, whereas feminine ideals enmesh girls within it. The oral artist rationalises and justifies discriminatory acts against women; that men dominate women in all spheres. The strategies used to do this serve in various ways to legitimize and enact the distinction of the other. These stereotypes and attitudes are stored in children's memory structures, which are acquired initially during socialization. In Bukusu community, women are valued for their ability to provide labour and to reproduce, and to create wealth. Boys are advised to respect the girls because when they get married, they can fetch wealth in form of bride price.

References

1. Kreinath J., Snoek J. & Barbara; *Theorizing Rituals: Issues, Topics, Approaches, Concepts*. Boston: Brill Leiden. 2006. Print.

2. Ibid. Snoek & Barbara, 2006.
3. Fairclough N; *Critical and descriptive goals in discourse Analysis: Journal of pragmatics*; 1995; 9, 139-63
4. Foucault M; *The History of Sexuality*. (vol.1) Harmondsworth, England: penguin. 2006. Print.
5. Donaldson M; *Time of our Lives: Labour and Love in the Working Class*. Sydney: Allen& Unwin. 1993. Print.
6. Sarantakos S; *Social Research* 3rd Edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 2005. Print.
7. Norman KD & Lincoln YS Eds; *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London, SAGE. 2003. Print.
8. Wodak R; 'What CDA is about –A Summary of its History, important concepts and development', in Wodak and Meyer (eds) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis: Introducing Qualitative Methods*. London: Thousand Oaks. 2001. Print.
9. Reisigl M. & Wodak R; *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Anti-Semitism*. London: Routledge. 2001. Print.
10. Martin H; 'On the foundations of critical discourse analysis' In *language and communication*, 1997; 17 (3), 237-248.
11. Van Dijk TA; *Discourse, Semantics and Ideology*. *Discourse and Society*, 1995; 6 (2), 243-289.
12. Wodak J; 'Gender mainstreaming and the European Union: Interdisciplinarity, gender studies and CDA' in M. Lazar (ed) *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave. 2005. Print.
13. van Leeuwen T; 'The Representation of Social Actors'. In C.D Caldas Coulthard (eds). *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London Routledge. 1996. Print.
14. Kress G; *Communication and Culture: An Introduction*. Kensington: NSW. 1996. Print.
15. Wall & Wall; *Ideology and power*. In Samovar, L.A., Porter, E.R., McDaniel, E.R.(2012) *Intercultural Communication. A reader*. USA: Wadsworth. 2009. Print.
16. Ibid. Wall and Wall, 2009
17. Khaemba JM; *The Discursive Construction of Hegemonic Masculinities in Selected Rituals of the Bukusu of Kenya*. Egerton University; Unpublished Thesis. 2013. Print.
18. Giddens A; *Sociology*. 3rd Edition. Cambridge: Polity Press. 1997. Print.
19. Ruxton S; *Gender Equality and Men: Learning from Practice*. Great Britain: Oxfam. 2004. Print.
20. Gramsci A; *Selections from the Prison Note book*. London: Lawrence and Wishart. 1971. Print.
21. Penelope E & McConnell- Ginet; *Communities of Practice. Where language, gender and power all live*. In Coates Jennifer (1998) ed. 484-494.
22. Bourdieu P; *Understanding Power for Social Change*. New York: Greenwood. 2004. Print.
23. Reisigl and Wodak, 2001. [See note 9]
24. Laclau E & Mouffe C; *Hegemony and Social Strategy*. London: Verso. 1985. Print.
25. Ruxton S; *Gender, Equality and Men: Learning from Practice*. GB: Oxfam, 2004. Print
26. Messerschmidt JW; *Flesh and blood: Adolescent diversity and violence*. Lanham, M.D: Rowman and Littlefield. 2000. Print.
27. Kreinath J, Snoek J & Stausberg M eds; *Theorizing Rituals: Issues, Topics, Approaches, Concepts*. Boston: Brill Leiden, 2006. Print.