

Silence or Shame?:
The Armenian Public Reception of Sex Crimes and Armenian Female Sex
Crime Victims on Social Media

by

Serli Haladjian

Presented to the
Department of English & Communications
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts

American University of Armenia

Yerevan, Armenia

May 11, 2024

Table of Contents**Abstract****Literature Review****3Introduction****4****6Research Questions****13Methodology****14Research Findings and Analysis****19Limitations and Avenues for Further Research****34Conclusion****35References****38Appendix****40**

Abstract

This study explores the Armenian public reception of sex crimes on social media based on and influenced by the patriarchal norms that dictate Armenian women's social roles. For this study, I have chosen to analyze the posts and comments under Armenian activist and influencer Lucy Kocharyan's prominent Facebook hashtag #բռնություն_ձայլը, which roughly translates to "the voice of violence". Discourse Analysis, set in my methodological framework of Standpoint Theory and Feminist Epistemology, of the comments under these posts revealed how the majority of the commenters, as a reflection of the mass public, place focus on the victims of the sex crime rather than the offenders. In addition, the majority of the sentiments directed at the victims antagonize them, through severe blame and shame.

Key words: Sex Crimes, Sex Crime Victims, Sex Crime Perpetrators, Social Media, Public Reception, Discourse, Knowledge Construction, Knowledge Transmission

Silence or Shame?: The Armenian Public Reception of Sex Crimes and Armenian Female Sex Crime Victims on Social Media

Violent crimes have been the main dish at the dinner table of traditional media, from newspaper articles to television sitcoms, for centuries now. In more recent times, this same phenomenon has been on the rise alongside the rise of social media, where now, public opinion and discourse regarding violent crimes is much more accessible, via posting and commenting publicly. Under the umbrella term of violent crimes fall sex crimes, which have rendered their victims, especially female victims, subject to mass debate and discourse. Such discourse regarding female victims is typically based on morality, dignity, and safety in the presence of the public eye. In the case of Armenia, this is only further exacerbated by social structures dictating women's social roles as that of the *docile pure woman-mother* archetype (Aslanyan, 2007). However, it is also important to note the way that topics of sex, sexuality, and sex crimes are swept under the *Armenian* rug, as these topics are associated with shame and are labeled a dishonor in the face of the Armenian nation (Aharonian, 2010).

This idea pertains to and is highly associated with the normalization of instilling shame in the Armenian population through language. For example, the popular term “*amot*”, which roughly translates to “shameful”, is a term that is typically used against Armenian women, especially in contexts regarding their sexualities, bodies, and how they portray themselves (Aharonian, 2010). Thus, the female subjects of sex crime cases posted on Armenian social media accounts fall under mass societal judgment in Armenia and are often depicted as the perpetrators of their sex crimes; That is, the female victims fall under the scrutiny of questions of their whereabouts, their clothing choices, their demeanor, and so on. In addition, the excessive number of comments, which seek to shame women under sex crime case posts, in turn, further

influences the mass public reception towards sex crime victims. Based on these observations, there is a clear interplay between patriarchal social structures, the social roles for women that are the products of patriarchal structures, crime that is a product of social roles, and the public perception of crime that is further enhanced by the accessibility of social media.

The focus of my research is how dominant patriarchal social structures heavily influence public perception towards sex crimes and female sex crime victims, as well as how social media platforms have become the stomping grounds for the spread of information on sex crimes and public attitudes towards them. The focus of this research is Armenia and the shifting social roles of Armenian women from that of the *liberated woman-worker* in Soviet Armenia to that of the revisited *woman-mother* from pre-Soviet Armenia as seen in the contemporary female Armenian social role (Aslanyan, 2007). Despite the Armenian criminal code stating that sexual violence, such as rape, is illegal and would result in the prosecution of the sex crime offender, as stated in Section 7, Articles 138, 139, and 140 (National Assembly of RA, 2021), the Armenian public reception of sex crimes and female victims are often based on shame and blame of the female victims.

As media, specifically social media in present times, has become a central governing force in shaping ideas and transmitting knowledge, I am heavily invested in how topics like sex crimes would be translated into that mass generation of knowledge. The influence of Armenian women's social roles in present day Armenia and the society that reacts to it constitute the individuals within my society, and understanding why and how such ideas are dominant in presence within the world I live in provides some semblance of certainty. I intend to uncover the inner workings and historical depth of the Armenian-specific patriarchal oppression and shame of women's sexualities in situations that fully compromise them.

Literature Review

In the scope of Armenian social media, the discourse that surrounds sex crime cases and female sex crime victims online, which tends to widely be held within the comment sections of social media posts, is typically based on morality, dignity, and safety of Armenian women in the presence of the public eye. Such discourse is also exacerbated by the prevailing masculinist social structures that dominate every corner of knowledge construction and transmission within Armenian society. Thus, the female victims and narrators of sex crimes in Armenian social media posts fall under mass societal judgment and are often depicted as the perpetrators of their sex crimes; That is, they fall under the scrutiny of questions of their whereabouts, their clothing choices, their demeanor, and so on.

Armenian Women's Social Identity

It is crucial to understand the role of social identity within a society and, in this case, the role of Armenian women's social roles and identities that are dictated by the patriarchal norms deeply embedded in Armenian society. Social Identity Theory, as detailed by Jan E. Stets and Peter J. Burke (2000), in their article *Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory*, analyzes identity in group settings; being the analysis of individuals' relations, shared identities, and commonalities with their *in-group* and their comparisons, oftentimes rendered as othering, with *outgroups*. Social roles, as analyzed under the lens of Social Identity Theory, require certain expectations and norms of behavior that *in-group* members must adhere to not be outcasted and othered. Bringing these ideas of social identity and social roles into the Armenian context, in her chapter titled *Women's Social Identity from an Armenian Perspective: Armenian Woman, Soviet Woman, Post-Soviet Woman*, Svetlana A. Aslanyan (2007) dictates the timeline from pre-Soviet Armenia to post-Soviet Armenia through the lens of Armenian women's transformational social

roles, from that of the *woman-mother* to the *contemporary woman*. Despite the precursor to the *contemporary woman* being the Soviet Armenian “*liberated*” *woman worker*, since the fall of the USSR, there has been a steep decline in the association of Armenian women with the “*liberated woman worker*” social role. Since Armenian women are no longer expected to be in the workforce to the same extent as men, this pre-Soviet *woman-mother* social role has seeped back into the expected *in-group* identification of the Armenian *contemporary women*. This idea of Armenian women’s social identity being more in line with the *woman-mother* social role is further explored in Sevan Beukian’s article *Motherhood as Armenianness: Expressions of Femininity in the Making of Armenian National Identity* (2014). Beukian (2014) states that motherhood as an identity is a key factor in Armenian women’s identification which separates them from “others”, or in this case, the *outgroups*. As such, viewing “Armenianness” and “motherhood” from Armenian women’s perspectives is an essential part of understanding how “motherhood” has become interchangeable with the term “Armenian woman” in the construction of a national Armenian identity (Beukian, 2014). Furthermore, this understanding of motherhood as “Armenianness” can be viewed as nation-building when putting this idea into the historical context of the shifts Armenia endured as a nation throughout the 20th century. This perspective of Armenian women’s *in-group* social identity aligning with motherhood in itself has created an Armenian-centric dichotomous categorization of Armenian women within the confines of the *contemporary woman*, the likes of which can be understood through the application of the Madonna/Whore Complex.

The Madonna/Whore Complex

In her article, *How the Madonna-Whore Complex Affects Men's and Women's Mental Health*, Katharine Chan (2023) defines the Madonna/Whore Complex as being a product of

dominating male psychology and patriarchal dichotomous categorizations of women based on sexuality and the construct of “purity”. The categories, as blatantly stated in the name, are the Madonna, also known as the pure mother archetype of womanhood and one that is cherished but not viewed as a sexual being, and the Whore, which is the sexualized archetype of women who fail to adhere to the social norms of motherhood and “pure” womanhood (Chan, 2023). She explores the Madonna/Whore Complex on a psychological and social psychological level as well, as the article thoroughly explains the damaging effects of such a simplified categorization on a societal level. In the context of the Madonna/Whore Complex’s application in the media, albeit traditional media rather than social media, Ann Genovese’s chapter titled *Madonna and/or Whore: Feminism(s) and Public Sphere(s) in Romancing the tomes: Popular culture, law and feminism* (2002) explores how the Madonna/Whore Complex as a dominating social norm has been further perpetuated by sex crime portrayals in the media. That is to say that 20th century media coverages of sex crime cases have consistently fed the idea of female sex crime victims as being either innocent *Madonnas* who had fallen victims to dangerous male strangers or dangerous *Whores* who were the perpetrators in their victimization in sex crimes by innocent men to the public in order to appease to the dominant masculinist ideas on “women’s roles” in the act of sex crimes. In the Armenian context, Aslanyan (2007) also deals with this idea of categorization, mainly by insinuating the dominant *in-group* social norm convention, also circling back to Stets & Burke (2000), in Armenian society is that of the current *contemporary woman* who is heavily influenced by past notions of the *woman-mother* social role of Armenian women. In short, women who fall out of the dominant *in-group* social role of the Armenian-centric idea of the Madonna are ostracized, and heavily compared to the *out-group* of the Armenian-centric idea of the Whore. In addition, Lara Aharonian (2010), in her article

Aharonian: Sex and Nationalism, discusses the shame surrounding the discourse, or lack thereof, of women's sexuality in Armenia, as well as the scrutiny Armenian women face if they have engaged in sexual activities outside of marriage. She also explains the ties of Armenian identity with that of the nation as a whole and states that the lack of discourse surrounding Armenian women's sexuality is rarely considered as a missing platform to keep women safe from sexual violence, but rather a way to preserve their Armenian identity. Thus, rendering an Armenian woman's victimhood in the act of a sex crime a feast for judgment.

Sex Crime Victims as Legal Subjects

With the understanding of women's antagonized victimhood on a social level in mind, it is just as vital to take sex crime justification and victim-blaming on a legal level into account. In her chapter of *Romancing the Toms: Popular Culture, Law and Feminism*, Isabel Karpin (2002) sheds light on the way masculinist knowledge construction bleeds into legal court and can influence judges' perceptions and rules over sex crime cases. She views the judges as audiences of media, as she states that popular culture and media often warp judicial outcomes. In turn, such outcomes also reflect societal outlooks on these sex crime cases. Thus, sex crimes of a similar nature that are confined to the social playground of social media lay exposed to the judgment of the public and their commentary tools. Focusing on women's narratives coming into contact with the patriarchally dominant legal court, Carol Smart, in her essay *Law's Power, The Sexed Body, Feminist Discourse* in her book *Law, Crime and Sexuality: Essays in Feminism* (1995), lays out the numerous issues regarding the silencing, suppressing, and twisting of women's perspectives, testimonies, and narratives in the courtroom if they do not align with the norms and values of male-dominated jurisprudence. These include the issues of the perception of law as a normative body of absolute truth, which in turn enables certain norms and conventions as true, and the

projection of women as sexed subjects and masculinist ideas of female sexuality projected onto women in the context of sex crimes (Smart, 1995). This once again ties in to the ideas that both Genovese (2002) and Karpin (2002) explore about the masculinist approach to highlighting or silencing women through labeling them as *Madonnas* or *Whores* based on their adherence to the patriarchal roles set for women as being one or the other and how this masculinist knowledge can seep into the legal level of society and thus influence judicial outcomes, respectively. In short, the possible results of a woman's verbalized testimony of her sex crime is a double-edged sword.

In Armenia, the *Criminal Code of the Republic of Armenia* (National Assembly of RA, 2021), under Chapter 18, *Crimes against sexual immunity and sexual freedom*, lays out the criminalization of several sex crimes, from rape to specified sexual acts with persons under the age of 16, as well as the terms of imprisonment for each of the criminalized sexual acts that are mentioned from Articles 138-142. With its application in Armenian society, Javier Truchero, Ana Urrutia, and Lusine Sargsyan (2017), in their report titled *Gap analysis of Armenian criminal law in light of the standards established by the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence* discuss both the Council of Europe's conventions' laws regarding sexual violence, domestic violence, and marital rape, as well as those concerning The Criminal Code of Armenia. As their findings suggest, the Armenian criminal law regarding sexual violence is far behind the Council of Europe's conventions' standards. Among the data they present, what is most notable is that while the law does not mitigate the circumstances of sexual violence as a product of "religious reasons" or "honor", under Article 62, the criminal code justifies cases in which the illegal or immoral behavior of the victim is taken into account (Truchero, Urrutia, & Sargsyan, 2017). Thus, not only does this lay the grounds for the justification of sex offenders in Armenia, but also the

greater attention placed on the victims rather than the offenders in the judgment of sex crimes. To see this more clearly reflected in Armenian society, Vladimir Osipov and Jina Sargizova, in their UNFPA report of their sociological survey titled *Men and Gender Equality in Armenia* (2016), illustrate the dominant Armenian patriarchal societal attitudes towards sex crimes. They present statistical findings of men's attitudes towards issues related to sexual violence and sex crime victims, in which, for example, they note that 82.4% of Armenian men justify rape with the most common answer being "In any rape case, one would have to question whether the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation" (Osipov & Sargizova, 2016).

Social Media and Influences on Sex Crime Perception

In their research article titled *Impacts of Media on Society: A Sociological Perspective*, Hakim Khalid Mehraj, Akhtar Neyaz Bhat, and Hakeem Rameez Mehraj (2014) present findings based on media, including social media, function in society, knowledge construction, and the challenges that media power has on individual autonomy. Their research extends to analyzing social media as a tool of both change and reinforcement, as well as the nuances that come with how certain topics in media, such as sexual violence, can create a confusing clash of judgment with both negative and more lenient views toward sex crimes, victims, and sexual offenders. In the coverage of sex crimes online, Andrew Harris and Kelly Michael Socia, in their study titled *What's in a Name? Evaluating the Effects of the "Sex Offender" Label on Public Opinions and Beliefs* (2016), dwell on the topic of placing heavy emphasis on the title of *sex offender* in the media and online discourse and the societal impact that such labels have on individuals' opinions and beliefs regarding sex crimes. The findings show how great the effects the term "sex offender" has on societal attitudes towards offenders and how this leads to increased societal efforts to push for justice and accountability on both a societal and legal level. Focusing deeper

on the interconnected nature between public perception of sex crimes and public policy, the study conducted by Stacey Katz-Schiavone et al. titled *Myths and Facts About Sexual Violence: Public Perceptions and Implications for Prevention* (2008) reveals that public reception of sex crime cases are and can be heavily influenced by popular myths and misconceptions of sexual violence, which are oftentimes exacerbated by the spread of such misinformation online. In turn, similar to Harris & Socia's (2016) findings, Katz-Schiavone et al. (2008) concludes that widespread misconceptions about sexual violence also heavily impact legislatures, and thus, also impact legislatures in passing laws that effectively tackle sex crimes. This all culminates in the experiences and public perceptions of members in society in regards to sex crimes and sex crime victims. Such is the case of public perceptions of sex crime victims in Armenia, especially considering the factor of Armenian women's social identity (Aslanyan, 2007) which has been accepted nationwide as the dominant *in-group* social identity of Armenian women (Stets & Burke, 2000).

Current Armenian Public Perceptions of Sex Crimes

The publication by Amnesty International titled *No pride in silence: Countering violence in the family in Armenia* (2008) brings light to the importance of the late 20th century and the collapse of the Soviet Union in shaping Armenian women's social role and reimagining the prominent motherhood role in contemporary Armenian women's identification in the face of issues regarding sexual violence. The publication mainly focuses on sexual violence as a product of domestic abuse but also dives deep into the prominence of sexual violence that happens within the workplace and outside the sphere of the household. However, the common consensus expressed in the text is how Armenian women are discouraged, whether directly or indirectly, by the public to speak up and bring awareness to their sex crime cases. On the other hand, in her

article *In Armenia, Women Are Breaking the “Law of Silence” on Rape*, Ani Paitjan (2019) discusses the recent trend of Armenian women opening up about their experiences with various sex crimes. This trend is facilitated and supported by the wide array of platforms and possibilities for Armenian women to remain anonymous as they shed light on their experiences with sexual violence. Paitjan (2019) specifically focuses on the activist Lucy Kocharyan’s hashtag where women’s stories of sexual violence, as they have privately messaged Kocharyan, were consensually publicized and the names of the victims remained anonymous. She brings up several recent sex crime cases of both Armenian and foreign women in Armenia and how their decision to open up, even on social media, has created a ripple effect of prompting Armenian women to discuss their victimhood more openly.

The literature I have chosen to engage with and utilize in the scope of my research has aided me in providing extensive knowledge and insight into several background issues related to my analysis of the Armenian public reception to sex crimes and victims online. Such aspects that I have taken into account for my research purposes, as aforementioned, include the Armenian patriarchal social structures which dictate women’s social roles, the role of legal systems’ in societal perceptions of sex crimes, and the impact of social media on societal discourse regarding social issues. The literature that I have mentioned has also been instrumental in the process of structuring and identifying my main research questions, as my research questions themselves have been the driving force behind my analysis process.

Research Questions

My primary research question for this study is “What are the Armenian societal attitudes toward female sex crime victims online?” This question is the driving force behind my research for this project and will be used to analyze my two cases of study. This question encompasses

my findings that are deeply rooted in my discourse analysis and the feminist methodological framework in which I have set my research method.

My secondary research question, which serves as a sub-question to my primary research question, is “Are the Armenian public’s commented sentiments more focused on discussing the sex crime victim(s) or the perpetrator(s) of sex crimes? Which individuals tend to be viewed in a harsher and more negative light?”

Methodology

My primary research method of choice in the scope of my study is discourse analysis, as discussed by Gabriele Griffin (2014). Since discourse analysis deals with analyzing all modes of knowledge transmission through written, and even verbal, language and imagery, this method is the most useful for my analysis of the Armenian public reception to sex crimes online as reflected through commented sentiments under these publicized posts. In addition, as Griffin (2014) describes discourse analysis, it is a method of research which contextualizes a given text in the larger context of political and social motivation, as language analyzed under context can never be neutral (Griffin, 2014). The methodological framework, in which I have nested my discourse analysis in, comprises two feminist epistemologies, which are standpoint theory (Harding, 2004) and feminist epistemology (Code, 1991). The data I have collected during the research process is both qualitative and quantitative.

As such, I have based my analysis on how the general social and political experiences of the commenters under posts regarding sex crime cases have shaped their views of Armenian women, sex crimes, female victimhood in sex crimes, and even sex offenders. I have also utilized my methodological framework to analyze the social location of the commenters and how

their knowledge and justifications are rooted in oppressive masculinist modes of knowledge construction.

Standpoint theory

Sandra Harding's (2004) conception of standpoint theory is a theory which highlights the connection between the production of knowledge and practices of power within a given society. Standpoint theory illuminates the pivotal role of certain politics and social structures in stimulating knowledge which is concerned to be the norm, as well as guiding it to further maintain certain normative conventions and dogmas (Harding, 2004). As applied to patriarchal society, standpoint theory seeks to establish modes of knowledge construction and transmission which is *for* women, rather than knowledge which places women as "objects" of research, and challenges the natural and social order (Harding, 2004).

I decided to integrate standpoint theory into my methodological framework as I utilized discourse analysis to draw relations between the authoritative position of the commenters, as analyzed by the content of their commented sentiments, and the production of knowledge. As discourse analysis is a research method which states that language is invested in the political and social, standpoint theory was an essential component in my methodological framework. This is especially due to the fact that standpoint theory views this understanding of the non-neutrality of language from the standpoint of power being held in masculinist social structures. Thus, weaving discourse analysis into a methodological framework consisting of standpoint theory was a sure-fire path for me to take in the construction of my research on the Armenian public reception to sex crimes online.

Feminist epistemology

Lorraine Code (1991) describes feminist epistemology as a critical and self-reflective model of interpreting and disseminating knowledge. It is a feminist model of social science based on subjectivity and deviates from the typically venerated patriarchal conceptions of what constitutes “factual” knowledge, which tends to be that which is “objective” (Code, 1991). Unlike masculinist modes of epistemology, feminist epistemology highlights the epistemic value of subjectivity as well as the constructor of the subjective knowledge that is being produced (Code, 1991).

I decided to also include feminist epistemology into my methodological framework as it provided the space within my research for the highlighting and analysis of the subjective recounts of sex crime story authors and the reception of commenters. As my research was based on the Armenian public reception to sex crimes online, the subjective nature of the analysis I was to conduct necessitated an epistemology based on subjectivity in my research. In addition, the integration of feminist epistemology in my methodological framework was also essential in my discourse analysis of the Armenian public’s comments and analyzing what the dominant truth claims made by the commenters consisted of. The most important component of analyzing these truth claims, however, was understanding to what subjective extent did these commenters adhere to patriarchal conceptions of sex crimes.

Research Context and Design

In the process of my research, I decided to focus on the prominent Armenian activist and influencer Lucy Kocharyan’s Facebook-based hashtag #բռնուղբյան_ձայնը, which roughly translates to “the voice of violence”. Under this hashtag, which gained nationwide traction in 2019, Kocharyan would post, with the full consent of the women

who would privately message her, the stories of Armenian women's sexual assault to shed light on the issue of sex crimes in Armenia being kept behind closed doors. However, Kocharyan's striking approach to raising the voices of Armenian women who have faced a wide range of sexual assault and violence profoundly backfired. The public reception towards these stories, as observed through the Facebook comment sections of these posts, were mainly severely negative and were focused on either blaming the women for the assault they faced, shaming them, justifying the perpetrators, or even a combination of all or some of the mentioned sentiments.

The research design I had chosen to formulate my findings through was by narrowing down my research participants to that of Lucy Kocharyan's hashtag and specifically focusing on three stories that were posted under the hashtag. I selected these three cases to analyze based on the fact that they had gained the most traction in terms of reactions and comments, with my most prominent case receiving a total of 26 reactions and 58 comments. Following this same logic, I also decided to focus my analysis on the commented sentiments under these posts on only the top five most popular comments under each post based on the number of reactions they received. Overall, I have conducted my research on a total of fifteen comments left by the Armenian public in reaction to these anonymous Armenian women's sex crime stories.

With each of these three posts, I have formulated my research based on, firstly, what the nature of each sex crime was, as sex crimes encompass a wide range of sex-based offenses and violence, but each share the common denominator of a non-consensual sexual act. Next, I focused on who these commenters focused on addressing in their commented sentiments, whether they directed their comments at the sex crime victim, the perpetrator, both, or other individuals within these sex crime stories. Finally, I analyzed what the perception of these

commenters were regarding the individual(s) they addressed in their comments, especially when their sentiments were based on morality, dignity, and legality with their intentions on shaming or blaming the individual(s) they addressed within their comments.

The language of the sex crime stories and the comments which I chose to analyze were predominantly in Armenian, with only the exception of one comment which was in English. As I do not have the ability to read and write in Armenian, I received the help of a local Armenian colleague and support team member of mine, Mane Yesayan, during the process of choosing the stories and comments, as well as translating them. We divided the translation process into two parts. The first part consisted of Yesayan reading through the selected stories and comments out loud so I could hear the material I set myself to work with in its original language. During the second part, she conducted her translation, where she implemented both the literal translation of the texts, as well as the deeper meaning that the original Armenian texts held. Thus, I conducted my Discourse Analysis of only the English translated texts rather than the original texts.

In addition, during my capstone creation, I was evaluating the necessity and the possibilities of perhaps conducting an interview with one or more women's rights activists, such as Ani Jilozian from the Women's Support Center, for the purpose of gaining further insight on the phenomenon of the dominant Armenian reception towards sex crimes in Armenia, via online comments. Unfortunately, due to other responsibilities that I had which diverted my attention during the time frame when I had approximately planned to set up interviews, I was unable to follow through with this area of interview-based research.

As a result, the vast majority of my area of research lay in my analysis of the discourse which took place within the comment sections of the three most popular posts under Lucy Kocharyan's hashtag on Facebook. The entirety of my research was strictly limited to the data

presented to me through simple observation of commented sentiments under these selected posts and my Discourse Analysis of them based on my methodological framework of Standpoint Theory and Feminist Epistemology. Thus, my research design is simply confined to this research paper, with no external sources of information other than my extensive corpus of literature as provided in my literature review.

Research Findings and Analysis

To analyze these three stories posted by Lucy Kocharyan, it is crucial to understand that Kocharyan's movement was deeply rooted in the idea of shifting the narrative from displaying victims of sexual assault as the key emphasis within publicized sex crime cases to emphasizing the perpetrator's role in the act of the sex crime (Harris & Socia, 2016). As Sandra Harding dictates in her construction of Standpoint Theory, women's movements, such as Lucy Kocharyan's movement, need a constructed form of knowledge that is *for* women, rather than one that places women as *subjects* of masculinist modes of knowledge (Harding, 2004). Furthermore, these stories of women's varying experiences with sexual assault and violence were strictly subjective accounts as provided by the women who had privately messaged Lucy Kocharyan. As Lorraine Code discusses in her chapter on knowledge subjectivity, women, under patriarchal systems of knowledge construction and transmission, have been co-signed with their role in this process of knowledge construction as being "insignificant" subjective transmitters of knowledge (Code, 1991). As such, the social position of the majority of these commenters, mainly consisting of Armenian men, places them in a hierarchical position of utilizing these women's role in knowledge construction as a tool for oppression and social control (Code, 1991).

The discourse of the sex crime stories and their comments are facilitated online, specifically Facebook, which is a relatively novel form of discourse. As Gabriele Griffin states, discourse assigns certain roles to the “actors” in discourse, where traditionally, these roles consist of the author, or speaker, and the audience within discourse (Griffin, 2014). In the case of the discourse taken place online, more specifically under Lucy Kocharyan’s hashtag, Kocharyan is herself the speaker, and the audience themselves are also speakers, as they are the authors of commented sentiments under the stories.

Post 1:

The first post I analyzed, which has received 58 comments and 26 reactions, details the experience of an unethically authorized doctor’s visit by the older brother of one woman when she was a 12-year-old girl. The woman states that she would experience severe pain in her tailbone and had to go to a doctor to understand the source of her medical issue. Thus, her older brother, without her knowledge of the doctor’s area of profession, took her to a gynecological doctor who abstained from inquiring about her tailbone pain and instead directed her to sit on a gynecological chair where he forced two of his fingers into her with no warning or given consent whatsoever. No matter how much she cried or begged for the examination to end, the doctor and the female nurse who was with them in the room ignored her and would occasionally tell her to stop fighting against the procedure. The nature of the crime in this first case is a non-consensual medical exam of a minor executed by a licensed doctor and nurse. The medical exam included the doctor’s abrupt insertion of his fingers into her vagina with no prior notice given by the doctor and no consent given by the patient.

This case, in the huge wave of posts that Lucy Kocharyan had posted, garnered a lot of attention from the Armenian public, receiving the greatest number of comments out of all the

posts. The majority of the discourse I observed in the commented sentiments of the public surrounded the justification and denial of the nature of the woman's case as being labeled a sex crime. The comment which received the most likes under the post, with a total of 14 comments, stated "I think there was no violence here, but just a rude and indifferent attitude from the doctor. What is described is a standard proctological procedure." The comment which received the second to most likes of 10 likes in total stated "Perhaps the doctor was a proctologist. He probably did an internal examination to understand whether there is a process from the inside or not (from the anus). The process is naturally painful. The stool is the same as the gynecological one. I don't think it's possible to say that it was violence. I'm saying as a patient, after going to the doctor with a similar problem." Another comment, which received 8 likes in total, held a similar position on the matter: "There is absolutely no element of violence here. Hopefully, the girl will get married and will have many more physiological opportunities to communicate with doctors, to enjoy pregnancy, childbirth and the joy of motherhood in general. The dates were not mentioned, I assume from the written text that it will still happen in the future."

The first two commenters focus on the doctor, who is the perpetrator of the sex crime, as the focal point of their reception towards the sex crime story, and the latter places emphasis on the sex crime victim. As presented, the three commenters explicitly disregarded the woman's unconsented experience as being sexually violent or a violation. Instead, the commenters, as several others in the comment section also state, justified the actions of the doctor as being a standard medical procedure. The authors of the comments also assume a position of authority with their sentiment, as they both use the personal pronoun "I" to indicate their own attitudes towards the text (Griffin, 2014).

Applying my Discourse Analysis, as set in my methodological framework, knowledge construction and transmission within Armenian society is heavily rooted in the dichotomous categorizations of objective and subjective modes of knowledge (Code, 1991). As such, the discursive conventions (Griffin, 2014) of presenting sex crime cases, given the violent nature that is typically associated with them, is to provide “factual” and “objective” evidence of the crime that was committed. With this in mind, the commenters' reception of the case rule out violence and instead emphasize the fact that the male doctor, as being in a high hierarchical position, was simply performing a standard medical procedure. In addition, the fact that the woman’s telling of her experience was based on her subjective narration of what she experienced at a young age, the relations of power (Griffin, 2014) between the now-older woman and the doctor were observed by the commenters of what is “usually” seen as the case within this power relation. That is, the woman’s experience is viewed as “unjustified” through lack of “objective” evidence and conventional patriarchal knowledge, and the doctor’s actions were justified as being standard medical procedure. Furthermore, the first commented sentiment also focuses on both denying the experience of the label of sexual violence and situating the woman in a hypothetical future in which motherhood would be her main goal. The social location and role of the woman, as imposed by the Armenian patriarchal system of knowledge construction and transmission, is that of the dominant *in-group* social identity of the *woman-mother* (Aslanyan, 2007; Beukian, 2014; Harding, 2004; Stets & Burke, 2000).

The fourth comment which I analyzed garnered a total of 8 likes and stated “And what did the pain in the tailbone have to do with the gynecologist and why did they take her to the gynecologist?” The commenter’s focus is on both the victim and the perpetrator, as they ask questions regarding the context of the victim’s visit to the doctor. At the same time, the

commenter does not address the sex crime in any way. The commenter's reception of the sex crime is one of demanding more context and a disregard of the fact that the underage victim experienced a non-consensual medical procedure at the hands of a much older practitioner; thus feeding into the discursive socially constructed reality of gaining a bigger picture of the situation through what is socially venerated as "objective" knowledge before ruling out any stance of the sex crime's validity (Code, 1991; Griffin, 2014).

The social location of the commenter, within the sphere of the dominant patriarchal state of the Armenian society, showcases their conformity to the social order (Harding, 2004) of attempting to "dig for evidence" in order to satisfy the typically held ideals of what constitutes sexual violence and what does not. The lack of discourse surrounding the actual sex crime itself is a product of the long-held social convention in Armenian society regarding Armenian women's sexualities and any sex-related instance, which includes discourse on sexual violence and consent (Aharonian, 2010). The nature of the commenter's questions also stems from a place of the discursive conventions of sexual violence in Armenia, as one that could possibly be justified (Griffin, 2014; Osipov & Sargizova, 2016).

The nature of the last comment I analyzed, which received 5 likes from the time of posting until now, strays away from the previous commenters' sentiments, which were primarily based on the justification of the sex crime and the nod to the lack of some "objective" and "factual" evidence behind the truth claims of the sex crime victim. The commenter stated "By the way, just yesterday in the group dedicated to childbirth, we were talking about the violence shown by doctors towards clients, about the fact that there is absolutely no limit to taking care of someone else's body. There is a lot to do there, because the doctors consider themselves the most capable and do not acknowledge boundaries, starting from the dentist to the gynecologist. They are very

incompetent people.” The commenter’s focus is on the perpetrator of the sex crime, and addresses the issue of other medical practitioners who commit similar offenses. At the same time, the commenter does not address the sex crime victim in any way. The author of the comment also positions themselves in their perspective on sex crimes of a similar nature by using the personal pronoun “we” and refers to a group to indicate that they are not the only authority of their truth claim (Griffin, 2014).

The typical discursive conventions, in this case, are challenged by the author, primarily in the author’s truth claim surrounding their use of the term *violence* to showcase that the referred sex crime story is not a standalone experience (Griffin, 2014). As the commenter stated that their understanding of the fact that the experience of the sex crime victim is not a case which comes in a vacuum, due to the fact that they had shared and learned about similar stories through different individuals, is a testament to the need for there to be a feminist epistemology and mode for the construction and transmission of knowledge that is *for* women (Code, 1991; Harding, 2004). The commenter’s sentiment is in line with the opposite of the discursive convention, in which women’s experiences and contributions to a growing body of knowledge is not deemed as insignificant (Code, 1991; Harding, 2004). Thus, the discursive convention is put to the test (Griffin, 2014). The commonality of the sex crime, according to the commenter, is further intensified through their truth claim expression (Griffin, 2014) of the state of medical practitioners in Armenia, by stating that the majority, from dentists to gynecologists, are *incompetent people*, where sexual violence and assault is more common than the number of cases which actually get reported in professional and workplace settings (Amnesty International, 2008).

Post 2:

The nature of the sex crime of the second case, which received a whopping 236 reactions and only 9 comments, was that of a woman who was raped at the age of 22 after graduating from Yerevan State University. The woman states that she was a young girl who would receive the attention of men who came from rich families. Soon, one of these men began to keep consistent communication with her. However, as the woman states, she did not fall in love with him. After her cancelation of a meeting between the two, the man grew furious as he swore at her, created accusations against her, and even later on threatened her and claimed she had driven him to near suicide. Two months later, he called her using an unknown number and claimed that he wanted to meet with her again to simply return a book to her. When she entered his car, he told her that the book was not with him and that he would drive them to his home so he could give her the book there. However, while on the road, the woman noticed that he was driving in a different direction and was not taking her to his home. When she pointed this out to him, he beat her unconscious and she woke up with bruises and noticed that she had lost her virginity. The victim also noted that she is now married to another man who did not react to her sex crime story by blaming or shaming her.

The majority of the commented sentiments under this post surrounded the claims that the story lacked “objective” evidence of the woman’s rape, denying the authenticity of the story, and shaming the woman. However, the comment which received the most attention and likes under the post, with a total of 5 likes, was that of a commenter who stated “That bastard will get his punishment from god...I wish you happiness.” Another comment, which received 0 likes, was a simple short comment written in English, which stated “Wow, respect.” Both commenters here expressed solidarity with the sex crime victim, as both of their comments address the victim in their sentiments; the first commenter also takes a full authoritative standpoint in their discourse

as they use the proper pronoun “I”, which enhances their sentiment as one of their own (Griffin, 2014). However, the first commenter also addressed the perpetrator of the sex crime, further opposing the discursive convention of sex crime discourse and challenging dominant power relations. (Code, 1991; Griffin, 2014).

Critical discourse analysis, set in my feminist methodological framework, reveals how discourse, such as online commented sentiments, contributes to the reinstatement of existing power relations within a society (Code, 1991; Griffin, 2014; Harding, 2004). When one strays away from the dominant discursive conventions and truth claims, which are deeply rooted in masculinist modes of knowledge construction and transmission, surrounding societal norms in matters deeply rooted in oppressive practices, the symbolic discursive reality of relations to power are challenged (Griffin 2014; Harding, 2004). The language used by the first commenter takes on a deeper challenge to the discursive norm in Armenian society, as they address the sex crime perpetrator and use the term *bastard* to address them as such. The link between the language used in their comment and socio-cultural practices (Griffin, 2014), as normalized under the patriarchal Armenian society, is one which seeks to place emphasis on the sex crime perpetrator and further push for increased efforts for the normalization of terms such as “offenders” and “perpetrators” in the scope of sex crime discourse on social media (Harris & Socia, 2016). Thus, the social location of these two commenters is that which challenges discursive conventions, through the direct encouragement of the sex crime victim and the indirect encouragement of Lucy Kocharyan and her sharing of the sex crime story (Harding, 2004; Paitjan, 2019).

The first of the next two comments, which received 3 likes, stated “Lucy Kocharyan, how do you prove the authenticity of the materials you posted? I am sure that your page is fake,

opened for a special purpose. I do not rule out that there will be people who will send their actual life stories, but most of them are false stories.” The second commenter stated “It’s a lie, it’s a lie and it’s a lie again. A girl can’t be that stupid at 22.” This comment received 1 like. The first comment of the two addresses Lucy Kocharyan herself and questions the authenticity of her truth claims due to a supposed lack of “objective” evidence, as well as the authenticity of most sex crime stories under her hashtag, and takes a full authoritative stance of this questioning through their use of the proper pronoun “I” (Code 1991; Griffin, 2014). The second commenter targets the sex crime victim herself and does not take an authoritative position on the matter, but rather situates their truth claim in dominant masculinist modes of knowledge, which seek to solidify a normative “objective” epistemology regarding men and women under a patriarchal society (Code, 1991; Griffin, 2014; Harding, 2004).

Critical discourse analysis shows that discourse, such as online commented sentiments, contributes to the reinstatement of existing power relations within a society (Griffin, 2014). As both the narrator and publisher of the text are women, whose situated subjective knowledge is deemed insignificant under oppressive masculinist social structures of knowledge construction and transmission (Code, 1991; Harding, 2004), the social positions of the commenters view this subjective recount of events as false and lacking in “authentic” and “objective” evidence. The first commenter also questions Kocharyan’s authority in publicizing this case, along with her other posted cases, as she does not provide enough objective evidence to satisfy the venerated structure of knowledge transmission that governs the dominant patriarchal modes of knowledge (Code, 1991). In addition, the second commenter blatantly blames the female victim of the sex crime by stating that what she has narrated was a lie because, according to the patriarchal norms of knowledge construction, her level of intellect should not have landed her in such a

compromising situation. This leads to the indirect blame and shame placed on the victim, as indicated in the structure of the commenter's discourse (Griffin, 2014). Thus, the indirect sentiment lies in the questioning of whether or not the woman was aware of what she was doing, as her actions could have led to the provocation of the man's reaction, and as such, the blame is placed on the victim ((Osipov & Sargizova, 2016; Truchero, Urrutia, & Sargsyan, 2017). The social location of the commenter here is one which adheres to the patriarchal modes of knowledge construction and transmission (Harding, 2004), and the language they used to describe the sex crime victim in denial of her intellectual capacity is one which positions the victim in the *out-group* of women, where the supposed falsity of her truth claims render her image as a *Whore* in the dominant dichotomous categorization of women under patriarchal society (Chan, 2023; Stets & Burke, 2000). This perspective of the commenter is further fueled by the political location of the commenter in the Armenian society, where masculinist modes of knowledge construction and transmission hold the norm of placing "objective" stances and truths and myths regarding socio-cultural practices, such as the spread of patriarchal understandings of women's sexualities in Armenia (Aharonian, 2010; Code, 1991; Harding, 2004; Katz-Schiavone et al., 2008). This can even be viewed from the point of the political position of the commenter, as within the Armenian Criminal Code Article 62 itself, sexual assault and violence cases are justified if the victim displayed some form of provoking behavior (National Assembly of RA, 2021; Truchero, Urrutia, & Sargsyan, 2017).

The last comment under this post, which received 1 like since the time of posting, was one which entirely did not address the sex crime itself, nor the victim, perpetrator, or Kocharyan themselves. Instead, the commenter stated "Your husband has a great soul", which addressed the victim's current husband, whose mention in the sex crime story post was limited to just the tail-

end of the post. Although the sentiment of the commenter strays away from the discursive conventions intrinsic to the discourse of sex crimes in Armenian society, the commenter also adheres to the Armenian social convention of remaining silent in the face of discussions regarding Armenian women's sexualities and female sex-based discourse, as the norm stems from the larger cultural context of labeling such discussions as "amot", or "shameful" (Aharonian, 2010; Griffin, 2014).

Post 3:

The final sex crime story I analyzed under Kocharyan's hashtag, which received a total of 40 reactions and 17 likes, was a woman's story from when she was a 13-year-old girl who would receive strange looks from her 24-year-old teacher in school. She stated that after he left his job, she also lost any contact with him until 2019 when he approached her at a store. They kept a line of communication from that point on and he confessed to being in love with her. She refused to date him and they agreed to remain friends. Later on, they met again when they gathered with a group of mutual friends. As she was leaving the gathering, the man followed her through a crowded area and proceeded to attack and grope her, but she managed to escape. She once again lost contact with him until he showed up at the entrance of her home one day and threatened to harm her because she did not want a relationship with him. The victim tried to run away from him, but he caught her where there was no one in sight and sexually assaulted her by pressing her against the wall, kissing her against her will, and attempting to put his hand in her pants. The victim stated that the man still threatens her to this day and that she wishes to report his behavior but is worried that she does not have the "facts" to back up her claims. The victim did not specify her age at the time of both of her sex crimes, which were both cases of sexual assault.

The commented sentiments under this post varied quite drastically in terms of the public's reception to the sex crime story and the victim. The sentiments ranged from commenters who supported the sex crime victim and those who mocked her or, once again, questioned the authenticity of Lucy Kocharyan's movement and the stories she posted under her hashtag. In fact, two of the comments I analyzed, which both received 4 likes each, the greatest number of likes in the entire comment section, bore contrasting sentiments and were directed towards different actors within the online discourse of the sex crime story.

The first of the two comments which received 4 likes was that of a commenter who stated "Sorry, of course, I believe that there are stories that are true, but half of the stories here are not believable. I wrote my opinion." Though they questioned the authenticity of the majority of the sex crime stories under Kocharyan's hashtag, including this one, the commenter did not directly target or address any specific actors within the online discourse under the post. However, through the commenter's use of the personal pronoun "I" to establish an authoritative position behind their opinion on the sex crime story posts in general and not regarding the content of the sex crime story of the post they commented under, their comment was ultimately meant to address the audience of the discourse (Griffin, 2014), as well as Kocharyan herself. Another comment under the post, which received 0 likes, bore a similar sentiment to the previous one, as the commenter stated "It is a lie, this country is not full of innocent girls." Once again, the commenter did not target any specific actor tied to the discourse surrounding the sex crime story post, but rather this commenter addresses the audience by adhering to the socially constructed discursive convention of sex crime discourse in Armenian society (Griffin, 2014).

My analysis of the two comments revealed the socio-cultural convention of knowledge construction and transmission under patriarchal society is one which requires a rigid standard of

“objective” knowledge which would be deemed “believable” (Code, 1991; Griffin, 2014). In the case of Armenian society, one which is inherently homogenous and patriarchal to its core, social, cultural, and political influences of the commenters, such as the greater general discourse surrounding sex crimes which take place on social media, lead to the Armenian public’s knowledge construction and transmission regarding the “norms” and “objective truths” of sex crimes (Harding, 2004; Mehraj, Bhat, & Mehraj, 2014). The commenters’ adherence to the discursive conventions (Griffin, 2014) of sex crime discourse on social media in Armenia, where knowledge construction and transmission is based on a wide variety of users’ social and political locations on a larger scale, thus further reinstate the dominant power relations key to Armenian society (Harding, 2004; Mehraj, Bhat, & Mehraj, 2014). The second comment in particular focuses on the masculinist categorization of women in Armenia. The commenter stated that the majority of girls in Armenia are not “innocent”, and thus, the commenter’s knowledge of the dichotomous categorization of women in either an “innocent” *Madonna* social role or a “sinful” *Whore* social role (Genovese, 2002) is an immediate reflection of the standard social conventions of the *contemporary woman* social role in Armenia (Aslanyan, 2007). However, the commenter’s sentiment is also one which challenges the discursive conventions (Griffin, 2014) of discourse surrounding Armenian women, as the dominant *in-group* social role (Stets & Burke, 2000) of Armenian women is one which aligns with the *Madonna* social role under the typical patriarchal society (Aslanyan, 2007; Genovese, 2002).

The second of the two most liked comments under this post, as aforementioned, was one which reflected a polar opposite reception, when compared to the other most liked comment, towards the sex crime story and victim. The commenter stated “Definitely contact the police. Don't pay attention to the facts.”, where they address the sex crime victim herself and challenge

the discursive conventions of sex crime discourse, where “objective” and “factual” knowledge is necessary for a body of knowledge and information to be accepted (Code, 1991; Griffin, 2014). Another commenter, whose comment received 0 likes, bore a similar sentiment to the previous commenter, where they addressed the sex crime victim herself by stating “You are not the police to collect proof, leave it for the police to investigate.”

Discourse analysis of the two comments revealed that not only is the discursive convention of sex crime reception and discourse challenged by the two commenters, but so is the socio-culturally constructed discourse and knowledge surrounding the legal framework of the Armenian justice system. Although Article 140 under the Armenian Criminal Code states that forced violent sexual acts, which include those that are backed by threats to destroy a victim’s life or property or even use blackmail, must go punished (National Assembly of RA, 2021), the common discursive convention (Griffin, 2014) surrounding sexual assault in Armenian society is one which is lenient towards the sex crime perpetrator and seeks to find justifications for the actions of the perpetrator (Osipov & Sargizova, 2016). This societal convention is further backed by the Armenian Criminal Code’s leniency towards criminal actions themselves, which include sex crimes, where Article 62 of the criminal code (National Assembly of RA, 2021) states that in any crime case, the punishment of the perpetrator can be determined by the victim’s behavior; where if the victim had displayed any “illegal” or “immoral” behavior, than that in itself is grounds for justification of any crime (Truchero, Urrutia, & Sargsyan, 2017). As a society’s legal framework and legal conventions are built upon socio-cultural norms in their respective society (Karpin, 2002), the discursive conventions surrounding Armenian women’s sexuality and understanding of sex crimes befall on the dichotomous categorization of women, even in legal court (Aslanyan, 2007; Chan, 2023; Griffin, 2014). This same logic also applies to the shame

placed on Armenian sex crime victims, as their engagement in a sexual activity, though non-consensual, is one that is considered “shameful” (Aharonian, 2010). Furthermore, these two commenters’ challenges to the discursive conventions of the Armenian legal system seek to neglect the masculinist structures which call for “objective” evidence as the only true backing to a truth claim and thus challenge the existing power relations and the production of knowledge in the Armenian society (Code, 1991; Griffin, 2014; Harding, 2004).

The final comment under this sex crime story post was by a commenter whose sentiments were similarly rooted in the challenge to the discursive and legal conventions of the understanding of sex crimes and victims in Armenian society. The commenter stated, “Tell your parents, at least only your mother, that you are worried, don't let them leave you alone before it's too late.” The commenter’s sentiment is once again directed towards the sex crime victim, as they offer solutions that go beyond the discursive conventions of sex crime victimhood intrinsic to Armenian society (Aharonian, 2010; Griffin, 2014). However, the commenter does this by also adhering to the Armenian social conventions of placing a heightened sense of responsibility on the Armenian social role of *woman-mother* as an essential source of the societal convention not bringing issues regarding Armenian women’s sexuality to light in the face of male figures (Aharonian, 2010; Aslanyan, 2007).

Overall, my analysis of the 15 comments under the 3 sex crime story posts revealed varying public attitudes towards each actor present in the online discourse of the sex crimes. However, the data revealed that the most dominant of these attitudes was one which sought to justify the sex crime perpetrator or blame the sex crime victim or even Kocharyan herself. In fact, this was the case with 7 out of the 15 comments I analyzed. On another note, 9 out of 15 of the commenters, whether their comments were blame-based or in support of the sex crime

victim, focused their sentiments towards the victim rather than the perpetrator. As previously mentioned, this falls in line with the discursive convention of sex crimes in a patriarchal society. In addition, patriarchal conceptions of violence were the leading truth claims behind the majority of the commenters' sentiments. Thus the data presented that the majority of the commenters' social and political locations are situated in adherence to Armenian masculinist knowledge construction and transmission. However, the data also presented several limitations and gaps which should be ideally addressed for future analysis and research.

Limitations and Avenues for Further Research

The greatest limitation I faced in the scope of my research was the limited amount of time I had to conduct a thorough analysis of the initial number of comments I had planned to analyze from the start. Due to the time constraints I faced, I was unable to conduct much larger research on the commented sentiments of a total of 9 comments each from all three sex crime story posts under Lucy Kocharyan's hashtag. Thus, my research was limited to a total of 5 comments each under the three posts, where I finalized a much more in-depth analysis of a total of 15 comments utilizing Discourse Analysis as set in my methodological framework of Standpoint Theory and Feminist Epistemology.

Another limitation I faced, once again due to the aforementioned time constraints, was not being able to conduct at least one in-depth interview with an Armenian women's rights activist. Most notably, I had initially planned to conduct an interview with Ani Jilozian from the Women's Support Center here in Yerevan. However, I eventually had to omit the idea and focus solely on my analysis of the comments left under Lucy Kocharyan's anonymously shared sex crime story posts.

For further research, I highly suggest bringing in the insights of professionals from various fields, from women's rights activists to even human rights workers whose work extends to the sphere of social media, in order to structure a much more in-depth analysis of a greater body of commented sentiments regarding the discourse of sex crimes in Armenia.

However, my greatest limitation in the scope of my research was the aspect of translation of the sex crime story posts and comments from the original language of Armenian to English. Despite my support team member Mane Yesayan's efforts to translate the original texts to English in a way which both preserved the literal and the deeper meaning of the texts, the process left a lot of crucial details to be lost in translation. In addition, the research and analysis was focused on the analysis of the English translation of the texts. Thus, I suggest a similarly conducted analysis of the Armenian texts for future research, in order to achieve a much more comprehensive understanding of the texts.

Overall, my capstone project focused heavily on my research method and methodological framework of Discourse Analysis with Standpoint Theory and Feminist Epistemology, and could have been further enhanced by the use of a secondary research method focused on analyzing the societal effects of social media in order to garner a greater understanding of the increased spread of socio-cultural discursive practices in Armenia.

Conclusion

This research paper provides an in-depth analysis of the Armenian public reception to sex crimes and Armenian female sex crime victims on social media through the use of Discourse Analysis, which is set in a methodological framework of two feminist theories. The study was based on the analysis of three sex crime story posts shared

anonymously under the Armenian women's rights activist Lucy Kocharyan's Facebook hashtag #բռնութեան_ձայնը.

In addition to the topic of sex crime stories and victims, this paper places focus on the historical context behind the national Armenian perception of Armenian women and utilizes the Madonna/Whore complex to understand the dominant social roles for women inherent to Armenian patriarchal society. Where the social convention for Armenian women is one which draws heavy influence from past notions of motherhood as *Armenianess*, Armenian women's victimhood in the act of a sex crime situates them in a social position where they are viewed as *Whores* and unworthy in the scope of Armenian womanhood.

The research also encompasses the social impact of social media as a tool for discursive convention reinforcement in society. The data presents a varying spectrum of adherence and challenge to the Armenian socio-cultural discursive conventions of sex crimes and sex crime victims, where social, cultural, historical, and legal influences are at play.

A striking nod to patriarchal conceptions of knowledge construction and transmission are also reflected in the research. Several commenters tended to question the authenticity of the sex crime stories, typically for the lack of "objective" facts that these stories bore. Under the analysis of Standpoint Theory and Feminist Epistemology, masculinist approaches to the dissemination of knowledge are present in Armenian society and seep into online discourse as well.

Lastly, this paper takes the legal Armenian framework into account, where the Criminal Code of Armenia serves as a vital normative function in Armenian society as an authoritative force in knowledge construction and transmission. Thus, the data presents those legal

understandings of sex crime and sex crime victim discourse influences public perception as a normative authoritative body.

References

- Aharonian, L. (2010, March 8). Nationalism and sex. *The Armenian Weekly*.
<https://armenianweekly.com/2010/03/07/aharonian-nationalism-and-sex/>
- Amnesty International. (2008). *No pride in silence: Countering violence in the family in Armenia*. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/eur54/004/2008/en/>
- Aslanyan, S. A. (2007). Women's Social Identity from an Armenian Perspective: Armenian Woman, Soviet Woman, Post-Soviet Woman. In *Emphyloi metaschēmatismoi = gendering transformations* (pp. 192–201). Panepistēmio Krētēs.
- Beukian, S. (2014). Motherhood as Armenianness: Expressions of femininity in the making of Armenian national identity. *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 14(2), 247–269.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/sena.12092>
- Chan, K. (2023, July 10). How the Madonna-whore complex affects men's and women's mental health. *Verywell Mind*. <https://www.verywellmind.com/madonna-whore-complex-definition-effects-on-womens-mens-mental-health-7556783>
- Code, L. (1991). *What can she know?: Feminist theory and the construction of knowledge*. Cornell University Press.
- Genovese, A. (2002). Madonna and/or Whore: Feminism(s) and Public Sphere(s). In *Romancing the tomes: Popular culture, law and feminism* (pp. 147–164). Cavendish.
- Griffin, G. (2014). Discourse Analysis. In *Research methods for English studies* (pp. 93–109). Edinburgh University Press.

- Harding, S. G. (Ed.) (2004). *The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies*. Routledge.
- Harris, A. J., & Socia, K. M. (2016). What's in a Name? Evaluating the Effects of the "Sex Offender" Label on Public Opinions and Beliefs. *Sexual Abuse*, 28(7), 660-678.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214564391>
- Karpin, I. (2002). She's Watching the Judges: Media Feedback Loops and What Judges Notice. In *Romancing the tomes: Popular culture, law and feminism* (pp. 47–65). Cavendish.
- Katz-Schiavone S. et al.. (2008). Myths and facts about sexual violence: Public perceptions and implications for prevention. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture*, 15(3), 291-311.
- Mehraj, H. K., Bhat, A. N., & Mehraj, H. R. (2014). Impacts OF Media on Society: A Sociological Perspective. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 3(6), 56–64.
- National Assembly of RA, Criminal Code of the Republic of Armenia 60–63 (2021). Strasbourg; Council of Europe.
- Osipov, V., & Sargizova, J. (2016). Men and Gender Equality in Armenia (pp. 54–135). Yerevan: UNFPA.
- Paitjan, A. (2019, July 8). In Armenia, women are breaking the "Law of Silence" On Rape. *Civilnet*. <https://www.civilnet.am/en/news/382143/in-armenia-women-are-breaking-the-law-of-silence-on-rape/>
- Smart, C. (1995). *Law, crime and sexuality: Essays in feminism*. Sage.

Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63(3), 224. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2695870>

Truchero, J., Urrutia, A., & Sargsyan, L. (2017). (rep.). *Gap analysis of Armenian criminal law in light of the standards established by the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence*. Council of Europe.

Appendix A -The three posts in Armenian

Post 1:

«Բարև Լյուսի ջան: Անչափ շնորհակալ եմ արժանապատվության, հավասարության, մարդու ամենահիմնական իրավունքների համար պայքարելու ու չընկերկելու համար:

Մտածեցի ես էլ կիսվեմ իմ պատմությամբ:

“Վստահեք բժշկին”

12 տարեկան էի, պոչուկիս հետ կապված խնդիրներ էին առաջացել, ցավում էր ու պետք էր բժշկի գնալ իմանալու համար թե ինչն է խնդիրը: Եղբորս ընկերը ասաց, որ լավ մասնագետի տեղ գիտի ով կարող է օգնել: Եղպես նա, եղբայրս ու ես միասին գնացինք հիվանդանոց: Բժիշկը ամրակազմ, սառը ու անտարբեր դեմքով միջին տարիքի տղամարդ էր: Նույն անտարբեր ձայնով ասաց. “արի” ու ես՝ վախվորած, շփոթված, սպասվելիք բժշկական պրոցեդուրայից լրիվ անտեղյակ, լուռ հետևեցի “բժշկին”: Սենյակ գնալու ճանապարհին մեզ միացավ բուժքույրը, ու իմ մեջ հույս արթնացավ, որ ամեն ինչ լավ կլինի, ու իրեն կարող եմ վստահել: Երբ ներս մտանք առանձնասենյակ, կենտրոնում տեսա գինեկոլոգիական աթոռ՝ կանանց զննումների համար նախատեսված: Երբեք մինչ այդ նման աթոռ չէի տեսել, ու նույն պահին տագնապի զգացում արթնացավ իմ մեջ...ինձ մենակ ու անպաշտպան զգացի...բայց չկարողացա արտաբերել ոչինչ, ի վերջո եղբայրս էր բերել Էդտեդ, ի վերջո “Բժիշկն” էր ուղղորդել Էդտեդ...իրեն էլ հո կարող էի վստահել.. Նույն սառը ու հրամայական տոնով բժիշկը կարգադրեց բարձրանալ, նստել աթոռին ու տարածել ոտքերս... երբևէ նման փորձ չունենալով՝ բարձրանալով աթոռին ինձ անչափ խոցելի ու անպաշտպան զգացի ...իսկ թե ինչ եղավ հետո երբեք չեմ մոռանա...առանց ոչ մի բառ ասելու բժիշկը մատները ուժով մտցրեց իմ մեջ...

Սաստիկ ցավից ճչացի ու սկսեցի լաց լինել..դրան ի պատասխան հարգարժան բժիշկը շարունակելով մատներով սեղմել ու անասելի ցավ պատճառել՝ սաստեց ինձ, ասելով՝ “Մի տոգա”..

Դրանից հետո լացս զսպելով փորձում էի դիմանալ ցավին.. Հիշում եմ Էդ պահին անօգնական նայում էի բուժքրոջը ու հայացքով աղերսում, որ գոնե ինքը օգնի, բայց բուժքույրը անտարբեր ու հանգիստ դեմքով կանգնած հետևում էր..երևի սովոր էր նման տեսարանների..հերթական աշխատանքային օրն էր..

Երբ դուրս եկանք սենյակից այլայլված ու սարսափած էի՝ աչքերս արցունքոտ: Եղբայրս հարցրեց ոնց եմ, բայց լուռ էի, չկարողացա ոչինչ արտաբերել...ինչ ասեի..ում մեղադրեի..ի վերջո Բժիշկը ինքն է չէ, իր բոլոր արարքները արդարացված են չէ, ի վերջո Էդ ամենը իմ ապաքինման համար էր չէ, ոնց կարող էր այլ կերպ լիներ..

Երկար ժամանակ չէի մտածել ես դեպքի մասին, բայց գրառումները կարդալով վերհիշեցի...Վերհիշելուց դեռ նույն սաստիկ ցավն եմ զգում ու հիշում բժշկի սառը ու հրամայական ձայնը..մի տարբերությամբ, որ հիմա վախի ու սարսափի

փոխարեն, անտանելի զայրույթ եմ զգում ու ցավով մտածում, թե ինչպեսա՞նք նույն բժիշկը շարունակում իր առաքելությունը ու որքան կանայք ու աղջիկներ են շարունակում ապրել նույն ցավը: Կուզեի հավատալ, որ իմ հետ կատարվածը եզակի դեպքա, հազարից մեկի հետ տեղի ունեցող, բայց ավաղ համոզված եմ, որ նման դեպքերը շատ են:

Ուզեցի կիսվել իմ պատմությամբ, որ չմոռանանք, թե ոնց կարող են նման “վստահություն վայելող” կարգավիճակ ունեցող մարդիկ նույնպես անպատժելիորեն բռնանալ մեր մարմնի արժանապատվության ու անեռնամխելիության նկատմամբ»:

Post 2:

«22տ-ում ինձ բռնաբարեցին:ԵՊՅ-ն նոր էի ավարտել ու աշխարհն ինձ այնքան փոքր էր թվում ի համեմատ իմ գիտելիքների, իմ գեղեցկության , իմ սպասելիքների ու երազանքների: Ես ապրում ու վայելում էի կյանքիս ամեն վայրկյանը , ամեն րոպեն, ապագան այնքա՞ն վառ էր թվում :

Ճակատագրի քամահրանքով ինձ միշտ սիրահարվում էին մեծահարուստ տղաներ. ես բավականին համեստ ընտանիքից եմ ,ասել, որ դա ինձ դուր չէր գալիս, ասել, որ ես ոգևորված չէի այդչափ ուշադրությունից , կլինի ստելիսկ ես ձեզ չեմ ուզում խաբել : Ծանոթացել էինք մարզասրահում, հայկական իրականության մեջ ընդունված հաջորդականությամբ ` համար ճշտել , գնալ հայաթ, կուրսվել , հետևել .. սկսեց գրել , սկսեցի գրել, առժամանակ անց առաջարկեց հանդիպել, ոչ մի խանգարող հանգամանք չկար, առավել ևս, երբ նա ամեն առիթով ինձ նվիրում էր սիրելի հեղինակներից գրքեր ու իմ սիրելի շոկոլադները.. Նա զուսպ էր , ինչպես դեռատի պատանին, ով հուզվում է առաջին սիրո հանդիպման ժամանակ: Զրապուրանք էր , սիրահարվել չհասցրեցի .. Մի օր , երբ հերթական հանդիպման առաջարկը մերժեցի զուտ վատառողջ լինելուս պատճառով , սկսվեց հայիոյանքների տեղատարափ , մեղադրանքներ: Եդ ամենը որքան տհաճ էր , նույնքան էլ անսպասելի ` ասես կույրը սկսել էր տեսնել , ես քարացել էի , անջատեցի , անցավ մի քանի ժամ , զանգեց , չպատասխանեցի. դեռ շոկի մեջ էի : Քանի օրերն անցնում էին, այնքան ավելի էի հասկանում , որ էլ չեմ ուզում հանդիպել , որ այն հրապուրանքն էլ , որ թվում էր, ուր որ է վերածվելու է գեղեցիկ սիրավեպի , նետի պես սլանում էր գրողի ծոցը: Զանգերին սկսեցին հաջորդել մեղայական հաղորդագրություններ , աղաչանքներ , ինքնասպանության մասին ակնարկներ : Էլի չէի արձագանքում : Անցավ մոտ 2 ամիս: Ես շատ հազվադեպ էի հիշում նրան, նա չկար . չէր զանգում , չէր գրում , ես ինձ սովորեցնում էի իմ նոր կյանքին ու ամեն անգամ, երբ մոտս փոքրիկ միտք էր առաջանում նրա մասին , իր կողմից հնչեցրած հայիոյանքները ապտակում էին երեսս, ու ես հաստատուն էի դառնում իմ որոշման մեջ: Լրիվ այլ համարից զանգ , ես հանդարտված էի , ինքը ` չափից դուրս հանգիստ , ասեց, որ ինձ չի մոռացել, բայց հասկացել է, որ իմ որոշումը պետք է հարգել ու ուզում է ինձ վերադարձնել գիրքս, որն իր մոտ էր , և որն ինձ հայրս էր նվիրել , կմոտենա մի քանի րոպեից մեքենայով , կտա , իրարից հաջողություն կմաղթենք ու վերջ.. Զանկարծ հիշեցի գիրքս, մոռացել էի, որ իր

մոտ էր ,ասացի,որ անպայման բերի:Յորս նվերն էր 18 ամյակիս:Եկավ ,իջա:Նստեցի, շատ հանգիստ էր ,հավասարակշռված,չերկարացրեցի.«Ու՞ր ա գիրքս»:Ինքը.«Գիրքը մնացել ա տանը ,ես ավտովագման տեղից եմ գալիս ,որ ասեի մոտս չի չէիդ գա,հենց հիմա գնանք ,դու սպասի մեքենայի մեջ ,մտնեմ վերցնեմ ,տամ քեզ»,վերջում էլ թե՛ « Կուզես նույնիսկ տաքսի կկանչեմ,եթե հաճելի չի ,որ ես քեզ տուն բերեմ» :Ասեցի որ որքան հնարավոր է շուտ գնանք ,գիրքս տա ու վերջ:Կեսօր էր:Մեքենան շարժվեց,շատ հանգիստ էր վարում ,գիտեի,որ Ավանում են ապրում ,և մի պահի նկատեցի,որ մեքենան լրիվ այլ ուղղությամբ է գնում,ու երբ ասեցի ,էդ ու՞ր ես քշում ,մեքենայի դռների կողպեքները փակվեցին ու մեքենան սլանում էր 200արագությամբ .հասցրեցի լսել.«Գնում ենք մեռնենք»:Սկսեցի գոռալ ,քաշքշել ,փորձեցի դուռը բացել ,չստացվեց ..Դեմքիս ապտակ ,ու բռունցքի մի քանի հարված և ես ուշաթափվեցի ,արթնացա ,երբ ամբողջովին կապտած էի ու արդեն «ոչ կույս» :

Ոստիկանություն :Պապայի միլիոններ, ու նա ճանաչվեց անմեղսունակ (իբր մեքենայից հայտնաբերել էին լուրջ հոգեմետ դեղեր) ...Ինձ առաջարկեցին ,որ ես իմ կուսությունը վաճառեմ իրենց 500000դր-ով,երբ քննիչն ասաց,որ անմեղսունակ տականքիս հայրը ինձ պատրաստ է ուղարկել Եվրոպա հանգստանալու...

Շուրջ 5 տարի ես նույն երազն էի տեսնում :Ոչ մի հանդիպում անձնական բնույթի :Ոչ մի տղամարդ ու լիքը զարմացած աչքեր ,թե ինչու օ իմ նման սիրուն աղջիկը չի ամուսնանում:Ես ամեն անգամ չոր հացի պես կուլ էի տալիս այդ հարցերը ու ժպտում :

Եսօր լրացավ 8 տարին ,որ ես կույս չեմ,իսկ մի քանի ամսից կլրանա 3 տարին,որ ես սիրված կին եմ.. հագել եմ հարսանեկան զգեստ ,ամուսնացել եմ հայկական սիրուն հարսանիքով ,չեմ վերականգնել իմ կուսությունը,ամուսինս իմացել է այն օրը ,երբ ասաց ,որ ուզում է լրջացնել մեր հարաբերությունները..

Ես կամ ,ես երջանիկ եմ,ես կին եմ ...❤️»:

Story 3:

«Լուսի ջան շատ մեծ աշխատանք ես անում: Ջնարավորություն տվեցիր , որ շատերը Եսքան տարի չասվածները ասեն: Ու ես նույնպես ունեմ իմ պատմությունը, որով անպայման ուզում եմ կիսվել:

Ջիշում եմ, որ դեռ փոքր էի մի ուսուցիչ ունեի: Ես 13 տարեկան էի ինքը մոտ 24: Դեռ էդ տարիքից նկատել էի, թե ոնց էր նայում ինձ: Ահավոր տարօրինակ հայացքով: Ինքն էլ երիտասարդ էր ու բավականին գեղեցիկ: Դե ես էլ երեխա էի, որ էդ հայացքով նայում էր սկսում էի ամաչել ու երևի դուրս գալիս էր: Ինքը շուտ դուրս եկավ աշխատանքից ու էլ իրենից լուր չկար, բայց միշտ եղել ա երեխեքի մեջ քննարկվող թեմա ` որպես "սիմպո" ուսուցիչ:

2019-ի ձմեռը պատահական տեսա իրան խանութում մոտեցավ , սկսեց խոսել ես էլ կարճ ` քաղաքավարությունից ելնելով պատասխանում էի: Մտածեցի, որ

գուցե իրանից վախենալու բան չկա, որովհետև ընդհանուր լիքը ծանոթներ ունենք ու ադեկվատ մարդիկ էին բոլորը: Ինքը սկսեց ինձ գրել, ես էլ պատասխանել: Յետաքրքիր գծուտ կերպար էր: Մի օր ասեց, որ սիրահարված ա ուզում ա ընկերություն անի, բայց ես ասեցի, որ պատրաստ չեմ ու ավելի լավ կլինի չշփվենք, ինքնել թե բա ես պատրաստ եմ գուտ ընկերականին էլ մենակ թե ինձ քեզնից հեռու մի պահի: Յամաձայնվեցի: Մի օր ընկերներով հավաքվել էինք ու ինքնել կար: Անընդհատ նայում էր վրաս, իրա հին տարօրինակ հայացքով: Արդեն երբ պիտի գնայի եկավ հետևիցս ու մենք էլ մարդաշատ վայրում էինք: Միանգամից հարձակվեց վրաս ու "ձեռք քցեց": Ոնց որը ինքը չլիներ այլ մի ուրիշ մարդ՝ ուղեղը անջատած :

Ահավոր բղավեցի հրեցի ու գնացի:

Անցավ ժամանակ, չկար:

Վերջերս դուրս եկա տնից մեր մուտքի մոտ կանգնած էր, սկսեց սպառնալ ինձ, որ ամեն ինչ կանի, որ ինձ վնաս տա ու կյանքս կործանի՝ քանի որ չենք կարող միասին լինել: Ես չէի լսում, արագ-արագ քայլելով գնում էի, շենքերի միջով դեպի կանգամ: Մի տեղ հասանք մարդ չկար էդ պահին, ինքը մոտեցավ ինձ ահավոր ուժեղ սեղմեց պատին, հրեշի հայցքով աչքերիս նայելով սկսեց վիզս համբուրել, առաջ ու հետ շարժվել ու հրում էի, գոռում էի, որ բաց թողներ չէր լսում ու ասում էր "հանգստացի մի հատ, լավ եմ անում": Սկսեց գոռով համբուրել, ձեռքը ուզում էր տաքատիս մեջ անցկացնել, բարեբախտաբար երկար պայքարից հետո կարողացա դուրս պրծնել: Ինքը ինձ պարբերաբար սպառնում ա, ու "նամյոկ" անելով հասկացնում ա, որ նույն բանը կարա էլի անի: Ես դեռ վախով լի էի, որովհետև էդ օրը ահավոր սթրես եմ ապրել, եկել էի տուն դողալով ու ամբողջ օրը լացելով: Եթե էլի ինչ որ քայլ անի հաստատ անպատիժ չեմ թողնի: Ուղղակի փաստեր չունեմ»:

Appendix B -The comments in Armenian

Comments under Post 1 (Order: least to most likes):

1. Երևի բժիշկը պռակտոլոգ ա եղել:Յավանաբար ներզնսում ա արել, հասկանալու համար ներսից պրոցես կա, թե չէ(հետանցքից):Պրոցեսը բնականաբար ցավոտ ա:Աթոռն էլ նույն գինեկոլոգիականի պես:Ասել, որ դա բռնություն ա եղել, ինձ թվում ա չի կարելի:Ասում եմ որպես պացիենտ,նմանատիպ խնդրով բժշկի գնալուց հետո:
2. Էստեղ կարծում եմ ոչ թե բռնություն, այլ ընդամենը բժշկի կողմից կոպիտ, անտարբեր վերաբերմունք է եղել: Նկարագրվածը ստանդարտ պրոկտոլոգիական պրոցեդուրա է:
3. Էստեղ բացարձակ բռնության տարր չկա: Հուսամ աղջիկը կամուսնանա ու դեռ բազմիցս ֆիզիոլոգիական առիթներ կունենա բժիշկների հետ շփվելու՝ հղիության, ծննդաբերության ու առհասարակ մայրանալու բերկրանքը վայելելու համար: 😊
4. Ժամկետները նշված չէին, գրած տեքստից եմ ենթադրում, որ դա դեռ ապագայում է լինելու:
5. Իսկ ի՞նչ կապ ուներ պոչուկի ցավը գինեկոլեգի հետ ու ինչի էին տարել գինեկոլոգի մոտ 😊
6. Ի դեպ հենց երեկ ծննդաբերությանը նվիրված խմբում խոսում էիմք բժիշկների կողմից հաճախորդների նկատմամբ ցուցաբերվող բռնության մասին, նրա մասին որ այնտեղ բնավ բացակայում է սահմանը ուրիշի մարմինը տնայրինելու: Այնտեղ լիքը բան կա անելու, որովհետև բժիշկները իրենց ամենակարողն են համարում ու էտ սահմանը չեն զգում՝ ատամնաբույժից սկսած մինչև գինեկոլոգը: Ծատ շՏ են մեջները ոչ կոմպետենտ էտ առումով մարդիկ:

Comments under Post 2 (Order: least to most likes):

1. Այդ սրիկան ասածուց իր պատիժը կստանա...Երջանիկ եղեք💕
2. Լուսի Քոչարյանն ինչպես կապացուցեք ձեր տեղադրած նյութերի իսկությունը ապացուցել և եթե ազգովի կանքենք ու այդ երևութների քրիորեն դատապարտումը պահանջենք: Ես համոզված եմ որ ձեր Էջը Ֆեյք է բացված հատուկ նպատակով: Չեմ բացառում որ կլինեն մարդիկ հավատալով կուղարկեն իրենց կյանքի պատմությունները , բայց մեծամասնությունը սուտ պատմություններ են:
3. Սուտ է, սուտ է և կրկին սուտ է: Եսքան հիմար աղջիկ չի լինում 22 տարեկանում:
4. ամուսինդ Մեծ հոգի ունի
5. Wow, respect

Comments under Post 3 (Order: least to most likes):

1. Կներեք իհարկե ես հավատում եմ,որ պատմություններ կան,որոնք իրական են,բայց ստեղ պատմություններից կեսը հավատալու չեն:

Իմ կարծիքս եմ գրել:

2. Անպայման դիմեք ոստիկանություն: Փաստերին մի նայեք
3. Պատմեք ձեր ծնողներին,գոնե միայն մայրիկին,որ ձեզ անհանգստացնում ա,թող ձեզ մենակ չթողնեն,քանի ուշ չի:
4. Սուտ է, անմեղսունակ աղջիկներով էս երկիրը լցված չի:
5. Duq vostikan cheq vor apacuycner havaqeq tveq vostikanutyun tox ashxaten

Appendix C -The three posts translated in English

Post 1;

“Hello dear Lucy. Thank you very much for fighting for dignity, equality, the most basic human rights and not giving up.

I thought I would share my story.

“Trust the doctor!”

I was 12 years old, I had problems with my tailbone, it hurt and I had to go to the doctor to find out what the problem was. My brother's friend said that he knows a good specialist who can help. So he, my brother and I went to the hospital together. The doctor was a middle-aged man with a firm, cold and indifferent face. He told me in the same indifferent voice: "Come" and I, scared, confused, completely unaware of the expected medical procedure, silently followed the "doctor". On the way to the room, the nurse joined us, and hope arose in me that everything will be fine and that I can trust her. When we entered the private room, I saw a gynecological chair in the center, designed for women's examinations. I had never seen such a chair before, and at the same moment a feeling of alarm arose in me... I felt alone and defenseless... but I could not utter anything, after all my brother had brought me there, after all the "Doctor" had directed me there. I could trust him too. In the same cold and commanding tone, the doctor ordered me to get up, sit on the chair and spread my legs... having never had such an experience before, climbing into the chair I felt extremely vulnerable and defenseless...and I will never forget what happened next...without saying a word the doctor forcefully inserted his fingers into me...

I screamed from severe pain and began to cry... In response to this, the respected doctor, continuing to squeeze his fingers and causing indescribable pain, scolded me, saying: "Don't whine!"...

After that, I tried to hold back the pain... I remember at that moment I looked helplessly at the nurse and begged her to at least help, but the nurse was standing behind her with an indifferent and calm face... Maybe she was used to such scenes... It was another working day...

When we left the room, I was changed and terrified, with tears in my eyes. My brother asked me how I was, but I was silent, I couldn't say anything... what should I say... who should I blame... After all, HE is the doctor, and all his actions are justified, right? After all, it was all for my recovery, right? How could it have been any different....

I hadn't thought about this incident for a long time, but after reading the stories, I remembered it... When I remember it, I still feel the same intense pain and remember the doctor's cold and commanding voice...with the difference that now instead of fear and terror, I feel unbearable anger and think with pain that how the same doctor continues his work and how many women and girls continue to experience the same pain. I would like to believe that what happened to me is a unique case, happening to one in a thousand, but alas, I am sure that there are many such cases. I wanted to share my story so that we don't forget how people with such a "trusted" status can also attack the dignity and integrity of our bodies with impunity."

Post 2:

"I was raped at the age of 22. I had just finished YSU and the world seemed so small compared to my knowledge, my beauty, my expectations and dreams. I was living and enjoying every second, every minute of my life, the future's so bright! it seemed.

As fate would have it, rich guys always fell in love with me. I come from a rather modest family, to say that I didn't like it, to say that I wasn't excited by so much attention, would be lying, and I don't want to deceive you. Asking about me, following me...he started writing, I started writing, after a while he offered to meet, there were no obstacles, especially when he gave me books by favorite authors and my favorite chocolates on every occasion... He was reserved, like a young boy who gets excited on the first date. One day, when I rejected the offer of another meeting simply because of my ill health, a torrent of curses and accusations began. It was as unpleasant as it was unexpected, as if a blind man had started to see. I was frozen, I hung up, several hours passed, he called, I didn't answer. I was still in shock. The more days passed, the more I realized that I didn't want to meet, that even the attraction that seemed to turn into a beautiful romance, flew like an arrow into the writer's bosom. The calls began to be followed by sinful messages. , pleas, hints about suicide. I didn't respond anymore. About 2 months passed. I rarely remembered him, he was gone. He didn't call, he didn't write, I was getting used to my new life and every time I had a small thought about him, the curses he uttered slapped me in the face, and I became firm in my decision. A call from a completely different number, I calmed down. he himself, very calmly, said that he has not forgotten me, but he understood that my decision should be respected and he wants to return my book, which he had and which my father gave me, he will come by car in a few minutes. he will give it, we'll wish each other success and that's it.. Suddenly I remembered my book, I had forgotten that he had it, I told him to bring it. It was my father's gift for my 18th birthday. He came, got down. I sat down, he was very calm, balanced. "Where is my book?" He said, "The book is left at home. I'm coming from the car wash. If I told you, you wouldn't have come to me. Let's go right now. You wait in the car, I'll go in and get it, I'll give it to you." Then he added "if you want to, i can even call you a taxi, in case you don't want me to take you home". I said let's go as soon as possible, give me my book and that's it. It was noon. The car started, it was driving very calmly, I knew that they live in Avan, and at one point I noticed that the car was going in a completely different direction, and when I said, where are you driving, the car door locks were closed and the car was speeding at 200. I managed to hear: "We are going to die." I started screaming, pulling, I tried to open the door, but it didn't work. I was slapped in the face. , and a few punches and I fainted, woke up when I was completely bruised and already "not a virgin".Police. Daddy's millions, and he was declared insane (allegedly, serious psychotropic drugs were found in the car) ... They offered me to sell my virginity to them for 500,000 AMD, when the investigator said that my insane scum's father was ready to send me on a vacation to Europe.. I had the same dream for about 5 years. No meeting of a personal nature. No man and eyes full of surprise, why a beautiful girl like me doesn't get married. I swallowed those questions like dry bread every time and smiled.

Today it's been 8 years that I'm not a virgin, and in a few months it will be 3 years that I'm a beloved woman. I wore a wedding dress, I got married with a beautiful Armenian wedding, didn't recover my virginity, my husband got to know about it the same day that he told me he wants to make our relationship serious.

I am alive, I am happy, I am a woman...❤️".

Post 3:

"Dear Lucy, you are doing a great job. You gave the opportunity for many to say what has not been said for so many years. And I also have my story, which I definitely want to share. I remember that I had a teacher when I was little. I was 13 years old, he was about 24. Even from that age, I noticed how he looked at me. With a very strange look. He was young and quite handsome. Well, I was also a child, when he looked at me with that look, I would get shy and maybe i liked him. He left work early and there was no news from him, but he was always a topic of discussion among the children as a handsome teacher. In the winter of 2019, I saw him by chance in the store, he approached me, started talking briefly, I answered out of politeness. I thought that maybe there is nothing to fear from him, because we have a lot of mutual acquaintances and they were all adequate people. He started writing to me and I answered. He was an interesting crazy character. One day he said that he is in love and wants us to date, but I said that I am not ready and it would be better if we don't communicate, and he said "I am ready to even be friends, just don't push me away from you". I agreed. One day we got together with our friends and there was a meeting. He kept looking at me with his old strange look. When I was about to leave, he followed me and we were in a crowded place. He immediately attacked me and groped me. As if he was not himself, but another person with his brain turned off.

I screamed terribly, pushed and left.

Time passed, he had disappeared.

I recently left the house. He was standing at our entrance. He started threatening me that he will do everything to harm me and destroy my life because we cannot be together. I didn't listen, I walked quickly through the buildings to the bus stop. We reached a place, there was no one at that moment, he came close to me and pressed me against the wall very hard, looking into my eyes like a monster, he started kissing my neck, I was moving back and forth and pushing, I was shouting that he didn't hear me let go and said "Calm down, I'm doing it because i want to".

He started kissing me forcefully, he wanted to put his hand in my pants, fortunately, after a long struggle, I managed to get out. He regularly threatens me and makes it clear that he can do the same thing again. I'm still afraid to leave the house, because I experienced terrible stress that day. I came home shaking and crying all day. If he does anything else, I will definitely not leave him unpunished. I just don't have the facts."

Appendix D -The Comments in English

Comments under Post 1 (Order: least to most likes):

1. Perhaps the doctor was a proctologist. He probably did an internal examination to understand whether there is a process from the inside or not (from the anus). The process is naturally painful. The stool is the same as the gynecological one. I don't think it's possible to say that it was violence. I'm saying as a patient, after going to the doctor with a similar problem.
2. I think there was no violence here, but just a rude and indifferent attitude from the doctor. What is described is a standard proctological procedure.
3. There is absolutely no element of violence here. Hopefully, the girl will get married and will have many more physiological opportunities to communicate with doctors, to enjoy pregnancy, childbirth and the joy of motherhood in general. 😊
4. The dates were not mentioned, I assume from the written text that it will still happen in the future.
5. And what did the pain in the tailbone have to do with the gynecologist and why did they take him to the gynecologist 🤔?
6. By the way, just yesterday in the group dedicated to childbirth, we were talking about the violence shown by doctors towards clients, about the fact that there is absolutely no limit to taking care of someone else's body. There is a lot to do there, because the doctors consider themselves the most capable and do not acknowledge boundaries, starting from the dentist to the gynecologist. They are very incompetent people.

Comments under Post 2 (Order: least to most likes):

1. That bastard will get his punishment from god...I wish you happiness 💕
2. It's a lie, it's a lie and it's a lie again. A girl can't be that stupid at 22
3. Your husband has a great soul
4. Lusi Kocharyan, how do you prove the authenticity of the materials you posted? I am sure that your page is fake, opened for a special purpose. I do not rule out that there will be people who will send their actual life stories, but most of them are false stories.
5. Wow, respect

Comments under Post 3 (Order: least to most likes):

1. Sorry, of course, I believe that there are stories that are true, but half of the stories here are not believable. I wrote my opinion.
2. Definitely contact the police. Don't pay attention to the facts.
3. Tell your parents, at least only your mother, that you are worried, don't let them leave you alone before it's too late.
4. It is a lie, this country is not full of innocent girls.
5. You are not the police to collect proof, leave it for the police to investigate.