Studying Men's Violences in Europe

Towards a Research Framework

Jeff Hearn, Irina Novikova, Keith Pringle, Iva Šmídová, Gunilla Bjerén, Marjut Jyrkinen, LeeAnn Iovanni, Fátima Arranz, Harry Ferguson, Voldemar Kolga, Ursula Müller, Elżbieta H. Oleksy, Dag Balkmar, Cornelia Helfferich, Ilse Lenz, Marek M. Wojtaszek, Elizabete Pičukāne and Victoria Rosa

With an Appendix by Raewyn Connell

ÖREBRO UNIVERSITY

CFS Report Series
No. 25: 2013 ÖU

Centrum för feministiska samhällsstudier

STUDYING MEN'S VIOLENCES IN EUROPE

The publication of this report has been funded
with the support of the
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Örebro University

Title: Studying Men's Violence in Europe:
Towards a Research Framework

Publisher: Örebro university, 2013
www.oru.se

Layout: Heinz Merten

Print: Trio Tryck, Örebro 12/2013

CFS Report Series No. 25: 2013-ÖU

ISSN: 1103-2618
ISBN: 978-91-7668-985-1

Addresses:

Centre for Feminist Social Sciences (CFS)
School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences (HumES)
Örebro University. SE-701 82 Örebro, Sweden

Gender Studies
School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences (HumES)
Örebro University. SE-701 82 Örebro, Sweden

Centrum för feministiska samhällsstudier (CFS)

Studying Men's Violences in Europe

Towards a Research Framework

Jeff Hearn, Irina Novikova, Keith Pringle, Iva Šmídová,
Gunilla Bjerén, Marjut Jyrkinen, LeeAnn Iovanni, Fátima Arranz,
Harry Ferguson, Voldemar Kolga, Ursula Müller,
Elżbieta H. Oleksy, Dag Balkmar, Cornelia Helfferich, Ilse Lenz,
Marek M. Wojtaszek, Elizabete Pičukāne and Victoria Rosa

With an Appendix by Raewyn Connell

Centre for Feminist Social Studies (CFS),
School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences (HumES),
Örebro University

Gender Studies, School of Humanities,
Education and Social Sciences (HumES), Örebro University

September 2013

CONTENTS

PART I

Background

CHAPTER 1 **INTRODUCTION**

Preamble

This text is the result of transnational cooperation amongst 18 researchers across Europe. The group was brought together through the work of Sub-network 2 of the Coordination Action on Human Rights Violations (CAHRV) (Project no. 506348), which ran from 2004 to 2007, as part of the European Commission Framework 6 research on "Citizens and Governance in a Knowledge-based Society".

The cooperation built on the work of the earlier European Thematic Network on Research on Men in Europe, "The Social Problem and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities", that operated 2000–2003, within the EU Framework 5 Programme. About half the 18 researchers in the CAHRV Sub-network were part of the previous Thematic Network. The overall aim of the Thematic Network was to develop empirical, theoretical and policy outcomes on the gendering of men and masculinities in Europe.

Both the CAHRV Sub-network and the earlier Thematic Network comprised women and men researchers researching on men and masculinities in an explicitly gendered way. The central focus of the Thematic Network's effort was, as its name implies, the investigation of the social problem and societal problematisation of men and masculinities. The reference to 'social problem' referred to *both* the problems created by men, and the problems experienced by men. The notion of societal problematisation referred to the various ways in which the 'topic' of men and masculinities has become and is becoming noticed and problematised in society – in the media, in politics, in policy debates, and so on. This focus was set within a general problematic: that changing and improving gender relations and reducing gender inequality involves changing men as well as changing the position of women.[1]

Within the subsequent Coordination Action on Human Rights Violations (CAHRV), Sub-network 2 focused on "the roots of interpersonal violence: gendered practices, social exclusion and violation". As such, our work has

1 The final report of the Network was republished in two volumes by the European Commission (Hearn et al., 2004) and is also available at the European Commission website (http://improving-ser.jrc.it/default/show.gx? Object.object_id=TSER----0000000000000121D&_app.page=show-TSR.html). The country reports, policy option papers, and Europe-wide summary reports are available at the European Documentation Centre on Men: http://www.cromenet.org (also see Hearn and Pringle, 2006, 2009; Pringle et al., 2006/2013)

raised many key questions for us, and for other researchers and policy makers. These questions include:

1. How broadly are men's violences to be drawn and defined? What types of violence should be included? Some types are readily measurable (for example, homicide); other types are less straightforward or perhaps less easily measurable (for example, prostitution).
2. Are they to be limited to physical violence and sexual violence (or more precisely 'sexual sexual violence'? Are they to include emotional, verbal, linguistic, cognitve, representational, visual and cultural violences? Are men's violences to include violences to women, children, other men, the self, animals?
3. Are men's violences to include both institutionalised violences, as in the case of the military or legitimated violence as in, say, some forms of sport?
4. Should both violence and dominance be addressed? Should 'dominance' be omitted? Can dominance be more specifically defined?
5. What is the advantage of including violation rather than violence? How to combine focus on violence of perpetrators, violation of victims, and social relations?
6. What should be the main elements of methodological frameworks in future European comparative, transnational research on men's violences?

The Sub-network's work began by updating and expanding the existing database of the European Documentation Centre on Men. From this research baseline the Sub-network aims to design a shared methodological framework for comparative research, including common concepts, definitions and standards for European level research on the roots of violent behaviour, social inclusial, social exclusion, and violation. The CAHRV Sub-network 2 included women and men researchers from the Framework 5 project, from Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Poland, and the UK, along with new partners or asociated members from Finland, Germany, Israel, Latvia, Poland, Spain, and Sweden.

Key aims

This work involved three key aims:

A. Developing a shared methodological framework for transnational comparative research on men's violences and men's gendered practices of social exclusion and inclusion, taking account of cultural and social differences.

B. Considering and assessing the possibilities for common concepts, definitions and standards for European level research on the roots of violent behaviour, social inclusion, social exclusion and violation.

C. Documenting the process of developing a methodological framework, identifying the obstacles and solutions.

The three aims are now considered in more detail.

A. Developing a shared methodological framework for transnational comparative research on men's violences and men's gendered practices of social exclusion and inclusion, taking account of cultural and social differences

Men's violences

Men's violence is one of the most massive global social problems. The range and amount of men's violences need to be recognised, including violence to women, children, men (other men, each other, themselves), transgender people, older people, and their interconnections. Violence takes many forms and all are gendered, including the abuse of children. It includes physical and sexual violence from and to those known and unknown, emotional and sexual degradation, rape and sexual assault, sexual trafficking, homicide and, in some cases, suicide. The extent of violence can be relatively minimal or extensive and life threatening, one-off or persistent, emotionally more or less damaging, explicit or implicitly sexual or sexualised. Attacks by men on women and children can be random or highly organised.

There is a need to go beyond quantitative measures that are primarily descriptive and lack in-depth analysis. There is a need to build foundations for culturally-sensitive studies that gather new comparable cross-national data and address issues of patterns, trends and differences in many areas.

There is a high degree of transnational commonality around some aspects of such practices. At the same time, there is the importance of understanding men's violence in its specific social, cultural and political contexts its concrete nature, dynamic development and wider social and societal con-

text. This entails attention to interpersonal, ideological and structural questions. There is a need to recognise the multi-level, multi-layered nature of explanation; this includes combinations of individual, family and structural explanations. There is also a need to gender explanation: to examine how gender and sexuality operate at interconnected levels of individuals, families, and social structures and cultural patterns.

Issues of difference and diversity, by age, ethnicity, race, religion, sexuality, and other social divisions, need to be highlighted, thus interlinking men's violences with economic and material circumstances, in terms of work, family, health, education, and so on, and the complex intersections of forms of social inclusion and social exclusion. This relates to the broad questions of gender power relations and societal constructions of masculinity, as well as the impact of poverty and other inequalities upon men's violences.

Men's gendered practices of social exclusion and social inclusion in a comparative perspective

Social inclusion, social exclusion and marginalisation take many forms; these forms are differentially distributed across the countries of Europe and the EU. Social inclusion of men and by men is often an unspoken element of social organisation. Social exclusion and marginalisation are often based on unemployment, lower education level and poverty, but also discrimination, for instance, on the bases of ethnicity. Within these broad categories, we include all types of discrimination as addressed by the Amsterdam Treaty of 1999 (gender, race or ethnic origin, nationality, religion or beliefs, disability, age or sexual orientation). However, one of the activised forms of exclusion is political exclusion and/or marginalisation in many EU countries.

The social exclusion of certain men links with unemployment of certain categories of men (such as less educated, rural, ethnic minority, young, older), men's isolation within and separation from families, and associated social and health problems. In the last decade, new forms of marginalisation have developed, with shifts from traditional industry to more postindustrialised society. Globalising processes may create new forms of work and marginalisation. Some men find it difficult to accommodate to these changes in the labour market and changed family structure. Instead of going into the care sector or getting more education, for example, some young men become marginalised from work and family life.

Three particular aspects regarding social exclusion are under-researched:

(i) There appears to be a lack of studies showing the variety of structures and processes that may lead to the marginalisation of men as groups or individuals, and what differences and similarities there are to women.

(ii) The conceptual separation of "the social problems which (some) men create" from "the social problems which (some) men experience" is often simplistic and there is a need to study the intersections more carefully – especially in the area of social exclusion.

(iii) There is a major lack of attention paid to men engaged in creating and reproducing social exclusion, such as around racism. Migration, and planned and potential migration, creates or is linked to exclusions, and often leads to differences between legal and illegal migrants, with the latter having a very limited access to citizenship. These differentiations are in turn gendered, often with different situations and experiences for women, men and child migrants, for example, in terms of access to safety and full citizenship rights.

The impact of men's actions on gender equality and on the granting of full citizenship rights to women is especially important. The relations of marginalised men to women are more complex in some ways. There are the experiences of women-in-contact, as colleagues, partners, family members and others, which are likely to be adversely affected by the marginalisation of those men with whom they are in contact. The actions of marginalised men may also have implications for women-not-in-contact, such as in competition for funds, when marginalised men stake their claims in ways that negatively impact on marginalised women, or in terms of violence and abuse against women, such as racism of white 'underclass' men or the social violence of ethnic minority men.

These impacts upon women are further complicated by important transnational considerations. In the case of men in power these may include the association of men in decisions that are transnational in their effects on women. In the case of marginalised men they may include the separation of migrant men from women partners and other family members, including from other men who are significan others. Furthermore, marginalisations and exclusions of migrant men and women are different in different European countires because of, for instance, variations in historical, social and political processes which impact on current migration and the policies of integration, social inclusion or exclusion of different ethnic groups.

B. Considering and assessing the possibilities for common concepts, definitions and standards for European level research on the roots of violent behaviour, social inclusion, social exclusion and violation

"Roots", outcomes and prevalence

Prevalence studies seek to document the nature and extent of interpersonal violence perpetrated against different categories of victims: women; immigrant, migrant and ethnic minority women; men; children and youth, older people; people with disabilities; lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people; those who prostitute. Types of violence can include: physical, sexual, psychological, sexual harassment, stalking and bullying. Contexts of the violence can include the domestic setting (families and intimate partner relationships), the school, the workplace, and the public sphere. This body of research also attempts to assess the impact of interpersonal violence on victims' health (physical and mental) and on human rights and quality of life (education, employment, social integration over the life course), with the latter having received far less attention (Müller and Schröttle 2004; Martinez et al. 2005, 2006; Humphreys et al. 2006; Hagemann-White et al. 2006).

The Sub-network has focused on the process of understanding the "roots" of men's violence. This kind of task needs to be informed by legal, historical, sociological, psychological, policy and practical research and knowledge. An interdisciplinary approach is important since no one discipline can define how or why violence is perpetrated or experienced. It is not self-evident what violence is or why violence occurs. Practices, ideas and explanations about the nature and definition of violence change over time, not least through policy, political and media constructions. Though men's violence (to women) is very widespread, men are not 'naturally' violent; their violence is created, reproduced and sustained within and by the social fabric.

It is also necessary to critically address use of this term "roots", and its pros and cons. The notions of "roots" may be misleading in suggesting a clear, even single and fundamental root to the problem of men's violences. The notion of "roots", as in the "roots of men's violence", is a metaphor. The root metaphor refers to the root of a plant. The notion of root can suggest a number of interpreations: (i) that foundation which holds up the edifice; (ii) cause or explanation; (iii) historical origins; (iv) the essence, kernel or characteristic element.

While these are all different, and the word "roots" is used in the plural, it can also suggest a singularity. Many plants have one main root, but not

all. Some have rhyzomic roots. So in using the notion of roots, it is important to be aware of the possibility of multiple roots. Applying the metaphor of roots, like that of origins, thus raises a number of methodological difficulties. Such complexities tend to be addressed more directly in approaches emphasising the multiplicity of oppressions and intersectionalities, and some poststructuralist and postcolonial approaches. But even such approaches to multiplicity are to be critiqued, if in using the metaphor, violence is taken to be similar to a plant.

But what if violence is not like a static plant in the first place? What if the violence is not to be explained in such a static "causal" way? What if violence is more shifting a process over time, a process of accumulating (or perhaps reducing?) violation, with a trajectory, power dynamics, a process of escalation, and dialectics of power and resistance? If so, the metaphor of roots does not seem to apply very easily, at least not in any direct way.

This kind of critical thinking can be applied to:

1. *Individuals* – there is a danger of seeing the root of violence *within* the individual and their psychology. This approach can also be reconstructed as excuses and justifications.

2. *Family, Group, Subculture, Culture* – there is a danger of seeing the root of violence *within* the family, group, subculture, culture. What is it in the local collective that is being sought to explain violence? There are dangers here of moving back to culturalist explanations or roots.

3. *Societies* – there is a danger of seeing the root of violence as historically pre-determined *within* "society". This view may make more sense with societies that are more isolated or more stable or perhaps sites of extensive traumatisation.

4. *International, Comparative, and Transsocietal analyses* – how does the metaphor of roots translate in explaining violence and violent movements across societies, for example, the sex trade or transnational abductions? Do these have roots?

Thus, overall, the notion of roots needs to be used with caution, and with attention to methodological assumptions, rather than as a simplified model of cause or explanation that can produce a quick fix for policy. Furthermore, there is no one explanation of men's violence; different explanations do not necessarily compete with each other. Insights from two or more approaches can be combined. For example, structural processes operate

through particular individuals with their own biographies. Multi-level, multi-layered explanations include combinations of individual, family, and structural explanations.

Men's violence (to women and children) though a structural phenomenon is enacted by individual men; the responsibility for violence lies with individual men. This is not to say that the individual man is necessarily or naturally violent; however, the dominant social constructions of the male psyche or subjectivity are themselves often intimately bound up with violence and associations of violence. Violence is at least a reference point for the social construction of dominant male subjectivities and sexualities. This "male self" is produced and reproduced in various social arenas: the family, men being with other men, the school, and so on. In family relations constituted in patriarchal attitudes and practices the problem of men's violence is intimately connected to men's social power and status as husbands, spouses and fathers.

Much of men's information about how to be a man comes from being with other men in groups. Boys, young men and men to some extent choose peer groups, and these vary in their relation to violence. Indeed 'male peer support' can reproduce men's violence, through providing attachments and resources in the form of social integration, information support and esteem support, as in some sporting groups, where high figures of violence to women have sometimes been reported, especially after sporting events. Some of these contexts can also constrct and reconstruct homophobic and trans(gender)phobic violence.

However, peer groups are not only the result of or matters of socialisation, but they also involve degrees of agency and selection, that is: to some extent, men, and in particular young men, choose their peer-group, and peer-groups have very different rituals and regulations of accepted or expected violence (or non-violence). In this sense, young men, and men more generally, really make a choice. Secondly, peer groups have important social meanings for male youth: they are a part of the social organisation of transition into adult masculinity; they can be an important part of the process of social initiation to adulthood. Young men do not yet have the symbolic status of adult masculinity, so they are in this sense vulnerable to degradation by their male peers, but even also by girl(friend)s and young women too. The collective actions and practices – including separation from and dehumiliation of 'the female/feminine' – are ways to proceed with this contradiction in male youth. This perhaps explains why violence in male youth is often regarded as transitory or temporary and accepted (if not supported), espe-

cially by adult men. And indeed, much of the overtly and physically violent behaviour appears to reduce when young men start to have girlfriends or even having a family. Such transformation of young men's masculinity, and indeed their peers through reciprocal actions between young men, need to understood through this lifecourse and biographical dimension.

The social production and reproduction of boys and young men in and around schools is a major part of the production and reproduction of adult men and masculinities, including men's violence to women, and part of the transition to adult masculinity/ies. There is also the problem of bullying in schools, and connections may be made between bullying and sexual harassment, as well as homophobia, trans(gender)phobia and their related violences. Various forms of boyhood bullying can go on to encourage or discourage violence in adulthood. Norwegain research has found men's experience of being bullied, as boys, correlated with men's use of violence to women, as adults (Holter 1989; see Råkil 2002). This thus includes attention to links between past violations (for example, bullying at school) and later perpetration of violence, without falling into a cycle of abuse argument.

The societal conditions that produce and sustain men's violence (to women, men, children and gender variant people) include broad questions of gender power relations, men's social power, privileges and domination, and societal constructions of masculinity, as well as the impact of poverty, economic inequalities and other inequalities upon men's violence. Despite social and economic changes of many kinds, these have continued to be maintained through gendered processes across generations.

C. Documenting the process of developing a methodological framework, identifying the obstacles and solutions.

A transparent collaborative process and an abductive approach

In order to illustrate how this methodological development has proceeded, we outline in the following the process in a transparent way. This is also intended to show explicitly how this has been done and how further development work can be done.

The process of this work on a methodological basis for further research on men's violence to women can be summarised as an *abductive research approach*. This highlights the importance of the constant movement between the data, ideas and theories. An abductive research approach enables the 'transcending' of data, and it encourages the use of multiple theoretical sources in order to make discoveries and achieve new insights (Coffey and

Atkinson 1996; Holmlund 1996; Hiillos 2004; Jyrkinen 2005). Thereby, 'theory, data generation and data analysis are developed simultaneously in a dialectical process' (Mason 2002, 180).

According to Amanda Coffey and Paul Atkinson (1996), abductive reasoning is a process which aims at to generating new ideas, and which can be understood as a contrast to the polar opposites of deductive and inductive logic. In deductive reasoning 'theory comes first' and theoretical propositions or hypotheses are generated in advance and tested during the research. In inductive reasoning 'theory comes last', and the researcher develops theoretical propositions and explanations out of the data, from the particular to the general. (Mason 2002, 180-181.)

In abductive reasoning, ideas can be derived from multiple sources, previous research, reading of the literature in the field or other fields, personal experiences and other knowledge. Thus '[n]o amount of reading can provide the qualitative researcher with off-the-peg ideas. Similarly, the data alone will not generate analytic ideas of their own accord. Understanding proceeds through a constant movement between data and ideas' (Coffey and Atkinson 1996, 153).

Therefore, the abductive approach in this process has been crucial. It has enabled constant discussion on the content of the documents, in particular on the definitions of (men's) violence (to women), and methodologies on that. In such a process which includes many researchers from several countries, it is important to be sensitive to the different approaches on violence and its research in different cultural contexts. Because of these, sometimes different and even contested views, is has been important that the process is as interactive and as transparent as possible.

The process of developing a methodological framework has been *interactive* in many ways, including many rounds of commenting on the draft texts and bringing in new ideas on future research methodologies on men's violence to women (see section which explains the main phases of the process). It cannot be emphasised too strongly that this collective, collaborative process has been important in producing a research strategy on men's violence in Europe in a way that includes contributions from as many countries, researchers and disciplines as possible. The contributions from all partners and members have been crucial in this collectively authored document.

Structure of the process

In developing a transnational and comparative methodological framework such as this, it is considered very important to be transparent in terms of the structure of the process. For this reason some details of that process are now provided.

At the first meeting of the Sub-network, held in Osnabrück, it was agreed that the Sub-network would need to develop a range of methodological tools rather than one single tool. This was partly to be sensitive to the variability of cultural and social contexts both in time and space when researching men's practices. Accordingly, it was necessary conceptually to develop the idea of a "methodology" into several components interlinking with one another.

These components were defined as follows:

(i) Procedural frames focused on the process of how to find knowledge.

(ii) Epistemological frames.

(iii) Critical methodological re-reading of existing materials on the CROME website: to analyse and reflect upon the methodologies used in selected studies in each existing national report with a view to methodological development.

(iv) Consideration of a series of theoretical and analytical issues in relation to men's practices summarised under the heading of "Cultural Variations, Convergences and Divergences in Time and Space". Among these issues are: understanding the data in terms of the "intersectionality" of various forms of power relations associated with, for instance, gender, ethnicity, age, disability, sexuality and class; analysing the dynamics of men's practices in the context, and deep critique, of mainstream comparative welfare theoretical frames such as that of Esping-Andersen.

(v) Towards the development of adequate quality assurance of research methods.

(vi) The implications of (i) to (v) for development of a Research Strategy for future trans-European research on men's violences n the context of Human Rights Violations.

The development of a methodological framework for a research strategy on violence and dominance associated with men's practices is understood

in terms of intersecting forms of power relations as they relate to the social location of both those who commit violence and dominance, and those who are subjected to it, and the methodological and epistemological assumptions that are made. Critical methodological re-readings of existing materials on the Framework 5 (Hearn et al. 2001a, 2001b, 2002a, 2002b) and Framework 6 materials on the CROME website have been conducted to analyse and reflect upon methodologies used in selected existing studies with a view to methodological development. We include brief extracts from these re-readings of substantive knowledge, data, methodologies and epistemologies from the various countries (see Appendices 1 and 2).

The second Sub-network 2 meeting, held in Paris, focused on developing guidance on a methodological research strategy for future researchers, policy-makers and practitioners about the best means for transnational researching of men's violences allowing for the dynamics of time, space and culture was discussed. Based on the CROME website data (national reports, and their updates), all Sub-network 2 members were asked to complete country reports on relevant forms of data from within their own country, that related to the main focus (a) on violence and dominance associated with men's practices (b) understood in terms of intersecting forms of power relations as they relate to the social location of both those who commit violence/dominance and those who are subjected to it. Nine country reports were subsequently conducted and some key points are summarised in the Appendix 3; longer versions are available at the CROME website (http://www.cromenet.org).

This work fed into the third Sub-network meeting, held in Riga, and which included invited CAHRV experts to increase interchange between sub-networks.[2] In addition to discussion and comments given during this meeting, comments were sought on the preliminary draft of this document (Hearn et al. 2006a) after the meeting. Thereafter several further iterative processes took place to produce the Workpackage 9 Deliverable 25 (Hearn et al. 2006b). Following this, several further rounds of consultations and revisions have been undertaken within the Sub-network, with updatings and refinements. This process has also involved further attention to and elaboration of key issues, including some issues highlighted by the Coordina-

2 The meeting was attended by Dag Balkmar (Sweden), Gunilla Bjerén (Sweden), Carol Hagemann-White (part) (Germany), Jeff Hearn (Finland), Cornelia Helfferich (Germany), Marjut Jyrkinen (Finland), Liz Kelly (UK), Lucyna Kirwil (Poland), Ilse Lenz (Germany), Ursula Müller (Germany), Irina Novikova (Latvia), Elizabete Pičukāne (Latvia), Minna Piispa (part) (Finland), Ralf Puchert (Germany), Iva Šmídová (Czech Republic), Olga Tóth (Hungary), and Marek M. Wojtaszek (Poland).

tor, which have been worked on in particular by members of the Steering Group. Many other inputs have been made from throughout the Sub-network and CAHRV. At each stage of redrafting the text has been circulated to all Sub-network members to seek to produce a documentary report and record that reflects the state of knowledge throughout the countries and disciplines represented. As such, the methodological report is interdisciplinary, transnational and comparative in its process of production. This kind of process, and its documentation, is an important part of developing the methodological framework in a collaborative and cooperative way.[3]

3 The initial draft document upon which this Methodological Framework is based was circulated to all members and partners of Sub-network 2 (version 1) prior to the Riga meeting, seeking any immediate comments or corrections. The document was then modified and sent in advance of the third meeting (version 2). Many constructive suggestions on the document and for the future work of the Sub-network were made. Some of these were immediately incorporated into the document, along with immediate comments sent shortly after the Riga meeting (version 3). This revised document was made available on the overall CAHRV (BCSW) Web Forum and the CROME website, as part of the dissemination strategy. After this a further round of comments by the Sub-network members and partners were received, and incorporated in this text. This document (version 4) was the basis for a revised document (version 5), which was then revised following feedback from the Coordinator (version 6) and circulation again to the Sub-network members and partners as the D25 (version 7). Thereafter, following comments from the Coordinator, the document was revised again and recirculated to all Sub-network members and partners for comment and improvement (version 8); in addition, specific key areas identified by the Coordinator were specified and addressed by members of the Sub-network Steering Committee (version 9); the document was then rewritten and recirculated (version 10), and then revised following comments, feedback and inputs (version 11), to be submitted as D32 (version 12), and the finalised D32 with some further modifications (version 13) (Hearn et al., 2007), before the version was developed for this current publication (version 14).

PART II

Methodological Framework for a Research Strategy

This second part sets out a shared methodological framework for a research strategy by addressing principles and issues. It begins with a discussion of key terms such as men's violences and domination, reports on the examination of some of the relevant data from the various countries in terms of methodological and epistemological assumptions, and then sets some key methodological principles for a research strategy. Three of these are addressed in some more detail:

- roots and explanations of men's violences,
- the contributions of critical studies on men, and
- further issues in comparative and transnational research, in relation to cultural variations and intersectionality.

These elements underlie the planning of a structure of a shared methodological framework, understood as guidance for future researchers, policymakers, and practitioners on researching men's violences, taking account of the dynamics of time, space and culture. The issues raised are focused in order to contribute towards the development of adequate quality assurance of research methods in a research strategy for studying men's violences.

CHAPTER 2 **CLARIFICATION OF KEY TERMS**

This section discusses issues related to key terms including men's violences, abuse, violation and dominance. Violence is an especially complex and contested term. This is clear from an historical analysis of the changing recognition of what counts as (forms of) violence. The use of the term 'violence' also usually implies recognition that a problem exists: that something is seen as unacceptable or threatening, and that the actions and practices labelled as 'violent' have at least some characteristics in common with others similarly labelled. In this sense, it is a concept with shifting moral referents. Indeed contestations over the definitions (in particular what is included and excluded) are especially intense in the case of violence, and are central in the social construction, social experience and social reproduction of violence. Debates and dilemmas around the definition of violence include those on: intention to harm; extent of physical contact; harmful effects and damage; differential perceptions, for example, of violator and violated; and interpersonal and structural violence.

Contestation over the definition of violence is itself part of the process of enactment of reproduction of and indeed opposition to violence. This process occurs differentially and unevenly in different cultural and historical contexts. It has both short term and local dimensions and historical and global dimensions. Accordingly, in addressing the definition of violence, a broad view of violence is necessary. Violence can thus mean many different things to different people; it can refer to or involve many different kinds of social actions and social relations. 'Violence' is sometimes used to include or exclude 'abuse', or to mean 'physical violence' or only certain forms of physical violence, rather than, say, 'sexual violence' or more accurately 'sexual sexual violence'. The term 'violence' can be used precisely or vaguely.

Furthermore, violence is not something that is separated off from the rest of life; violence can be mixed up with all sorts of everyday experiences – work and housework, sex and sexuality, marriage and cohabitation, leisure, care and carework, "relaxing", watching television, and so on. Indeed some men specifically separate violence off from other parts of life and their life, and treat violence as some kind of separate activity. This in turn can become part of the problem of the continuation of the violence.

Perhaps most importantly, violence is not one thing; indeed, it is not a thing at all. Violence is simply a word, a shorthand, that refers to a mass of different experiences in people's lives. And as a word, 'violence', like other

words, can itself be used and abused – it can fall prey to the problems of nominalisation and reification. In the first case, 'violence' as a word can obscure power relations (by hiding them) within the practical use of the word; in the second case, social relations in the case of violence are reduced to things without human agency, or even social structure.

For these reasons, what 'violence' is and what 'violence' means is both material and discursive, both a matter of the experience of change in bodily matter, and a matter of change in discursive constructions. Violence is simultaneously material and discursive, simultaneously painful, full of pain, and textual, full of text. This suggests that it is very difficult to find a definition of violence that works for all situations and all times. Violence, and what is meant by violence, is historically, socially and culturally constructed.

Moreover, historical and cultural constructions of violence are not just matters of local or relative variations; they specifically shape the personal circumstances and future courses of action available to women and men in relation to violence. To put this more concretely, historical constructions of violence affect the way in which state organisations, the law and other institutions define violence. These in turn are important in the development of actual and potential policies on men's violence and these have the effect of structuring the lives of women and men. State and other organisations and institutions, themselves dominated by men, thus structure the meaning of violence through both inclusion and exclusion of actual or possible actions.

Definitions of violence thus vary greatly. Let us consider three possibilities. First violence is often equated with physical violence, or certain kinds of violence socially defined as 'serious' or that constitute crimes. Sometimes this is taken to include sexual (sexual) violence. This can apply in everyday definitions, especially of those being violent, and in official definitions. In criminal law this generally means the 'unjustified' use of physical force.

A second alternative is to expand 'violence' to include further forms of control, harassment and bullying more generally. This brings together debates on different forms of violence that are usually kept separate. Violence then includes sexual, racial and other harassments (unwanted, persistent physical or verbal behaviour of a sexual and/or racial nature); and bullying (exposure repeatedly and over time to negative actions from one or more persons such that the victim has difficulties defending themselves, as well as physical violence). Harassment can be seen as 'repeated and persistent attempts by one person to torment, wear down, frustrate or get a reaction

from another' (Bast-Petterson et al. 1995, 50). Bullying includes, for example, isolation (people refusing to listen to you, people refusing to talk to you), slander (gossip behind your back, spreading false and groundless information), negative glances and gestures, sneering (Björkqvist et al. 1994; Vartia 1995).

A third way is to adopt a broad, socially contextualised understanding of violence as violation. Accordingly, violence can be defined as those structures, actions, events and experiences that violate or cause violation or are considered as violating. They are usually, but not necessarily, performed by a violator or violators upon the violated. Violence can thus be seen as much more than physical violence, harassment and bullying. It can also include intimidation, interrogation, surveillance, persecution, subjugation, discrimination and exclusion that lead to experiences of violation. This is close to what Judith Bessant (1998) calls 'opaque violence'. As she comments, 'In relationships where significant long-term power disparities exist, then inequality can easily slip into violence.' (p. 9). This raises the question of how violence and violation relate to broad questions of oppression, inequality and (gender and other forms of) equity. For example, Iris Marion Young (1990) has explicated a plural cathegorisation of oppression: exploitation, marginalisation, powerlessness, cultural imperialism and violence. In contrast, Nancy Fraser (1997, 44-49) has outlined a concept of gender equity that encompasses a plurality of seven distinct normative principles: antipoverty, antiexploitation, income equality, leisure-time equality, equality of respect, antimarginalisation, and antiandrocentrism.

Violence and violation are thus *social* phenomena. Violation usually, though not always, includes some kind of *force* or *potential force*: force *by* the violator; forced violation *of* the violated. Violence as violation includes structured oppression; harassment, bullying and violences; and mundane, everyday violations. Dominant forms of violence as violation are by men to women, children or other men. They range across verbal, emotional, psychological, cognitive, representational and visual attacks, threats and degradation; enactment of psychological harm; physical assaults; use of weapons and other objects; destruction of property; rape; and murder. These distinctions may in practice break down, as in the understanding of all forms of violence from men to women as sexual violence (Kelly 1987).

There are also several standpoints from which to define violence as violation: the violator; the violated; those of other social actors involved in dealing with violence; for example, lawmakers or enforcers; and those of analysts, who may or may not be involved in such intervention. In some situa-

tions the position, observation and sometimes relatively passive participation of audiences is especially important. These perspectives are, however, not always distinct; someone may occupy more than one location simultaneously. All are mediated through representations and perceptions, usually differently for violators and violated, men and women. Violence involves violation; but violation is a broader, more useful concept for our purposes. Even though the term, violation, does not exist in exact translation in a number of European languages, we have chosen it because of its breadth and transferability across locations. This focus on violation has important methodological significance. Just as sexuality is not a fixed thing or even simply a set of acts, but a process of desiring, so similarly, a focus on violation refers to a process of damaging. These processes involve the desiring or damaging event, and responses to desire/damage, and are, moreover, embodied, material and discursive.

Violence and violation can be more or less institutionalised in particular contexts, institutions and organisations, even whole societies. Violation may also include the creation of the conditions of violence, whether social structurally or when someone's presence is violating. Violation can be dramatic or subtle, occasional or continuous, chronic and endemic (as in slave workplaces), generally invisible and 'unnecessary' (as inequalities are *so* entrenched), normalised and naturalised (as in the acceptance of abuse in some relationships or of sexual harassment as part of some jobs), an indication of changing power relations (perhaps through challenging previous power relations) or a reassertion of power by dominant groups (as in men's responses to women's power). Violence and violations can be ways of reinforcing relations of domination and subordination; of developing resistance; of refining gradations of status and power; and facilitating alliances, coalitions, inclusions, exclusions and scapegoating.

Definition can be thus approached from number different perspectives and interests. These perspectives and interests are differently implicated in the *recognition* of violence. Thus it is axiomatic yet highly significant that a necessary part of the definition of violence is the *recognition* of violence or the threat or potentiality of violence or the possibility of violence. *Recognition* is both an individual and a group or collective process. Recognition may often, though not always, move from the individual to the group or collectivity, especially when individuals begin to share their experiences of violence – or more precisely their experiences of the possibility of violence, their suspicions of a recognition of violence.

It may be useful to consider the following perspectives on violence:

(i) that which is or involves the use of force, physical or otherwise, by a violator or violators;

(ii) that which is intended to cause harm;

(iii) that which is experienced, by the violated, as damaging and/or violation;

(iv) the designation of certain acts, activities or events as 'violent' by a third party, for example, a legal authority.

All these perspectives are themselves historically and culturally specific. In particular, what is not named as violence in one situation or time may become named as violent elsewhere or subsequently. This, for example, may make possible the naming of certain kinds of sexual-social relations as 'sexual harassment'. This is even clearer still when, what are at one time named as 'consensual' sexual-social relations, are renamed as power relations, exploitation, abuse or harassment. Thus, seen in this kind of way, violence is an open-ended category, and especially so if the experience of violation is emphasised as part of definition.

Violence is both interpersonal and structural. While the concept of interpersonal violence refers to *direct* violence from one person to another in an identifiable situation, what is meant by structural violence needs some attention. There are several different, though related, meanings of the term structural violence, including:

(i) structural violence as the structural pattern of individual and interpersonal violence, such as the societal patterns of men's violence to women in the home;

(ii) structural violence as the acts and effects of social institutions such as the state. This might be more accurately referred to as institutional violence;

(iii) structural violence as the violent effects of inequalities, including those on a world scale, such as the distribution of famine;

(iv) structural violence as the violent effects of warfare and inter-nation and inter-community violence;

(v) structural violence as the social structural relations of institutions when and where those social relations have historically been violent or have underwritten violence, for example, the social relations of fatherhood or capitalism.

Men's violences are those violences that are done by men or are attributed to men. The term 'men's violences' is preferred to 'male violence' for several reasons. First, it is more precise: it attributes the violence to men. Second, it makes it clear that there is not any assumption of biological inevitability to the violence or a biological cause of the violence. Third, it removes the ambiguity that there might be a special form of violence that is 'male' that is only one part of the totality of violence of men. Fourth, it acknowledges the plurality of men's violences. Fifth, it recognises that all 'men' might not be unequivocally 'male'. Indeed there is growing attention to the social construction of biology and biological and sexual difference, from both biologists and cultural theorists.

The range of men's violences is immense. It spans the very particular and the global; the interpersonal and the institutional; the agentic and the structural. It includes violence to strangers and to known others, violence to women, children, each other, animals, and men's own selves. It varies in form and in process. It includes physical, sexual, verbal, psychological, emotional, linguistic, social, spatial, financial, representational and visual violences. It includes violence done, threatened violence and potential violence. It includes enacted violence in the present and accumulated or consolidated violence in the past and present. It also includes the interrelation and overlap between all these kinds of violences.

There is thus a range of terminological and definitional issues that need addressing. Men's violences can be taken as a broad term to include controls and abuses, as well as direct physical and sexual violences. They can be seen to include prostitution, pornography and the sex trade more generally. Violation is a concept referring the experience of that person(s) that is experienced as violating.

Dominance is also a general broad term, referring in this context to (i) men's dominating practices; (ii) men's structural dominance. This latter can be taken to mean men's dominance of certain occupations, business management and board membership, the public sector, and government and politics in general. While there are a growing number of studies on men's violence and abuse, there is still a lack of detailed studies on men's dominance more generally and men in positions of power. The connections of this structural domination and more direct violence are rather rarely addressed.

CHAPTER 3 **METHODOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES**

The following methodological perspectives are fundamental in developing a research strategy:

(i) *gendered analysis and gendered power relations;*

(ii) *gender collaboration;*

(iii) *use of multiple methods, methodologies and epistemological frames;*

(iv) *interconnections between social arenas;*

(v) *ethical and political sensitivities;*

(vi) *examining and problematising roots and explanations of men's violences;*

(vii) *building on and reviewing the contribution of Critical Studies on Men;*

(viii) *developing a comparative and transnational orientation, by attending to cultural variations, convergences and divergences in time and space, and intersecting forms of power relations.*

Gendered analysis and gendered power relations

Research strategy needs to attend to the centrality of gender and gendered power relations. This is not only in terms of the substantive focus of the research, but also in terms of the gender composition of the research networks. Issues of gendered content and process need to be addressed throughout research, including the production of data and the interpretation of data and gaps in data. While it is now clearly recognised that violence is gendered, the gendering of research on violence is discussed less often.

One crucial issue that distinguishes different approaches to gender is whether gender is seen as one of several fundamental social divisions underpinning social life, individual experiences, and the operation of other social divisions (such as age, class, 'race', ethnicity, religion), on the one hand, or as just one of a string of social factors defining an individual's response to a situation, on the other. Studies that refer to women or women's experiences do not necessarily constitute a fully gendered approach. They may, for example, treat women (or gender) simply as a variable, rather

than as constitutive of, or located in, some social structural formation. And moreover they may not analyse men as just as gendered as women. A fully gendered, that is gender-present, approach needs to attend to these questions.

An adequately gendered approach would include at least the following features:

- attention to the variety of feminist approaches and literatures; these provide the methodology and theory to develop a gendered account;
- recognition of gender differences as both an analytic category and experiential reality;
- attention to sexualities and sexual dynamics in research and the research process; this includes the deconstruction of taken-for-granted heterosexuality, particularly in the study of families, communities, agencies and organisations;
- attention to the social construction of men and masculinities, as well as women and femininities, and including understanding masculinities in terms of relations between men, as well as relations with women and children;
- understanding of gender through its interrelations with other oppressions and other identities, including those of age, class, disability, 'race', ethnicity and religion;
- acceptance of gender conflict as permanent, and as equally as normal as its opposite, as well as examining resistance to this view;
- understanding that gender and sexuality and their relationship are historically and culturally acquired and defined; and
- understanding that the close monitoring of gender and sexuality by the state (the official biography of individuals) is not accidental, but fulfils the purposes of particular social groupings.

Research on men's violence has to be gender-present. To scientifically present violence as gender-absent or gender-neutral would require that it be random in its doing and receiving in relation to women and men, and require it to play no role in the maintenance of gendered and other social boundaries and social divisons. This does not apply to any form of violence, including same-sex violence where, for example, violence between men is far greater than violence between women (Hanmer and Hearn 1999).

Gender collaboration

Research on men's violences needs to bring together women and men researchers who research men and masculinities in an explicitly gendered way. Such a meeting point for women researchers and men researchers is necessary and timely in the development of good quality European research on men in Europe. Such work offers many opportunities for collaboration and learning across countries and between colleagues.

Research on men that draws only on the work of men is likely to neglect the very important research contribution that has been and is being made by women to research on men. Research and networking based only on men researchers is likely to reproduce some of the existing gender inequalities of research and policy development. This is not a comment of gender essentialism but rather a commentary on the need to draw on the full knowledge and expertise available. Gender-collaborative research is necessary in the pursuit of gender equality, the combating of gender discrimination, achievement of equality, and anti-discrimination work more generally. This is not to suggest that all research teams should comprise women and men researchers.

Use of multiple methods, methodologies and epistemological frames

It is assumed that no one method is able to answer the spread of research questions. A range of methods needs to be employed, including: national representative surveys, survivor accounts, perpetrator accounts, individual biographies (Critical Discourse Analysis), agency data interviews, analysis of case files. Various international databases have been used, and these can be supplemented. Data prevalence, along various databases, such as, ESF database, International Studies Association, Eurostat, INED, UNDP, needs to be used. While attending to the existing statistical and other information, qualitative and grounded methods and analyses need to be emphasised and developed. It is also necessary to critically reflect on the methods in use as research proceeds.

Methodological contributions need to be from across social sciences, demography, anthropology, family sociology, and so on. All forms of approaches and epistemological frames to understanding knowledge should be utilised including positivist social science, feminist standpoint theory, post-stucturalist, postcolonial, critical social postmodernism approaches, but all should be reviewed critically. Methodology needs to attend to both material inequalities and discursive constructions.

Interconnections, and separations, between social arenas

A key principle is to see the interconnections between men's violences and other social arenas: home, work, social exclusion, social inclusion, health, care, and so on. For example, varieties of violence connect with the health and welfare of those involved – both those violated and the construction of bodies of violators and others. Violence involves the use of the body and the affecting of the bodies of others. Many such interlinks co-exist at once both in the gendered structure of society – in the symbolic realm, in the division of labour and in individual gender life trajectories. Social institutions, such as the family, education, law, politics, labour markets, are not polarised – as either/or – when violence is concerned. The institution of the family or household can both be a place where care is practised and a place where various types of violence occur.

Violence does not operate as a separate sphere of practice. There are impacts of work and employment on violence (including gender differences regarding work), and vice versa; impacts of domestic and family relations on violence, and vice versa; impacts of social inclusion and social exclusion on violence, and vice versa; and impacts of men's health and women's health on violence, and vice versa.

Home and work – violences

Much violence occurs in the home, in the form of men's violence to known women and men's child abuse, including child sexual abuse (and the co-occurrence of men's violences to women and children). The home is a major site of men's violence. There is increasing recognition of the scale of violence, including bullying and harassment, at work. Violence at home is clearly antagonistic to equality and care at home, and is detrimental to performance at work. Home and work both provide potential social support and networks, to both reproduce and counter men's violence.

Social exclusion – violences

The social exclusion of certain men may often be associated with violence. This may be especially popular in media reporting of men's violence. In some situations social exclusion may indeed follow from violence, as in imprisonment. On the other hand, social exclusion may even be inhibited by some forms of violence, as when men show they are worthy of other men's support by the use or threat of violence. Social exclusion may also be seen as one of the causes or correlates of violence, but this explanation may only apply to certain kinds of violences, such as certain kinds of riots. The connections of social exclusion with interpersonal violence to known others

are complicated. Deprivation may be associated to some extent and in some localities with some forms of men's violence, such as certain forms of property crime, violence between men, and the use of physical violence to women in marriage and similar partnerships. Such forms of violence are also typically strongly age-related, with their greater performance by younger men. On the other hand, men's violence and abuse to women and children in families crosses class boundaries. Generalisations on these connections thus need to be evaluated in the local situation. There is growing recognition of men and boys as victims of violence, albeit usually from other men.

Two further significant but frequently overlooked points are: first, that men's violences to women, children and to some extent other men represent a massive forms of social exclusion themselves; and, second, men's violences, together with dominant and dominating ways of being a man, are intimately connected with the dynamics of racism – another profound form of social exclusion. It is also important to note that the very way violence is conceptualised is mediated by class. In cases when middle or upper class men (rather than working class men) are violent to women, they have more resources that may enable them to hide the acts in question (more than working class men), thereby rendering it invisible.

Violences – health

Men's violences and health connect in many ways. Violence is a graphic form of non-caring for others. Some forms of ill health, such as those induced by risk-taking, may also involve non-caring for the self. Risk-taking is especially significant for younger men, in, for example, smoking, alcohol and drug taking, unsafe sexual practices and road accidents. In this context it is interesting that some research finds that men are over-optimistic regarding their own health. Recent studies on men have often been concerned to show how men too are affected by health risks, violence and so on, without connecting the theses more systematically to societal context.

Ethical and political sensitivities in collaborative work

Studying sensitive but also powerful topics, such as gendered violence, calls for addressing specific ethical issues on the research process and method(s) used. Ethical issues concern especially professional integrity and relations with and responsibilities towards research participants, sponsors and/or funders. Possible problems, such as methodological, technical, ethical, political and legal problems, need to be taken into consideration at every stage of the research on a sensitive topic.

The importance of good collaboration and work process, and appropriate ethical practices cannot be emphasised too strongly in the development of high quality comparative, transnational research. This question operates in several respects and at several different levels, and is an important ethical issue in its own right. This applies all the more so when the attempt is made to act against violence, violation and abuse, in this case men's violences and abuses.

This is also a practical question in terms of getting tasks done with the benefit of the greatest input and contribution from all concerned, from different ethnic(ised), gendered, sexual, linguistic, national and other differenced socio-political contexts. Without this, there is a great danger of some participants dominating the research process, leading to a limited understanding of men's violence. Indeed the ability to work collaboratively is a *sine qua non* of successful transnational research work, and especially so on such difficult and sensitive topics as gender power relations, violence, violation and human rights.

Furthermore, it is also a matter of the content of research knowledge and of epistemology, for without good collaborative practices the epistemology of dominant one(s) may dominant the epistemologies of others. These points apply for all participants, and particularly for those in leadership positions. In particular, it is vitally important to develop facilitative and supportive research working, research practices, and research leadership.

Our experience of working on European, EU and other comparative, transnational research on men and masculinities suggests a number of pointers for developing such research practice. These matters of research process cannot be separated from the content of research, in this context, comparative, transnational research on men, masculinities and men's interpersonal violences.

Thus we suggest these positive guidelines:

- Give strong attention to ethical questions in the gathering, storage and distribution of data and other information.
- Be respectful of all researchers and what they bring to the research; this extends to understanding of difference, and for other's research and national and regional locations.
- Be aware that the major regional differences within Europe (and beyond) mean that assumptions that single models should be applied in all parts of Europe should be treated critically and with great caution. While there may has been more research and more research resources in Western Europe, researchers there have much to learn from Central and Eastern Europe, including about the latter's historical situations. As is often the case within structural and uneven power relations, those with less resources often know more about those with more resources, than vice versa.
- Be aware of major national, legal and cultural differences within Europe, around openness/secrecy, financial accounting and many other matters.
- Value self-reflective approaches to the development of multiple methods, and in the conduct of researchers, meetings and other activities.
- Be aware that much research is done by goodwill and indeed overwork, and with few or no additional resources; thus excessive demands can mean that time and resources are taken from other academinc and related activities, and other research projects; this is issue of ethical allocation of time and resources between different activities, which is especially important in working on questions of violence and violation.
- Express positive support and gratitude, not excessive criticism.
- Be aware that most people are working in their second, third or fourth language, and that extra attention may need to be given to clarity in the working language.
- Take care in writing emails and other communications; where possible, write clear short emails and other communications; do not use obscure phrases or make ungrounded suggestions in email and other communications.
- In collective research discussions give feedback in good time, and not late in the process of research production.

- Develop an appropriate and fair collective publishing policy, so texts and information are not used inappropriately by others as their own.
- Be aware of internal differences within research projects, especially between those who are more funded and those who are less (or not) funded, and between universities and similar institutions that are better resourced (especially in Western Europe) and universities and similar institutions that are less well resourced (especially in Central and Eastern Europe). This involves a thorough grounded understanding of the conditions under which different researchers are working: some are working on permanent contracts, some temporary contracts; some are well paid, others are not; some are in supportive working environments, others are in environments lacking support. Researchers are subject to other social divisions and differences, such as by age, class, disability, ethnicity and racialisation, gender, sexuality.
- Develop projects that are fair in terms the distribution of resources, including between those with greater coordinating functions and other research functions, between those who are more funded and those who are less funded, and between universities and similar institutions that are better resourced (especially in Western Europe) and universities and similar institutions that are less well resourced (especially in Central and Eastern Europe); This is especially so with the under-resourcing of research and the overwork of many researchers doing much work unpaid or in "overtime".
- Develop a violation-free mode of organisation and working.
- Aim to produce a working environment that people are satisfied with, that they look to working with and are pleased to be in.

Examining and problematising roots and explanations of men's violences

The examination of causes, explanations and 'roots' needs to be considered, both in broad and multiple ways, without seeing them in over-simple and deterministic interpretations. Debates on why men do violence – the 'roots' of men's violences – has been long and varied. It has moved through shifts in disciplinary and discursive constructions, and in the placing of men's violence in relation to 'men' and 'violence'. Explanations of men's violence may be developed from a wide range of academic and disciplinary traditions. These include biological and sociological, psychological and psychoanalytic, sociological, anthropological, political and economic.

Within such different traditions, there are different conceptual, analytical and empirical building blocks. Within human rights frameworks, instead of 'roots' of violence, the terminology is often much based on 'causes' of violence that can sometimes, but not in all cases, be interpreted as obliging states that have signed the relevant UN conventions to address such violations through prevention and intervention (Kelly 2006, 10).

Forms of explanations, and thus possible 'roots', are listed below. These all should be considered critically.

1. Nature and Biology: these include: the focus on instinct and territoriality, including competition for food, resources and sexual partners; chromosomal explanation of violence, hormonal levels, socio-psychoendocrinology, in which reciprocal links are recognised between testosterone, aggression, dominance, social structure, and indeed sexual behaviour; human intervention in the biochemical, as in debates about the effects of steroids.

2. Moves towards Various Social Explanations: Many theories and analyses of violence have at their centre debates about the nature of the social – the relationship of individual and society; of social order and social conflict; of mind and body; of the internal and the external; and above all the place of violence in the social. There are a number of difficult dilemmas to be engaged with, including:

- Violence can be constructed as part of the inherent 'badness' of people or an exception to the inherent 'goodness' of people.
- Violence can be something taken on by individuals from the social or something placed upon individuals by the social.
- Violence can be expressive of internal needs or instrumental to achieve external ends.
- Violence of one party, in this context particularly men's violence, can be considered separate from or in relation to the violence or potential violence of others.
- Violence can be a means of maintaining social structure or of disrupting social structures.

Furthermore, each of these elements may be gendered and each is problematic. Accordingly violence can be understood as gender-neutral or gendered, or even as inherently gendered.

A simple framework for the analysis of explanations of men's violence to women is that outlined by Gondolf (1985), drawing on the work of Bagarozzi and Giddings (1983) and Gelles (1983). Gondolf's framework is

drawn up in relation to 'wife abuse', but it is useful for considering the broad terms of debate around men's violence more generally. He presents three major theoretical explanations as follows:

> Psychoanalytic themes [that] focus on stress, anxiety instilled during child rearing ...; social learning theories [that] consider the abuse to an outgrowth of learned patterns of aggressive communication to which both husband and wife contribute ...; socio-political theories [that] hold the patriarchal power plays of men oppressing women to be at the heart of wife abuse (Gondolf 1985, 27).

3. Psychological and Psychodynamic Explanations: This applies to both men's/male/masculine psychology in general, and the identification of different specific psychologies of different groups of men, for example, men who have severe or multiple psychological problems, who have experienced sexual and other violence as children, and who are experiencing depression. There is strong interest in increasing understanding of men repeat offenders of violence against women and children. One aspect of this research is the identification of 'abusive personalities' and 'anti-social personality disorder/trait' among violent men.

4. Role Theory and the Social Environment, and Cognitive and Cognitive-Behavioural Approaches: A well-developed framework is to explain men's violences as learned behaviour. This involves the focus on violence as external sense data that are observable and reproduced, replicated or imitated over time. Cognitive-behavioural analysis focuses on the particular forms of learning that have taken place for particular individuals, which in term is assumed to constitute the longer tem process of reproduction of violence through intergenerational learning and socialisation. This kind of analysis attempts to describe the detail of either social learning or socialisation. These are, however, relatively simple formulations of how violence works and is reproduced.

Bandura (1973, 1977) has analysed the origins, instigators and maintaining conditions and regulators of aggression. Goldstein (1989) follows this view in arguing that there are three main arenas where aggression is to be learnt, namely the home, the school and the mass media. Learning may be direct following the reinforced practice of aggression, or vicarious by the observation of others behaving aggressively and being rewarded for doing so.

Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) suggest that most of the men whom they studied had been violent to wives had been traumatised as children either by being abused or by observing the abuse of their mother. The idea of

trauma reproducing violence allows for an intrapsychic model of violence or a composite model containing social learning and psychodynamic insights. Attention is paid to inter-generational processes in the reproduction of violence, enabling a wide range of subsidiary concepts, such as 'inter-generational transmission', 'the cycle of violence', and cultures of violence'.

5. Reactive Theories: Frustration, Stress and the Blocking of Social Roles: Reactive theories of violence can be psychological or sociological in their focus. Aggression and violence are explained as a response to psychological frustration, 'emotional illiteracy, individual or social stress, or economic and political deprivation. The argument that are used to 'explain' the violence is that men use violence when their goals are blocked and other means of proceed are unavailable or ineffective. The main genre of reactive theories on men's violence to women is stress theory (Gelles 1974; Straus et al. 1980). In this approach, factors such as unemployment or part-time employment, low income and the greater number of children are related to violence towards children and 'between spouses'. A rather similar interpretation is sometimes of men's violence to women to see it as a reaction to men's alcohol use/abuse. Whilst acknowledging that there is an association between the two, Horsfall (1991, 85-86) also notes some of the difficulties in seeing alcohol as a direct cause of violence. These kinds of approaches leave open why it is that in particular men, or some men, might respond to such situations with violence.

6. Environment, Cultures and Systems: Family Culture, Subcultures and Cultural Theories: Violence is understood as produced and reproduced through learning, socialication, modelling and imitation, which in turn can be conceptualised as producing an environment of violence that operates over time, for instance, across across generation, and also above and beyond individuals through social relationships. Thus these temporal and social continuities 'produce' the environment of violence that transcends the individual and the particular violence of the individual. The advantage of these kinds of approaches is that they provide a way of moving beyond a focus on the individual towards the consideration of social relations. They also raise important questions of continuities across time and space, social or physical. On the other hand, systemic theory, especially in the form of marital and family systems theory, focuses on the interactive dynamics *between* the violator and the violated. Therefore, there is a danger of reducing the people, the man and the women, to parts of degendered system.

7. Hybrid Theories: Stress, Inequality and Subculture: This kind of theories bring together elements of learning, reactive stress and environmental cultural theories According to Lees and Lloyd (1994, 9), '[s]ocial structural stress is another theory, often used in collaboration with social learning theory, to explain the beating of women. Integrated into this approach is the notion that social stress is associated with unequal access to resources, especially for the poor. In this view, individuals who are under stress resort to violence as an outlet for frustration, which may result from one incident or a slow build-up of incidents. (…) However, stress and poverty by themselves are not sufficient to explain the violence, as many poor families are not affected. Also, women battering and stress occur right across social spectrum, although it is thought that stress and violence is greatest amongst lower classes'.

8. Multicausal Explanations: Lees and Lloyd (1994, 10-11) summarise the multicausal approach as follows:

> Some theorists have recently attempted to combine some or all of the theories so far discussed in order to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of woman beating. Edleson, Eisikovits and Guttmann (1985) argue that terror is the major feature of the battered woman's life, rather than beatings which might only occur spasmodically. They looked at the many empirical studies undertaken of woman battering and suggested they fell into five areas: 1) violence in the man's family of origin; 2) chemical abuse and violence; 3) personal characteristics; 4) demographic and relationship variables; 5) information on specific violent events. Some approaches emphasise the assessment of multiple risks.

9. Violence as Structured Oppression: The Socio-political Critique of Patriarchy/ies: In the above mentioned 'exlanations' of (men's) violence (against women), women and men remain conceptualised as relatively autonomous individuals within the liberal society or as bearers of sex roles, and thus a relatively simple understanding of gender is in use. However, feminist studies have emphasised how men's violence to women can be understood as a part of the system of structured power and oppression that constitutes patriarchy/patriarchies, and social relations within these (see, for instance, Brownmiller 1975; Dworkin 1982; Sheffield 1987; Hanmer et al. 1989; Hester et al. 1996).

10. Cross-cultural Societal Studies: There is also the question of how violence, men's violence, and knowledge thereof is formed and organised

in different societies: in other words, the comparative and transactional dimensions once again. In the book, *Societies at Peace*, Howell and Willis (1990) posed the question: what can we learn from peaceful societies? They found that the definition of masculinity had a significant impact on the propensity towards violence. In those societies in which men were permitted to acknowledge fear, levels of violence were low. In those societies, however, where masculine bravado, the repression and denial of fear, was a defining feature of masculinity, violence was likely to be high. Those societies in which such bravado is prescribed for men are those in which the definitions of masculinity and femininity are very highly differentiated.

11. Difference and Diversity, including influences from Poststructuralism and Postmodernism: The question of difference and diversity is important in relation to men's violence to (known) women in terms of age, disability, economic class, gender, race and ethnicity, and sexuality. For instance, black feminists have highlighted the neglect of experiences of black women in much of the research on men's violence (for instance, Bhatti-Sinclair 1994) Thus earlier research on (men's) violence in 'white' contexts and communities would need further emphasis and focus on and through the aspects of research and researchers of/from 'non-white' communities. The cultural settings in Europe concerning ethnicity are very diverse, and increasingly so. Therefore, emphasis on these aspects is very much needed in the current and future Europe. This arises also the question that 'who' ('white' or 'non-white', 'originally European' or immigrants/ethnic minorities, and so on) are involved in the research processes, and what does it mean for the outcome of the research settings, their contextualisations and outcomes.

At the same time, there is a danger that when following the cultural/ethnic/race 'path', research becomes essentialist, and starts to 'explain' the violence in a 'cultural' and non-gendered way. This is an aspect that needs to be emphasised in the process of developing of a 'European' strategy to research on violence.

According to Hearn (1998, 33): 'structuration theory, in emphasising the intersection of social structures and agency/actions, also raises the theme of difference and diversity (Messerschmidt 1993). These issues of difference and diversity between forms of violence, between kinds of men's violence, and experiences of different social groups defined by other divisions and oppressions are a major theme of current research (see, for example, Rice 1990, Kirkwood 1993; Tifft 1993; Pringle 1995).'

Until recently, there has been a relatively limited development of feminist work on men's violence to known women that is inspired or influenced by post-structuralism, postmodernism, and feminist poststructuralisms and postmodernisms. As such and according to many of these approaches, violence, including men's violence, is not a discrete area of study not is it a separate object cause or 'explained' by some other subject or cause. Instead, violence is multiple, diverse and context-specific; it is also formed in relation to and in association with other social forms, such as sexuality, family, marriage and authority. Violence is not a separate thing, but is constructed in diverse social relations and discourses (Hearn 1998).

However, violence is never 'only a discourse' when thinking about its object and its effects: violence is very much a physical, mental and emotional experience(s) to its victim and in a different way for its perpetrators. Thus research that builds on or is limited to very strong postmodernist ideology may reduce the acts of violence to discursive elements or processes.

12. Hegemonic and Dominant Masculinities, and their Empirical and Theoretical Critique: There is now a major debate on the critique and limitations of hegemonic masculinity in general and in relation to men's violence. This area is now discussed in more detail.

Building on and reviewing the contribution of Critical Studies on Men

There is now a substantial international body of critical, feminist and profeminist work on men, masculinities and men's practices. Some of this is on men's violences. Some of the implications of this general research can be extended men's violences. The approach here argues for Critical Studies on Men that are:

- comparative, international and transnational
- interdisciplinary
- historical
- cultural
- relational
- materialist
- deconstructive

The variety of disciplinary and methodological frameworks available for the study of men, masculinities and men's practices include approaches from: biology, stressing sex differences; essentialism searching for the

"real" masculine; role theory; gender-specific socialisation and identity formation; history; anthropology and cross-cultural studies; feminist theories; patriarchy theory; multiple masculinities and hegemonic masculinity; focus on habitus; gay theory; queer theory; social constructionism and discourse theory; deconstruction; postmodernism; postcolonialism; transnational globalised conceptualisations; as well as humanities perspectives.

There are tensions between approaches that stress gender dichotomy and inevitability to gender adversities, as against those that emphasise change, processuality, flexibility and self-reflection for different genders. There are also variations in the extent to which these studies take a critical stance towards men and masculinities, between the development of feminist/profeminist Critical Studies on Men (Hearn 1997, 2004a; Connell et al. 2005), as opposed to the much more ambiguous and sometimes even anti-feminist activities of 'men's studies', which can become defined in a much less critical way as 'by men, on men, for men'. CSM examine men as part of historical gender relations, through a wide variety of analytical and methodological tools and approaches. The notion of men is social and not to be essentialised and reified, as in some versions of the equivocal term 'men's studies'. Men are understood as historical, cultural and changeable, both as a social category and in particular constructions. In this sense CSM are part of the broader project of Women's Studies and Gender Research, rather than competitive with them.

Critical Studies on Men have brought the theorising of men and masculinities into sharper relief, making men and masculinities explicit objects of theory and critique. Among the many areas of current debate, we would draw attention to three particular sets of questions that have preoccupied researchers: the concept of patriarchy; similarities and differences between men and between masculinities; and men's, or male, sexualities and subjectivities. In each case, there are tensions between generalisations about men and masculinity and specificities of men and masculinities, including the notion of hegemonic masculinity.

The notion of hegemonic masculinity was developed in the late 1970s and early 1980s, as part of the critique of sex role theory (Eichler 1980). In a key 1985 article Carrigan, Connell and Lee wrote:

> What emerges from this line of argument [on the heterosexual-homosexual ranking of masculinity] is the very important concept of *hegemonic masculinity*, not as "the male role", but as a particular variety of masculinity to which others – among them young and effeminate as well as homosexual men – are subordinated. It is particular groups

> of men, not men in general, who are oppressed within patriarchal sexual relations, and whose situations are related in different ways to the overall logic of the subordination of women to men. A consideration of homosexuality thus provides the beginnings of a dynamic conception of masculinity as a structure of social relations. (Emphasis in original; p. 586).

In the book Masculinities, Connell (1995) discusses and applies the notion of hegemonic masculinity in more depth. This reaffirms earlier discussions of the link with Gramsci's analysis of economic class relations through the operation of cultural dynamics, and also notes that hegemonic masculinity is always open to challenge and possible change. Hegemonic masculinity is now defined slightly differently as follows:

> … the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women. (p. 77).

Masculinities operate in the context of patriarchy or patriarchal relations. The notion of patriarchy is understood in this context not in its literal sense of rule of the father(s), but as men's structural dominance in society. The development of a dynamic conception of masculinities can itself be understood as part of the feminist and gendered critique of any monolithic conception of patriarchy, that was developing around the same time in the mid 70s and early 80s (for example, Rowbotham 1979). Thus the notion of masculinities fits with a more complex and diversified understanding of patriarchy (Walby 1986, 1990; Hearn 1987; Holter 1997) or patriarchies (Hearn 1992). In reviewing the field, Connell (1998) summarised the major themes in contemporary studies on men as: plural masculinities; hierarchy and hegemony; collective masculinities; bodies as arenas; active construction; contradiction; dynamics.

There is also a growing lively debate on the limitations of the very idea of 'masculinities', including around the confusions of different current usages in the term (for example, Donaldson 1993; Nordberg 2000; Whitehead 2002). The very concept of 'masculinity/masculinities' has been critiqued for its ethnocentrism, historical specificity, false causality, possible psychologism and conceptual vagueness (McMahon 1993; Hearn 1996b, 2004a). Whilst Connell (1993, 1995) has emphasized the cultural specificity of masculinities, and even of the concept itself, it has been pointed out that there has been a widespread application of the term in many and various ways, and this can be a conceptual and empirical weakness. Con-

nell has also described hegemonic masculinity as a "configuration of gender practice" rather than a type of masculinity, yet the use of the term has sometimes been as if it is a type. Cross-cultural research has used the concept of 'manhood' (Gilmore 1990) and historical research the notions of 'manliness' and 'unmanliness', in the UK (Mangan and Walvin 1987) and Sweden (Andersson 2003; Tjeder 2003).

Generally we prefer to talk rather more precisely of men's individual and collective practices – or men's identities or discourses on or of men – rather than the gloss 'masculinities'. However, the latter term is still used at some points in this report, as it remains the shortest way to refer to how men act, think, believe and appear, or are made apparent. The concept has been very important, even though commentators use the terms very differently, in serving several definite academic and political purposes. Perhaps above all, more recent studies have foregrounded questions of power.

There is some development of critical studies on men addressing men's violences. In such critical approaches the focus on men's power and domination is central. Violence is located as one element of that power and domination, even though there are major discussions and debates about the explanation of those violences. In order to understand men's violences, it is necessary to understand the social construction of men and masculinities, not just the abstracted nature of violence. The perspectives noted can be seen as possible modes of explanation of both men and men's violences. Different perspectives on violence give different accounts of men and masculinities. An explicit focus on men may engage with the variety of ways in which men, masculinities and violences interrelate with each other, for men in general, particular groups of men, and individual men.

There is an increasing literature that places the analysis of men's violence to women, especially known women, within the context of the analysis of men and masculinities more generally, rather than within the context of violence or 'domestic violence'. In order to understand such men's violence, it is necessary to understand the social construction of men and dominant forms of masculinity, not just the nature of violence itself. The explicit focus on men is emphasised by Pringle (1995) in his review of men's violence to women. He notes first that 'men tend to have a need to dominate and control', and, second, that 'structural factors play a part in the generation of men's physical and emotional violences' (p. 100). He stresses that such violence is behaviour *chosen* by men, it is the product of choice within a *structural* context of hierarchical power arrangements. As Tifft (1993) has explained, the prevalence of battering is directly related to the ideological and institutionalised strength of such structural gender arrangements.

The application of masculinities theory to men's violence to women has been developed to some extent. One of the broadest analyses of the relation of crime and masculinity within a framework of masculinities theory is James Messerschmidt's (1993) *Masculinities and Crime*. He has argued that crime, including violence, is available as a resource for the making of masculinity, or at least specific forms of masculinity. He sees various forms of criminal behaviour, crime and violence as structured action and differentially available resources for "doing masculinity" (West and Zimmerman 1987), when other resources are not available (according to class, ethnicity/"race" and sexuality). His theoretical stance is more explicitly tied to structuration theory than much of the earlier work of Connell and colleagues. He also implicitly posits a compensation model of masculinity, so that violence is seen as a resource when, for example, marriage, steady employment with reliable pay, having and providing for children and other dependents, or educational success are not available as "masculine-validating resources".

Various subsequent, mainly qualitative, studies have explored these possible "compensatory" dynamics, for example, in interviews and observations of unemployed and marginalised men and young men. Less attention has been given to quantitative studies of these processes. An exception is Krienert's (2003) study of 704 newly incarcerated prison inmates, which seeks to operationalise Messerschmidt's relational logic on masculinity and violence. This found that "traditional masculinity and acceptable ['traditional'] outlets [of masculinity] alone are not significant indicators of a violent event." (p. 18). On the other hand, some support was found for the hypothesis that the effects of masculinity on violence depend upon the level of "appropriate outlets" – with less outlets meaning that the effect of masculinity on the escalation of violence is greater than if there are more such outlets.

The production and reproduction of masculinities is detailed by Miedzian (1992) in her description of the significance of violence in the rearing of boys and sons. She does not simply chart the socialisation of boys but also sees the construction of masculinity of boys and young men within wider society as intimately interconnected with violence. Stanko (1994) has also spoken of the need to look simultaneously at masculinity/violence in analysing the power of violence in negotiating masculinities. While this may appear to be clearer in considering men's violence to each other, such a 'simultaneous yet negotiated' analysis needs to be extended to man's reproduction of violence/masculinity in relation to women.

Violence seems sometimes, indeed often, to be directly linked to *masculinity* with only the difference whether this relation is constitutive or subtle. This might support the idea of *homogenous or hegemonic masculinity* and a relatively non-differentiated understanding of violence. However, the relation between masculinity, or rather, masculinities, and violence is more complex.

First, there are many men who condemn or despise violence against women and children. This, however, does not necessarily (or even perhaps probably) imply a fully egalitarian view of gender relations. Rather this may possibly involve a viewpoint such as 'a man has to make his wife obey without using physical strength', that is, through his (male) authority.

Second, the construction of masculinity is contradictory: there are complex connections between "responsibility" and "violence", between "honour/respect" and "violence", between "autonomy" and violence"; in each case, both elements might contradict each other or go together (violence in the name of honour, responsibility, education, or even respect), and the specific combination contributes to the construction of masculinities and defines what kind of violations against whom are acceptable and what kind are not. At the same time, this also raises important questions of how to address other men's, or male, "non-violent" practices that are still tightly bound to (legal or non-criminalised) violent practices, such as in military and war, or as clientele in the sex trade.

Third, attitudes concerning men's, or 'male', violence in different forms and the practice of non-(physical) violence can constitute distinctions between masculinities. The superiority of (non-violent) masculinity can be (re)constructed by understanding that this form of masculinity does not need to use of physical strength or direct interpersonal power over others. In this sense, the condemnation of violence might, in some contexts, also be men's, or male, practices to reassure or revalorise other or dominant forms of masculinity. There are indeed power relations between men and masculinities, which regulate what kinds of violence are accepted and who has the power to condemn violence for which kinds of men and in what contexts. This is an important historical point for analysis of the situation in many European countries. The police, which is still very largely a male-defined and 'male-attributed' organisation, on both the symbolic and material levels, is now involved in arresting men and thus contributing to their conviction in some cases, because of their (alleged) violence against wives and other known women. Thus, there are various power relations between men (and not only between offender and victim) and different ways

of handling of violence (accepting, expecting, convicting) as part of the regulation of power relations between men more generally.

In a recent article Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) have critically reviewed the concept of hegemonic masculinity, at least in part in relation to violence. They suggest that what should be rejected includes the continued use of psychological trait theory, and too simple a model of global gender dominance. Both of these elements (and their rejection) are relevant to the analysis of men's violence to women. Several reformulations were presented, including more holistic understanding of gender hierarchy; the importance of the geography/ies of masculinities; the return to the emphasis on social embodiment; and the dynamics of masculinities, including contestation and democratisation.

A further promising development is to understand men's violence to known women at least in part through relations between men, as men. Helping men to understand his relationship with other men may be a means to unlocking the emotional dynamics of his abuse of women, as a compensatory and regulatory mechanism in his relations with other men. The processes by which men construct women through relations with each other, as men, and use those constructions to regulate relations between men, may be at the core of the persistence of such violence (Hearn and Whitehead 2006). Such violence appears on the surface to be a paradox, since it is inconsistent with the heroic role of provider to and protector of women. Yet it appears to be a paradox, however, only for as long as masculinity is understood in terms of '…the study of men conceptualised solely as the study of personal identity, of masculinities.' (Hanmer 1990, 34) When models emerge which are rooted in what men have in common, as men, across social divisions (Whitehead 2005), or models which are concerned with the actuality of men's practices (Hearn 2004b), men's violence to known women may be seen as functional in maintaining masculine identity, while appearing on the surface to undermine it.

(viii) *Developing a comparative and transnational orientation, by attending to cultural variations, convergences and divergences in time and space, and intersecting forms of power relations*: a shared methodological framework for a research strategy needs to adopt comparative and transnational orientation in examining men's practices, gender relations and social policy responses to them in their specific social and cultural contexts. Consequently, it seeks to understand them as both socially and culturally constructed and with real material forms, effects and outcomes for people's

lives. This involves taking into account the complex intersection of gendered inequalities with other forms of social disadvantage.

While all of these principles are very important, this last principle is especially so, and is now examined in more detail in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 4 **DEVELOPING A COMPARATIVE AND TRANSNATIONAL ORIENTATION: CULTURAL VARIATIONS, CONVERGENCES AND DIVERGENCES IN TIME AND SPACE, AND INTERSECTING POWER RELATIONS**

Studying men and men's violences comparatively and transnationally

In recent years comparative perspectives have been applied to many fields of study. Comparative research can be pursued for many reasons, to: gather basic empirical data; test theories developed in one context to another; develop more comprehensive models; examine influences of cultural conditions; feed into transnational policy development, such as EU policy (Pringle 1998). Much comparative research on social welfare has been macro in focus, such as comparing welfare states or social security systems (Esping-Andersen 1990; Duncan 1994; Sainsbury 1994). Some has focused on social services or social care services (Anttonen and Sipilä 1996; Sipilä 1997). Studies need to be made grounded in and with a full awareness of both historical context and comparative statistical data, not only on violence, but also on other aspects of gendered societal structures.

One of the most convincing reasons for adopting a comparative approach is the potential offered for deconstructing the assumptions that underpin social practices and policies in different countries. In turn, such a process of deconstruction facilitates a reconstruction of more effective policies and practices. There is also a growing awareness that such practices and policies increasingly interact transnationally, at both European and, indeed, global levels: consequently research may seek to explore the processes and outcomes of those interactions and connections.

There are well-known methodological difficulties in comparative research around the cultural equivalence of concepts/frames that are problems primarily for quantitative research. Of course the same issues occur with qualitative research. However, provided it is carried out with both cultural sensitivity and a critical perspective, qualitative research can thrive on the lack of cultural equivalences or at least differences/variations in cultural equivalences: because qualitative research can allow one to explore those differences and variations in detail – as well as the cultural continuities

and the connections between continuities and variations across cultures, which of course enriches our understanding of the social, cultural and political dynamics within those varying cultural contexts. That is also why such qualitative exploration of culturally differing concepts/frames can be a vital pre-cursor to broader quantitative exploration. All this applies as much to the topic of men's violences as any other. Thus cultural variations in concepts and conceptual frames are both a big problem and massive opportunity for transnational comparative research – including that on men's violences.

In many cases where specific social issues have been studied transnationally, attempts have been made to apply various general theoretical categorisations to particular issues. In the case of differential welfare regimes, the most common model applied in this specific fashion is that devised by Esping-Andersen (1990, 1996). There has also been an extensive critique of such models in terms of their insufficient attention to gender relations (Lewis and Ostner 1991; Leira 1992; Lewis 1992; Orloff 1993; O'Connor 1993; Sainsbury 1994, 1996, 1999; Tyyskä 1995). Commentators have also taken a variety of positions regarding the analytic value of these applications from the general to the particular (for instance, Alber 1995; Anttonen and Sipilä 1996; Harder and Pringle 1997, Pringle 1998a; Pringle and Harder 1999), partly depending upon the issue being studied. Furthermore, there is a need for considerable open-mindedness in the assumptions that are brought to bear in such analyses. For example, Trifiletti (1999), through a feminist perspective on the relationship between gender and welfare system dynamics, has provided detailed arguments that Southern European welfare regimes may not in fact (contrary to some opinion) be more sexist than those in Northern and Western Europe. Esping-Andersen-type models do not seem appropriate for addressing patterns of men's violences, and state and other interventions against them.

There has been a considerable development of research on gender relations and welfare issues in Europe (Dominelli 1991; Rai et al. 1992; Aslanbeigu et al. 1994; Leira 1994; Sainsbury 1994, 1996; Duncan 1995, 2001; Walby, 1997; Duncan and Pfau-Effinger 2000; Hobson 2002). Throughout much of Europe contemporary gender relations can be characterised by relatively rapid change in certain respects, for example, rates of separation and divorce, new employment patterns, along with persistence of long-term historical structures and practices, such as men's domination of top management, men's propensity to use violence and commit crime. This can be understood as a combination of contradictory social processes of change and

no change (Hearn 1999). An important feature and effect of these changing gender relations has been the gradually growing realisation that men and masculinities are just as gendered as are women and femininities. Gendering men is both a matter of changing academic and political analyses of men in society, and contemporary changes in the form of men's own lives, experiences and perceptions, often developing counter to earlier expectations and earlier generations of men. Critical study of men's practices has, until very recently, largely escaped specific comparative scrutiny, although it has received attention within broader transnational feminist surveys of gender relations (for instance, Dominelli 1991; Rai et al. 1992). Yet, the limited amount of work devoted specifically to men's practices transnationally suggests there is immense scope for extending critical analysis in that particular area.

In the field of social welfare there are complex patterns of convergence and divergence between men's practices internationally which await further interrogation (Pringle 1998b). Similarly, Connell's inquiries regarding the global transactions that occur in processes of masculinity formation have opened up many possibilities for exploration and contestation (Connell 1993, 1995, 1998; Hearn 1996a; Woodward 1996). Such studies have conceptualised broad transnational categories of men and masculinities, such as 'global business masculinity' (Connell 1998) and 'men of the world' (Hearn 1996a).

Attempts have been made to push forward the boundaries in the comparative field using profeminist perspectives to consider men's practices in Asia, Southern Africa, the South, Central and North Americas, Australasia and Europe (Breines et al. 2000; Pease and Pringle 2001; Kimmel et al., 2005). These are attempts that seek to locate such considerations within recent debates about globalisation and men's practices, throwing some doubt in the process on more ambitious claims of globalisation theses. There is a growing academic and policy literature on men in development, which examines the impact of globalisation processes on men and gender relations (Sweetman 1997; Cornwall and White 2000; Greig et al. 2000; *the network newsletter* 2000; Harcourt 2001). Despite those relatively recent developments, there remains a massive deficit in critical transnational studies of men's practices and in the sources available for such study.

To undertake comparative study, specific attention to the challenges and difficulties of comparative perspectives in European contexts is necessary. Comparative study facilitates several avenues for research:

- Representatives of different major welfare regimes allow testing of general welfare typologies in relation to men's practices. This includes the exploration of the extent to which differential social patterns and welfare responses between countries often grouped together based on alleged historical, social and/or cultural proximity are similar or different.
- These and other considerations can be framed within developing notions of what 'being European' constitutes. However, this is much contested with the enlargening of the EU. There are and will be several contested ideas of 'Europe' and being 'European', which strongly highlights the analysis of violence and diversity/difference to be a focus and subject to problematisation.
- Inclusion of countries from Central and Eastern Europe allows exploration of how recent massive economic, social, cultural and political changes impact upon attitudes and practices relating to men across Europe. It seems that the most powerful nations in the EU are also powerful in the context of defining of what and how things are to be researched. Thus, for example, the aspects of 'transit countries' might be too easily overcome, even though these transitions and their roots embed very difficult problematics also concerning violence to women and their gender relations. For instance, the shift from communist rule can be 'liberating' in many senses, but the socio-economic circumstances of many men and women have actually deteriorated. For many men, this has meant losing of working places and at the same time, the position in society. In planning research that covers the enlargened Europe, it is crucialcountries in Central and Eastern Europe are included, and that the circumstances of women and men in the post-socialist countries are taken into account when planning research in the future.
- There are both clear similarities among the countries studied thus far as well as clear differences, in terms of the extent of egalitarianism, in relation to gender and more generally; the form of rapid economic growth or downturn; the experience of post-socialist transformation; the development of a strong women's movement and gender politics.

In addition, distinctions need to be made between: transnational research on men's violences; comparative research, comparing different countries, societies, cultures and systems; and research on men's transnational violence in terms of cross-border violences, such as in trafficking, pornographisations, militarism, abduction, "paedophile" rings, "honour" killings, and so on. These include actions by men, as individuals and as collectivities, both directly as in their practice of violence and less directly in their management, monitoring, sponsorship and facilitation.

Studying men transnationally

There has been a strong emphasis within recent Critical Studies on Men (CSM) on the interconnections of gender with other social divisions, such as age, class, disability, ethnicity, racialisation and sexuality. The idea that gender of men is derived from any kind of fixed, inner trait or core is especially antagonistic to CSM. There are also well-established arguments that men's gendered relations of and to power are complex, even contradictory (for example, Brod and Kaufman, 1994). For example, the collective, historical power of men may be understood as maintained by the dispensability of some men, for example, as soldiers in war, even with the violence to and killing of women and children, usually as non-combatants.

There is growing concern with more precise specifications of men's individual and collective practices within gendered globalisations, or glocalisations. Indeed one of the most important trends of recent critical research on men has been towards more international, transnational and global perspectives. This is to be seen in many publications that move attention away from the Western world and individual nations as the focus, and towards the South and transnational and postcolonial studies on men (for example, Connell 1998; Ouzgane and Coleman 1998; Morrell 2001; Pease and Pringle 2001; Cleaver 2002; Morrell and Swart 2005; Ouzgane and Morrell 2005). There is increasing focus on global transactions in processes of masculinity formation and transnational categories of men and masculinities, as in 'global business masculinity' (Connell 1998), 'men of the world' (Hearn 1996a) or the central place of men and masculinity in the collective violence of war (Enloe 1990; Higate 2002), with the apparent increased use of rape and sexual violence in war. This seeks to locate such considerations within recent debates about globalisation and men's practices, throwing some doubt on the more ambitious claims of globalisation theses. Despite these recent developments, there remains a massive deficit in critical transnational studies of men's practices and in the sources available for such study.

Men's relation to social power is closely interlinked with men's relations to social problems, that is, in both the creation and experiencing of problems, and the broader issue of the societal problematisation of men and masculinities (see, for example, Holter and Aarseth 1993; Popay et al. 1998). Not only are men now increasingly recognised as gendered, but they, or rather some men, are increasingly recognised as a gendered social problem to which welfare systems may, or for a variety of reasons may not, respond. These processes of problematisation of men and construction of men as

gendered social problems apply in academic and political analysis, and in men's own lives and experiences; they exist at the societal level, and very importantly in quite different ways in different societies. Thus while it may be expected that some kind of problematisation of men and masculinities may now be observable in most, perhaps all, European societies, the form that it takes is different from society to society. Social problems exist in terms of men's violence, crime, drug and alcohol abuse, buying of sex, accidents, driving, and so on, and indeed the denial of such problems as sexual violence (for example, Ventimiglia 1987). These are all activities with immediate and long-term negative effects on others, friends, family and strangers. Some men suffer from adversity, as with ill-health, violence, poverty, suicide.

In the gendered problematisation of men and masculinities and constructions of men and masculinities as gendered, social problems have been examined in their European national contexts. There is great national and societal variation in how men and masculinities interact with other major social divisions and inequalities, in particular, class, "race" xenophobia and racism, ethnicity, nationalism and religion. The intersection of "race", ethnicity, nationalism and nationality appear to be especially and increasingly important for the construction of both dominant and subordinated forms of men and masculinities. This entails investigation of the complex interrelations between these varying genderings and problematisations and the socio-economic, political, state structures and processes within and between the countries.

In terms of the "actuality" of men's violences, we are already aware from existing transnational studies (see, for instance, Pringle and Pease 2001) that in general there are massive continuities and massive variations in the forms of such violences and their underlying dynamics across broadly differing cultures. Therefore, *any research strategy for exploring the dynamics of men's violences transnationally must give a primary role (not necessarily the only primary role) to qualitative approaches.* For, in seeking to explore in more detail such shifting patterns of continuity and variation – as well as the complex dynamics underpinning those patterns – qualitative research is clearly of crucial importance. Partly because, in itself, it can provide the sensitivity for exploring such comparative subtleties; partly because it is an essential pre-cursor to any quantitative comparative research if the latter is to minimise as far as it can the massive methodological problems it will inevitably face.

Processes of cultural variation impinge directly not only on any research topic (including men's violences) but also on the research process itself. Of course this occurs in a whole range of ways – not least the fact that different research traditions in different countries value various forms of research differently. For instance, thinking about Denmark, Sweden and the UK, it seems clear that qualitative research is valued more highly within "mainstream" social sciences in the UK than it is in Denmark or Sweden. Moreover, where qualitative research is carried out, one can find considerable cultural variations in how it is done, especially as of course there is no clear dividing line between qualitative and quantitative research. So, for example, in a cultural context where quantitative research is seen very much as the "norm", it may well be that much qualitative research is carried out there along more quantitative principles than is the case in a context where qualitative research is more broadly accepted. These kinds of variability have important implications for what is researched and how it tends to be researched in different countries and contexts. The picture is even more complex when one takes in to account variability between research approaches across disciplines as well as across countries.

Thus it can be concluded that *a research strategy to explore the dynamics of men's violences in a transnational and trans-disciplinary fashion must allow, as a central requirement, considerable "spaces"/fora – both initially and throughout the project – to ongoing discussions and consultations between the researchers involved about the methodologies/methods they adopt and about developing frames for accommodating/dealing with/taking advantage of variations in such methodologies/methods. This cannot be emphasised too much.*

The same considerations apply to theoretical and analytical understandings of men's violences – and indeed of men's gendered practices more generally. As we know, there are massive potential variations in the way in which men's practices can be understood analytically and theoretically – not least the highly political and emotive issue of men's violences.

When and where a collection of researchers are drawn together to explore such issues, it is vital that any research strategy for this purpose creates clear "spaces"/fora – again initially but also throughout the process – whereby analytical and theoretical variations can be discussed and clarified, and frames developed to accommodate and deal with and harness such variations. This is especially the case, again, where research will be transdisciplinary. Most of all, this is essential where research is to be transnational and transcultural.

This is because there are indications (for instance, from Framework 5 project; see Hearn and Pringle 2006; Pringle 2006) that different theoretical and analytical approaches vary partly according to country and cultural context. This may partly (but only partly) explain the fact that the emphasis of gender research on men in the Nordic countries has historically been placed on topics such as employment, work in the home, health rather than on men's violences to women and children; whilst a different balance has tended to occur in countries such as Germany and the UK (Pringle 2005).

Ethnicity and gender

Situations where issues of ethnicity and gender intersect in various ways to increase the likelihood of violence occurring and/or to increase the likelihood of violence not being prevented or halted. There are a number of types of situations that can be envisaged under this heading. Some of these include: (i) militant racism; (ii) projects of State and non-state nationalism and pan-nationalism (e.g. in the Baltic States, in the Balkans, in US and UK foreign policy, the "Alliance of the Willing"); state and non-state terrorism; (iii) The unwillingness sometimes of state and non-state agencies to intervene in gendered violence in minority ethnic group families; (iv) overeagerness sometimes of state/non-state agencies to intervene in gendered violence in minority ethnic group families (at other times avoidance); (v) relative lack of attention sometimes paid to gendered violence in majority ethnic group families compared to that in minority ethnic group families.

Multiple dimensions of power and disadvantage

Situations where multiple dimensions of power/disadvantage (for instance including age, gender, ethnicity/"race", religion, sexuality, disability, kinship, class) intersect may often be ones where violence is most likely to occur, even if not all the dimensions of power flow constantly in the same direction. For example, the "commercial sexual exploitation of children", in one perspective, can be seen as the outcome of a complex interaction of various dimensions of oppression and violence: at least gender, age, class, ethnicity/"race", sexuality. We are thinking here primarily of dominant, even taken-for-granted, ways of being men, rather than the concept of so-called "paedophilia". It is indeed heterosexuality that most often – though not always – enters problematically into processes of violence and oppression.

This involves examining the specificity of intersectionalities, in such a way that:

- the likely vulnerability of both women and men in less powerful social locations;
- the less resources of both women and men in less powerful social locations;
- the greater likelihood of the prosecution of men in less powerful social locations;
- gender power relations are not neglected.

Violence and violations are not simply means for or structurings of *other* forms of power, domination and oppression. They are forms of power, domination and oppression in themselves that structure organisations. While such a perspective can mean that violence as violation may blur into power relations, a key distinction is that power relations are not necessarily violating.

Challenges in comparative and transnational research

There are many challenges around methodology in research on gender violence and in particular how to plan and accomplish such research transnationally. Kelly (2006) discusses some methodological questions and points out challenges to combine human rights framework and social research, for example, in studying gender violence transnationally. The premises of these frameworks and their embedded positions and ideologies differ in many ways. According to Kelly, the human rights framework is based on universality, commonalities and setting boundaries, whereas in current social research much attention is increasingly paid to diversity, differentiation and cultural contexts (p. 2). This creates tensions, even though such tensions could be overcome by (re)constructing of methodologies as well as procedures in doing research.

Major possible difficulties in such comparative research include practical and empirical problems, such as obtaining comparable empirical data. Cultural and linguistic problems include how descriptions depend on national and cultural writing styles and linguistic understandings, so that comparisons are of not only systems but also linguistic, cultural practices. Administrative and statistical systems usually do not correspond with each other. Major difficulties posed by differing meanings attached to apparently common concepts used by respondents and researchers are likely. This signals a broader problem: for diversity in meaning itself arises from complex vari-

ations in cultural context at national and sub-national levels – cultural differences which permeate all aspects of the research process.

Practical responses to such dilemmas can be several. On the one hand, it is perhaps possible to become over-concerned about the issue of variable meaning: a level of acceptance regarding such diversity may be one valid response (e.g. Munday 1996). Another response is for researchers to carefully check with each another the assumptions which each brings to the research process. The impact of cultural contexts on the process and content of research are central in the Sub-network's work, as exemplified in the different theoretical, methodological and disciplinary emphases and assumptions in the national contexts and national reports. In addition, the impacts and interaction of different cultural contexts is of major significance for the internal cooperation and process of future initiatives in research development.

In reviewing previous research, considerable differences have been identified between the ways in which academic research and statistical sources in different countries have conceptualised social exclusion, and indeed social inclusion. Moreover, these differences varied to some extent depending upon which forms of national and international data or evidence were examined, as in the contrasts between academic research and statistical sources. The forms of social exclusion addressed within one institutional sphere differed to a certain extent from the forms addressed in another sphere within the same country. Typically this difference occurred between academic research, on the one hand, and government law and policy, on the other hand. The reasons for such a partial mismatch can be various and each mismatch has to be understood within its own specific cultural context.

Theoretical issues include how different theoretical models and assumptions may be more or less consciously used by researchers in different societal contexts. There are dangers in reifying nation or society at the expense of, say, the region. Researchers' familiarity with each others' systems varies greatly. While much comparative research has been focused on macro comparisons and the pursuit of an objectivist notion of truth, our approach is informed more by a critical realist approach in which everyday meanings are taken seriously, located within the context of historical material change. The micro-level of individual life strategies and settings of "doing gender" must be analysed in the context of supranational institutions and organisations that powerfully influence (such as the EU, transnational economic corporations).

The importance of attention to different historical and political contexts of different regions, countries and parts of Europe cannot be overstated. There are dangers in transplanting ideas and theories from one part of Europe to others, in seeing comparison as an 'even surface'. For example, in conducting comparative research between England and Finland, the former group of researchers found it at times difficult to understand that there is no equivalent linguistically and institutionally for certain practices and concepts (Hearn et al. 2004). Caution needs be exercised in terms of developing a single methodological measure across all Europe. Cultural differences in Europe, as elsewhere, need to be taken into consideration when researching gender violence transnationally. Major differencies are related to history, forms of organising societies and their welfare models, and power relations between different groups of people, such as ethnic majorities and minorities. Diversity among citizenships often impact on how violence is understood societally: culturalised and ethnisised citizenship can lead to essntialism in interpreting violence by certain groups, for instance, 'honour killings' or forced marriages are sometimes explained, even excused, on cultural grounds.

In the light of these considerations, we provide some examples of possible comparative and transnational research approaches to men's violence, before identifying some final research priorities. Three examples are given here.

- *Comparative surveys on gendered violence:* Accomplishing such surveys can often meet various problems based on differences in cultural and social situations in different areas. In spite of such problems, comparative survey studies of men and masculinities in the context of gender power relations may be developed. One example is the approach developed by Connell and colleagues (Connell 2004, 2005a), initially in an Australian context. This combines diverse quantitative measures with more qualitative assessments of situational context and embodied dimensions, informed by poststructuralist approaches. Men's violences are considered in the broad context of conflict and peacemaking and other aspects of gender relations (see Appendix 4).
- *Comparable cases of men's violences:* The study of parallel cases on forms or locales of men's violences simultaneously across several or many countries, for example, men in prison (short-term, long-term, lifers), men arrested for 'domestic violence', men in men's anti-violence programmes, young men and violence in and around sport. This can draw on quantitative, qualitative and ethnographic approaches, and

build on matched cases. Similarities in some parts of the procedures or basis for the organisations can offer an important common ground for comparative research, which still leaves space for embedded cultural and social differences to be taken into account in comparing the cases. Another possibility for comparative research on gender violence is key incident analysis (Kroon and Sturm 2000).

- *Studies of men's transnational violences:* Studies of men's transnational violences can include the sex trade, use of information and communication technologies, 'paedophile rings', violence in transnational interpersonal relations, abductions, 'honour killings', human trafficking, militarism, and related violences. These involve both transnational violent phenomena and demand transnational collaboration in doing research. This links with contemporary developments in transnational feminist and profeminist scholarship, including critical research on men and masculinities (Connell 1993, 1998, 2005b; Hearn 1996a, 2006; Pease and Pringle 2001; Novikova and Kambourov 2003; Jyrkinen 2005; Desai 2006; Kelly 2006).

CHAPTER 5 **RESEARCH PRIORITIES**

1. Focus on men's violences to women, men, children, transgender people, by full attention to men's relations with men.
2. Develop quality assurance in research on men's violences in terms of it being conducted in the full knowledge of international, critical gender scholarship and research on what is already known.
3. Link research on men's violences to social inclusion/exclusion, and intersectional approaches to cultural and other differences.
4. Link research on men's violences to human rights agenda, its potentials and its limitations, including its feminist critiques.
5. Link research on men's violences to current critical debates on masculinities and men's practices.
6. Include physical, sexual and other forms of violences, including the relations of men's violences and men's sexualities.
7. Develop transnational, as well as comparative and international, research, including research on men's transnational violences.
8. Develop policy-driven research on what reduces and stops men's violences.
9. Attend to both questions of research content on men's violences and questions of research process in researching men's violences, and also to their interrelations.
10. Increase investment and build support for investment in research in Central and Eastern Europe, which remains the most under-funded area for research into men's violences.
11. Focus on ethical issues during and throughout the whole research process, and develop collaborative, facilitative and supportive research environment from the beginning of the process.
12. Develop relational approaches between: forms of men's violences; men's interpersonal violences and men's institutional violences; social divisions/exclusions/inclusions; violence and other social arenas.
13. Develop research that explores the dynamics of men's violences transnationally by giving a primary role (not necessarily the only primary role) to qualitative approaches.

14. In developing research strategy to explore the dynamics of men's violences in a transnational, transdisciplinary fashion, create and maintain considerable "spaces"/fora – both initially and throughout the project – to ongoing discussions and consultations between the researchers involved about the methodologies/methods they adopt and about developing frames for accommodating/dealing with/taking advantage of variations in such methodologies/methods. This cannot be emphasised too much.

15. When and where researchers are brought together to explore such issues, it is vital that research strategy creates clear "spaces" or fora – both initially and throughout the process – whereby analytical and theoretical variations can be discussed and clarified, and frames developed to accommodate, deal with and harness such variations. This is especially so with transdisciplinary research, and is essential where research is to be transnational and transcultural.

***

APPENDICES: BUILDING ON EXISTING SUBSTANTIVE KNOWLEDGE, METHODOLOGIES AND EPISTEMOLOGIES

The following appendices summarise findings from the member countries, regarding men's violences and social exclusion, noting gaps and suggestions; the third provides short summaries of the overviews of research on men's violences; and the fourth reproduces, with kind permission from Professor Raewyn Connell, the research outline and plan of studies on 'Masculinities, Change and Conflict in Global Society'.

Appendix 1: **Violences – Academic research and statistical sources**

The recurring theme in academic research on men's violence and men's practices more generally is the widespread nature of the problem of men's violences to women, children, other men, and transgender people, and in particular the growing public awareness of men's violence against women. There is much substantive knowledge available in these and other countries that provide the basis for developing research strategy on men's violences. This is in terms of the forms and level of men's violence, explanations, processes of its practice and reproduction, and the responses (or lack of responses) from men, other men, agencies, and so on.

There is also clear knowledge that men tend to understate, underestimate, deny, excuse, rationalise, justify violence, and may well blame the other (woman) for their own violence. Men who are violent often also tend to see themselves as "not violent", "not wife batterers", "not criminals", or "not sex offenders". The social form of masculinity seems to be recognised as playing a significant role when violence against women is the explicit topic, but rather less so clearly recognised in men's violence to men. Violence against women by known men is becoming recognised as a major social problem in most European countries. The range of abusive behaviours includes direct physical violence, isolation and control of movements, and abuse through the control of money.

There are numerous gaps in research knowledge. A very important, if still relatively unexplored, area of research is the relationship between men's violence to women and men's violence to children. There are both direct connections and connections through children witnessing violence to their mothers or other close women relatives or friends. Child abuse, including physical abuse and child neglect, is being more recognised as a prominent social problem in many countries, but child sexual abuse is still widely under-recognised. Both the gendered nature of these problems and an appreciation of how service responses are themselves gendered have received some critical attention, both in terms of perpetrators and victims/survivors, but there is still a major pressure towards non-gendered studies and services.

There has been some concern with the intersection of sexuality and violence, and this is likely to be an area of growing concern. There is some research on men's sexual abuse of women and children, but this is still an

underdeveloped research focus in most countries. In some countries sexual abuse cases remain largely hidden, as is men's sexual violence to men. There has also been some highlighting of those men who have received violence from women. Men's violences to ethnic minorities, migrants, people of colour, lesbians and gay men, and older people are gradually being highlighted more, but still very unexplored. Especially unexplored are men's violences towards transgender and other gender variant people people.

There is a striking lack of gender awareness in studies that seem to understand themselves as dealing with so-called "general" issues around violence, for instance, racist violence. Aspects of men's violences rarely addressed in a gendered way include 'civil disorder' or 'anti-social behaviour', and ethnic and community conflict. In addition, in many countries relatively little explicit *gendered* academic literature exists on elder abuse and violence against men. This is even though criminology has much researched men's violence to men, but often in a non-gendered ways. Studies on the reasons for non-violent behaviour in men are lacking, as are studies on connections between violence between men and men's violence against women.

Key research questions that need more attention include:

- How men's violent gendered practices intersect with other oppressive power relations around sexuality, cultural difference/ethnicity, age, disability and class, and the implications of such analyses for challenging those practices and assisting those abused and experiencing 'hate crime';
- How different forms of men's violences interconnect, for instance, men who are abusive to partners and men who are abusive to children;
- How programmes against men's violences can be developed, particularly research that aims at the promotion of successful initiatives at school, community and societal levels;
- Men's sexual violences to women and adult men;
- Men's violences to lesbians, gay men, and bisexual and transgender people;
- Men's violences to ethnic minorities, migrants, people of colour, and older people;
- Intersections of men's violences, men's sexualities and men's sexual violences;
- 'Non-violence' as a vision, practice and reality, and its relation with egalitarian gender and other social relations.

The general organising principle of official statistics on men's violence tends to be crime rather than violences; knowledge on the prevalence men's violence to women is more likely to come from self-report surveys of women. Child abuse, including physical abuse, sexual abuse and child neglect, is being more recognised as a social problem in the statistical sources in many countries, but child sexual abuse is still widely under-recognised. Markedly 'male' offences are sexual abuse of children and heavier physical violence to children. Following growing recognition of child abuse of boys, there is increasing interest in surveying men's experiences of violence, predominantly, but not only from other men. For both academic and statistical sources of information, there is a much variation across European countries regarding the levels attention paid to both men's violences to women and to children.

Appendix 2: **Social exclusion – Academic research and statistical sources**

In reviewing previous research, considerable differences have been identified between the ways in which academic research and statistical sources in different countries have conceptualised social exclusion, and by implication social inclusion. Key forms of social exclusion that have been identified within academic research on men, masculinities and men's practices are as follows:

Czech Rep: unemployment, poverty, homosexual subcultures, prison, educational inequality, life chances post-1989

Denmark: unemployment, ethnicity, youth/ethnicity, homelessness, social isolation/older men, male prostitution

Estonia: homelessness, social isolation, poor education, poverty

Finland: unemployment, homelessness and alcohol, links between social exclusion and health, criminal subculture, car subculture, youth subculture, gay men, HIV/AIDS, ethnicity/ ethnic minorities

Germany: unemployment of youth, juvenile delinquency, loosening social connections in old age, migrants, homosexuality

Ireland: unemployed, prisoners, excluded fathers (after divorce and unmarried fathers).

Latvia: homosexuality, citizenship, ethnicity, rural unemployment, language, unequal access to higher education and further professionalisation

Norway: Sámi, new forms of marginalisation due to globalisation leading to exclusion from labour market, men in non-traditional occupations

Poland: homosexuality

Spain: poverty, unemployment, ethnicity, education, immigration, disability, suicide

Sweden: unemployment, ethnicity, homelessness, homosexuality

UK: intersection of gender, sexuality and cultural identities; older men

Key forms of social exclusion identified within the statistical sources:

Czech Rep: homelessness (men), poverty, unemployment, age (ageing society)

Denmark: poverty, unemployment, ethnicity, educational disadvantage

Estonia: education, ethnicity, drug addicts

Finland: poverty, homelessness, foreign nationals and ethnic minorities, prisoners, sexualities

Germany: wage gap between western and eastern Germany, unemployment, consolidated poverty (men with a low level of education, younger, under 40s age groups), immigrants

Ireland: educational disadvantage, disabilism, racism, long-term unemployment, prisoners, ethnicity

Latvia: poverty, unemployment, suicide, ethnicity and political citizenship (status of alien)

Norway: unemployment of certain groups, exclusion of non-Western immigrants, asylum applicants.

Poland: homeless, ethnic minorities, homosexuality

Sweden: poverty, ethnicity, homelessness, disability, health, political participation

UK: poverty (care system, unemployment, skills, age), ethnicity (criminal justice system, education, unemployment, health), disability

These differences varied to some extent depending upon which forms of national and international data or evidence were examined, as in the contrasts between academic research and statistical sources. The forms of social exclusion addressed within one institutional sphere differed to a certain extent from the forms addressed in another sphere within the same country. Typically this difference occurred between academic research, on the one hand, and government law and policy, on the other hand. The reasons for such a partial mismatch can be various and each mismatch has to be understood within its own specific cultural context.

In order to effectively analyse and challenge forms of social exclusion associated with men and men's practices across Europe, it is necessary for these processes of social construction – operating differentially in various national milieux and in various institutional sectors (academia, government) – to be recognised and de-constructed. Because, otherwise, many marginalised groups in many countries will go unrecognised and their needs un-addressed in social policy.

Various interconnections need to be considered: there is a need to understand the intersectionality or the mutual constitution of various forms of

power relations in a triadic analysis of poverty, gender and ethnicity. There is a need to take into account thematic overlaps such as social exclusion and violence, and social exclusion, violence and health. However, intersectionality in gendered violence research can be also problematic, because without careful specification it can lead to be interpreted as the 'culturalisation of violence': for instance, in the cases of ethnic minorities, 'domestic violence' can become interpreted as more 'understandable' because of assumptions that particular religious or cultural traditions and meanings should be considered as legitimising factors for violence within certain groups of people. In addition, to connect marginalisation and social exclusion too tightly with violence can lead to, and often has led to, too simplistic and misleading interpretations and implicit understanding of 'problems emerging from (social) problems', the impeding of which and actions against which could automatically prevent violence.

Appendix 3: **Overviews of relevant existing data in the member countries**

The following texts are summaries of much longer reviews conducted by Sub-network members and partners.

Czech Republic. Most available data stems from statistical surveys based in positivist research approaches. The Czech Statistical Office is good in collecting various and numerous data (census and microcensus, representative studies) and categorises them by basic socio-demographic criteria (including sex cathegory). The trouble with using these data for a valid sociological analysis is in the fact of the lack of higher level categorisations (for instance, sex, education, position on the labour market or age). But recently (2002, 2004 and 2005) topical publications offering more "gender" detailed statistics are available – but information on violences on men and by men is still very limited to criminal statistics and health statistics. Dominance can be judged on the face value of general data (income, representation etc.); no representative research study has been conducted with the aim to explore dominance, power relations in any gendered way (nor in any other).

Two sources that could be valuable for international research studies on the European level are: first, the International Violence Against Women Survey – Czech Republic/2003: Sociological Research on Domestic Violence – however, it should be noted that men's practices are only latent or implicit in this study; and, second, a large international study (known as the PISA-L 2003 study; Matějů and Straková 2006) on educational systems and structures – though far from satisfactory in its analysis of gender, it does include relevant gendered interpretations on likely gendered life chances in the context of societal structures. More specifically they name, in this sense uncritically, the "young men problem" – the complex difficulties that may tend to be faced disproportionately by young men in the educational process – as the only relevant gender problem, if there is any at all).

On the other hand, critical analysis using (de)constructivism is widespread in small scale, mostly qualitative (interpretative) sociological research studies reflecting and exploring issues of gender dominance. Here again, the issue of violence (perpetrators, victims and intermingling of these, structural conditioning) has not been a primary research goal of any study on men or masculinities. The field of studies on violence (mostly on women) lacks

gender perspective in the Czech Republic. Most of the studies conducted by NGOs (even women's NGOs) dealing with battered wives etc. use essentialist (sociobiological) explanations due to (a) strong influence of "sexologists" (well established discipline considered very scientific in the CZ, or at least dominating the public discourse) (b) overwhelming (and still not fading) essentialist discourse in medicine, law and relevant disciplines dealing with violence, and (c) lack of feminist or gender sensitive knowledge (or at least sociologically informed in social constructionism). If these small-scale nonrepresentative research studies do include 'women perspective' they use it in a very differentialist way (women as victims, men as perpetrators).

Denmark. In terms of the victimisation experiences of adults, gender disaggregated crime victimisation statistics have been published by the police in Denmark since 2001 based on official police statistics. Information on violent victimisation is also available from surveys which either incorporate gender as an analytic category or focus exclusively on women's experience of men's violence. The former type of survey makes note of the relationship between gender and the intimate versus stranger context but lacks critical analysis.

These victimisation surveys are: (1) A survey by the Danish National Institute for Social Research and the Ministry of Justice of women and men that asks about violence after age 15 and in the previous year, location of violence, relationship to perpetrator (unknown vs. known, current vs. previous partner), one time versus repeated violence, minor vs. serious violence, perceived reason for violence; questions about the experience of rape are also included. (2) *The Danish Health and Morbidity Survey 2000 (SUSY 2000)* by the National Institute of Public Health which included questions about exposure to interpersonal violence. (3) Gender differences and violent victimisation were also examined in a 1998 survey (being updated in 2005-2006) conducted by the National Police Commissioner. This report was not designed to specifically measure partner violence but rather violent victimisation in general. The survey examined factors such as gender differences, the victim-perpetrator relationship, and location of the violence. (4) Women's violent victimisation was examined in Denmark's participation in the International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS).

With the exception of 1992 survey (Christensen and Koch-Nielsen 1992), Denmark has until recently lacked a national prevalence survey on women's experiences of violence comparable to other countries. However, such a national study on violence against women was conducted in Denmark as

part of the International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS) sponsored by the European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control affiliated with the United Nations (Balvig and Kyvsgaard 2006). Interviews with 3,552 women ages 18 to 70 years revealed that fifty percent of the respondents had been exposed to at least one of twelve types of violence (threat, physical violence or sexual violence) by any man since age 16 and five percent had experienced at least one of these in the last year.

Statistical and descriptive knowledge produced by the National Organization of Shelters for Battered Women and their Children (LOKK) focuses primarily on the situation of ethnic minority women who are disproportionately represented in the shelter population compared to Danish women. In addition to its annual statistics, LOKK publishes special topical reports, some of which are based on data from running surveys of women in the shelters. LOKK and the Danish Centre for Research on Social Vulnerability (VFC) jointly produced a study of the situation of victimised immigrant women married to ethnic Danish men. Separate reports produced by LOKK (LOKK 2003) and by the Danish Research Center on Gender Equality at Roskilde University (Madsen 2005) elucidate the legal bind for ethnic minority women escaping violence in the context of stringent Danish integration laws, residence permits, etc. Their point of departure is a gendered power perspective on the violence.

A key source of knowledge on the victimisation experiences of children is the National Institute of Public Health survey of youth at age 15 about experiences of sexual abuse, carried out via computer assisted self-interview. The study provides information on prevalence, type of assault, victim-perpetrator relationship; physical violence in the home against self and against mother; gender differences; it also reports on ethnic differences.

Men's use of prostitution was examined in a recent study by sociologist Claus Lautrup (Lautrup 2005) of the Videns- & Formidlingscenter for Socialt Udsatte [Danish Centre for Research on Social Vulnerability] consisting of a quantitative Internet survey of men both with and without experience paying for sex plus twenty qualitative telephone interviews of men the majority of whom use prostitution services regularly. The quantitative data covers prevalence, frequency, motivations; the qualitative data examines moral dilemmas, societal disapproval, perceptions of women as businesswomen, men's sense of powerlessness, and perceptions of ethnic minority women as victims of trafficking. The study aims to shed light on the social and cultural factors influencing men's purchase of sexual services but lacks a critical perspective on men and gender.

In a positivist approach, the Danish National Institute of Social Research (Christoffersen 2000) used longitudinal, population based, register data to examine differences between Danish males convicted and not convicted of rape on a range of factors, with an unstable relation to the labor market emerged as the most important factor in rape conviction. The author explicitly argues against a patriarchal culture explanation of rape, interpreting his finding in terms of the poor marriage potential of men with poor employment potential, as well as the degradation and humiliation associated with poor education and employment which "put an extra stress on frail boys, which may provide a basis for an elevated risk for sexual coercion."

Men's violence and child custody is the focus of a critical examination of the shift in Danish custody law from a safety-oriented, pragmatic approach to a rights-based approach that emphasises equal access by non-residential parents (fathers) at the expense of child welfare, quality of access and mother's safety. There is no legal requirement to consider domestic violence in relation to the best interests of the child and the use of evidence in custody cases in limited (Hester 2002). The primary reason for the failure of contact arrangements is often continued violence from male ex-partners.

Research on men's violences is virtually absent from Danish academia; knowledge comes primarily from crime statistics (with a significant focus on ethnicity), large scale surveys conducted by government agencies or from reports produced by knowledge centers. The national organisation representing the women's crisis shelters is a leading voice and produces various statistics, surveys and reports with a focus on ethnic minority women. This means that most of the information produced in Denmark lacks sociological analysis or critical discussion of gender and power.

Finland – Non-gendered traditions have dominated the field, at least until recently (see Ronkainen 1998; Jyrkinen and Ruusuvuori 2002). The main traditions on violence research in Finland have been criminological, historical and psychological. Their methodological and epistemological assumptions tend to be individualist, positivist, and gender-neutral (or at least not gender-critical). The gender-neutral term, 'family violence' has been much used. The main statistical sources on violence are police data, court statistics, Statistics Finland's interview and postal surveys on violence, National Research Institute of Legal Policy publications, which are often based on police and court statistics, and causes of death statistics.

The most important national survey of women's experiences of men's violence is the 1998 *Faith, Hope, Battering. A Survey of Men's Violence against Women in Finland* (Heiskanen and Piispa 1998). The study gives statistical information, such as prevalence of violence and threats, violence in partner relationships, violence perpetrated by others than partners, childhood experience of violence, and fear of violence. Men's violence is approached here through women's experiences of that violence. A new national survey on women victims was conducted in 2005: This offers information on the frequency and forms of gendered violence in Finland (Piispa, Heiskanen, Kääriäinen and Sirén 2006). The data offers the possibility of comparing the situation with the 1997 survey, and accordingly, there have been some changes concerning violence against women in Finland during the intervening eight years. For instance, there seems to be an incease in frequency of violence or threatening by violence from 40 per cent (1997) to 43.5 per cent (2005) of women experienced at least once in their lifetime (Heiskanen 2006, 20-21). Reports in the surveys of sexual violence and theatening behaviour against women outside a relationship have also increased from 16.7 per cent to 21.2 per cent over the period (Heiskanen 2006, 22).

Smaller scale surveys and interview studies include: focused studies on the intersection of sexuality and violence, from the experience of women; focused studies on men and sexualised violence (for example, prostitution and pornography, see Näre 1994, 1995; Laukkanen 1998, 2000); experiences of girls and young women regarding sexual violence (Honkatukia et al. 2000); experiences of boys and young men regarding violence; workplace surveys and studies (especially sexual harassment, bullying); studies of agencies and their users; age and generation. These have all been influenced by feminist research methodologies and debates around them (Ronkainen 1999, 2001), including on feminist empiricism (Husso 2003; Nikunen 2005), and the uses of multiple methods (for instance, Piispa 2005).

The Academy of Finland "Targeted Call": Gender, Power and Violence (2000-2004) has been an important research initiative in relation to men's violences. The ten (groups of) projects include those on global sexualised violence, men who batter their partners, sexualised violence in intimate relationships, violence in schools, gender in legal discourses, incest, political violence, prostitution and the sex trade.

Overall, such recent research has emphasised the gendered nature of violence, especially men's violence to women, with an increase in approaches that bring together feminist materialist and feminist discursive approaches

(Jyrkinen 2005), and more structuralist and more poststructuralist (pro) feminist analyses of these violences (Keskinen 2005). The importance of multiple methods is emphasised, as is the interrelation of theory, policy and practice.

Germany – For a long time, reliable survey data on gendered violence were lacking. The first example of a study with a broader representative sample was that by Metz-Göckel and Müller (1986). Almost one-fifth of the men knew a man who was a batterer. Both, the seriousness of the problem in men's eyes, as well as the demand for understanding the perpetrator as a victim himself, were important results. Zulehner and Volz (1998) measured male propensity towards violence with a factor analysis combining racist, projective and sexist attitudes and considered 4% of German men as being very ready to act violently, 37% in a medium level of propensity for violence, and 59% at a weak level of propensity.

More recently, the Ministry for Family, Youth, Women and Senior Citizens commissioned the first German survey on violence against women. That national study of violence to women has now been completed amongst 10,000 German women. The survey concluded that 37% of all interviewees had experienced at least one form of physical attack or violence since 16; 13% of them had experienced some form of sexual violence, as defined narrowly as criminally forced sexual acts; and 25% of all women resident in Germany have experienced physical or sexual abuse from their current or previous partners (Müller and Schröttle, 2004, p. 9). Studies on the societal costs of this violence are estimated as about 15 million Euros a year.

Not much information was available on violence against women in the former GDR. In a multi-method study on violence in East German couples before and after unification, Schröttle (1999) analysed data from social science and criminology and came to the conclusion that in the 1970s and 1980s one in five to one in seven women had been suffering from battering and/or sexual violence from their intimate partner. It seems that very heavy violence, based on weapons, has been less widespread in the former GDR.

Men as victims of violence are a rather new field of debate. Hans-Joachim Lenz (1996) has been pioneering here, together with some others (cf. Bange 2002, on sexually abused boys), thus spreading the idea that men can be victims of violence too. The dominant pattern of masculinity is said to be structurally intertwined with the hitherto invisibility of male victimisation; this understanding is especially widespread amongst practitioners in in-

stitutions like the helping professions, justice, and youth research. He has differentiated the specific violent experiences of boys, such as emotional exploitation, mental maltreatment, physical violence, neglect, and sexual exploitation (including child sexual abuse, incest, prostitution, child pornography), and for men, such as going to war, same-sex assaults, rapes inside institutions, and violence against homosexuals.

A pilot study on violence against men in Germany was commissioned by the Ministry of for Family, Youth, Women and Senior Citizens. This study, now completed (Jungnitz et al. 2004), with the research group, http://www.dissens.de, and a mixed gender advisory board, consisted of a survey of 266 men in Germany by way of 'largely standardised interviews that included some qualitative components', supplemented by some 32 guided interviews and 190 written questionnaires (Jungnitz et al. 2004). It found that up to two-thirds of physical violence reported in adult life took place in the public sphere or during leisure time, and that one in ten of the men studied had stated that he had had '… within the last five years at least once had the experience of someone seriously threatening to physically attack or injure him.' (p. 7). Other research literatures draw on experiences with therapeutic work with violent men, such as Brandes and Bullinger (1996) and Lempert and Oelemann (1995/1998). Further developments make clear the necessity of networking, drawing on a long history of experience with battered women (Brückner 1998).

Another debate in Germany has also been focusing on men as victims of female violence (Gemünden 1996). The subtext of his Ph.D. thesis is that "male violence against women" has been exaggerated in public debate, and has ignored the alleged "fact" that female violence against men is almost as frequent. This thesis is fed by the much disputed Conflict Tactics Scale of concept of Strauss (1979), measuring any verbal and non-verbal aggressive incident and weighting it in the same way for women and men. Gemünden concentrated on the level of frequencies, seeking to prove a more or less equality between women and men; but, like Strauss et al. (1980) he has to admit that the injuries of female victims of male violence are much more serious than vice versa, and that the serious injuries of female victims occur much more often. The peak of this debate, though not supported by serious scholarly evidence, but rather fed by a small, but very active group of anti-feminist activists and scholars, seems to be over. It has, however, been nurtured by parts of the media, and has had some influence in the debate on gender justice. A review of a broad range of literature on the subject (Minssen and Müller 1998) revealed much latent, and sometimes overt, mi-

sogyny and "blaming the mother" in explanations of male propensity for violence, accompanied by simplistic gender concepts.

Another thematisation of violence is juvenile violence against foreigners. Here, Heitmeyer (1996, 1997a, 1997b) has become very popular with the thesis of the costs of individualisation. The loss of reliable family contexts, changing values, people being forced back to their own individual rather than collective resources, and the decline of collective social contexts, are regarded as an important, if not the decisive, cause for violence as such, and specially so violence against foreigners. Inability of individuals or groups to obtain respect is also an important concept for explaining propensity for violence. Unfortunately, the Heitmeyer research group has until now not done gender-differentiated or gender-comparative work; but this may well change in the future (http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/ikg/). This research is actively transforming research on violence into a topic of social exclusion.

Ireland – Given that the central organising ideology which dictates how men are governed in Ireland is the provider model and the hard-working 'good family man', when evidence emerges that not all men are in fact 'good', a deficit in governance and services arises. Minimal attempts have been made to develop intervention programmes with men who are violent to their partners, while only a fraction of men who are sex offenders are actively worked with towards rehabilitation/stopping their offending. Masculinity politics with respect to violence are becoming more complex, with increasing pressure to recognise male victims of women's domestic violence.

Violence against women by known men is a major social problem in Ireland. In relation to 'domestic violence', that is abuse of women by intimate male partners, the first major national prevalence study was published in 1995. This independent study was commissioned by Women's Aid and showed that 18% of Irish women have been subjected to either mental cruelty, threats of physical violence, actual physical violence, and sexual violence at the hands of their husbands/partners and damage to property and pets (Kelleher and Associates and O'Connor 1995). Seventy-one per cent of women who had experienced physical violence reported that the violence resulted in physical injury, including fractures, head-injuries, severe bruising, burns, loss of consciousness and miscarriages, martial rape and sexual assault (O'Connor 1996).

In 2005, the National Crime Council in association with the Economic and Social Research Institute produced the national survey of *Domestic Abuse of Women and Men in Ireland* (Watson and Parsons 2005). This study examined the nature, extent and impact of domestic abuse against women and men in intimate partner relationships. It was based on a survey with a nationally representative statistical sample of over 3,000 adult women and men, as well as focus group interviews with Traveller and immigrant women. The survey found that 15 per cent of women and six per cent of men have experienced severely abusive behaviour of a physical, sexual or emotional nature from an intimate partner at some time in their lives. Apart from the higher risk faced by women, the risk of having experienced abuse was also higher in couples where one partner (rather than both jointly) controls decisions about money, for those whose parents were abusive to each other, for young adults, and for those with children. A number of indicators from the survey suggest an increased risk of abuse where the partners are isolated from close family and neighbourhood supports.

A second strand of research into the nature of domestic violence in Ireland has focused on 'official populations' of cases that present to statutory agencies. Ferguson (2001a) studied 319 referrals made to three Health Board child and family social work teams in the Mid-West region in 1996 and tracked them for 12 months into mid-1997. Domestic violence featured in 27% of cases referred. Ninety-four per cent of cases involved men's violence against women. In the majority of cases domestic violence was treated as a secondary problem as it invariably presented along with other child care problems which tended to be given prominence.

Latvia – The reports on domestic violence persist. The Human Rights Committee recommends that the country adopt a policy and legal framework to counter domestic violence, establish advice and victim support centres and raise more awareness about the issues through the media. However, men's violences against children and women are not analysed in terms of dominances associated with men's practices. The methodological frameworks on men's violences and men's gendered practices as forms of power relations are not used in the reports and in the related research practices.

Another important theme is violence in places of detention and imprisonment due to the alleged police ill-treatment. Data on violence comes primarily from criminal statistics. "Violence as a gender statistical area is still the prerogative of separate efforts made by professional NGOs or poli-

cy-interested governmental institutions. A separate category "Premeditated homicides by men" appears in the UNDP Human Development Report in the category "Violence and Crime" (1999).

Gender statistics are contained in the Statistical Yearbook "Crime and Social Deviance in Latvia. A Collection of Statistical Data", Riga (1993-1999) – number of prisoners, suicide deaths by sex and age – 1999; sexually transmitted diseases: patients by sex and age – 1999; victims by sex (1998); deaths from drug overdosing by sex and age (1996); deaths caused by alcohol poisoning (1995); patients by sex and age (syphilis/gonorrhea) (1994). Crime is explicitly combined with sexually transmitted diseases"

Another important theme is racially motivated violence in the streets of the capital of Latvia over the last couple of years. One more theme is societal and occasional governmental discrimination against homosexuals.

Poland – Police statistics provide general victimisation data (with gender and age). A victim orientation is more apparent in other data sources: a recent report by the Public Opinion Research Center addresses domestic conflicts (spouse-to-spouse, parent-to-child) in terms of physical violence and other forms of conflict; data and reports from the *Blue Line* (emergency for home violence victims) provide demographic data, information on alcohol use, and other social survey data (attitudes, convictions) regarding home violence; the *Blue Line* also reports on victims' experiences with social workers and interviews with specific work groups (teachers, police, medical service, psychologists and pedagogues); quantitative data is also available in annual listings of phone calls to the *Blue Line* service grouped into general clusters (legal advice or assistance, psychological aid, developmental problems, educational problems, and addictions).

The "Violence" report prepared by Renata Siemieńska in February 2006 investigates broadly construed family violence. It characterises and contextualises family violence, and typifies violations according to gender, specificity of violation, and size. It looks into the gendered acts of violence with respect both to oppressors and victims. Its focus is decisively upon women as victims of both social and societal systemic structures. Terminology and definitions utilised throughout follow the ones of the Penal Code. Most presented data tables span from 1990 up till 2003. The report, also, publishes data coming from the TEMIDA programme (Police Criminal Statistical System) accompanied with descriptions and commentaries. This programme ignores gender and introduces two categories of victims: underage

and adults (here, also foreigners). Special attention in the report is dedicated to the women trafficking issue considered as a phenomenon uneasily subject to quantitative estimation. Here, the statistics display the percentage of social consciousness of the problem.

Spain – The major shortcoming of databases in Spain, as in other European countries, is that the data is not specific, as it has been developed with other aims in mind. Most of it is also not scientifically reliable. Some reasons for this are the lack of unified criteria for data acquisition and production, as there is not a unified legal or social definition for the problem at hand. The definitions are very restrictive or the categories too exclusive. The application of protocols for data production is also most often done by non-experts, or the criteria are not clearly fixed in advance. Also, the fact that studies are carried out at a regional level (as most policy decisions in this are taken at that level) has led to a lack of unified criteria. In addition, there is a strong political use of research, which has, on the one hand, increased the range of differing criteria and, on the other hand, improved policies in some aspects of gender violence.

The Gender Equality law that will be passed in late 2006 explicitly states in its Article 19 that public statistics relating to physical persons (i.e. as opposed to juridical persons such as companies) must have their data available by sex, considering whenever convenient other variables related to sex, so as to enable the evaluation of gender inpact and improve the efficacy of the principle of gender equality.

Sweden – A key source of information on violence against women (physical and sexual violence, threats, controlling behaviors and sexual harassment) is the prevalence study by Lundgren et al. (2001) *Captured queen: Men's violence to women in equal Sweden*. Otherwise, information on violence appears to be found mainly in official sources, can be gender-disaggregated and is often in the context of crime: the National Council for Crime Prevention reports on deadly violence directed at women, based on official data, with information on the circumstances of the event; information on child sexual abuse is mainly available through official statistics and includes the victim-perpetrator relationship; the Statistics Sweden's crime victim survey is part of an overall "Investigation in Living Conditions" and includes violence experiences; Statistics Sweden has also charted victims of violence with interviews that include consequences of violence and

victim-perpetrator relationship; Statistics Sweden provides data on a large package of social indicators, including victimisation. The *National study of rapes reported to the police* (Brottsförebyggande Rådet 2005) builds on information from victims and proceeds from the perceptions, experiences and reality experienced by these women. It is based on information from approximately 90 per cent of all cases of consummated rape reported to the police in the years 1995 and 2000. The National Board of Health and Welfare, gives an overview over the statistics on child sexual abuse in Sweden (Socialstyrelsen 2002). There have been a few victim surveys carried out in Sweden, however rather a long time ago (see Edgardh 2001).

UK – There has been more critical research and scholarly enquiry regarding men's violences to women, children and, to some extent, men in the UK than anywhere else in Europe. One important issue thrown up by the extent of research on men's violences in Britain are the complex linkages between those forms of violence: violences to adult partners and violences to children (Hester and Pearson 1998); child sexual abuse and pornography (Itzin 1996, 1997, 2000); pornography and men's violences (Itzin 1992; Cowburn and Pringle 2001); prostitution and pornography (Itzin 1992; Swirsky and Jenkins 2000); prostitution and men's violences (O'Neill 1996). A vital policy implication of this ongoing research connecting men's violences together is that an effective challenge to those violences needs to be broadly based.

Despite the marked emphasis on critical studies of men in the UK, major gaps in research on men's violences nevertheless remain. There needs to be more systematic exploration of: how men's violent gendered practices intersect with other oppressive power relations; how concerted programmes against men's violences can be developed – in particular more research into the promotion of successful initiatives at school, community and societal levels; transnational comparisons.

In terms of official statistical sources focused on violences, there are interesting and striking continuities and discontinuities between the emphases in the academic literature and the emphases in that statistical material. On the one hand, government statistics in the UK now pay considerable attention to men's violences to women within heterosexual relationships (or "domestic violence" as it is termed in official publications) and to racist crime (or "racially motivated" crime as it is termed in official publications). This must be seen as a considerable achievement (Walby and Allen 2004). On the other hand, there remains little official statistical attention directed to-

wards men's violences, including sexual violence, to children or to men's violences against gay men and lesbian women.

It is particularly striking that the academic literature in the UK has probably focused more on the extent and gendered quality of child sexual abuse than anywhere else in Europe. Yet, official statistical sources are remarkably silent about these issues in contrast to their emphasis noted above on "domestic violence" in adult relationships. The fact that academic research is increasingly making clear the major overlaps between men's violences to adult partners and violence to their children means that this contrast is not only worrying but that also illogical.

In terms of the official statistical material available in the UK, as with the academic data, it is striking how clearly the statistical picture confirms the importance of understanding the complex intersections of disadvantage associated with gender, ethnicity, class, age, sexuality, and disability. Similarly, the statistical data confirms that issues of home and work, social exclusion, violences and health overlap and intersect in complex ways – and that these complex intersections have not been adequately addressed. At the same time, there are imbalances in terms of what issues have been focused upon by official statistics and which have not. In the UK, there is an immense quantity of official data on gender in relation to the labour market: it dwarfs the amount of data on other topics, even those relatively well covered, such as crime. There is an urgent need for much broader official statistical data-gathering in relation to issues of social disadvantage and gender – in particular on disability, sexuality, age, and men's violences to children.

Appendix 4: **Masculinities, Change and Conflict in Global Society**

Project outline – July 2004

Study director:
Professor Raewyn Connell, University Professor, Faculty of Education and Social Work, University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia

Project summary

The rapid development of research on masculinities has greatly increased our understanding of men and gender. This project will gather empirical information to fill two important gaps in knowledge. One is the way different patterns of masculinity are distributed across the broad population. This will be studied by a carefully designed Australia-wide survey. It is hoped that parallel surveys can be cooperatively developed in other countries. The second is the patterns of masculinity that are emerging in corporate leadership in different parts of the global economy. This will be studied by a five-country life history project.

Description of project

The project explores changes in contemporary masculinities and gender relations, with a main focus on the lives of men but also exploring the lives of women. The project seeks empirical solutions to current dilemmas in understandings of gender and masculinities, especially those arising from the new focus on masculinities in global contexts. It is also intended to find information relevant to the solution of practical problems such as the prevention of violence, and to stimulate conceptual work on masculinities.

Study A: Men, Women and Change. This study will map gender practices and beliefs in a cross-section of the Australian adult population, taking account of social and generational differences. The fieldwork will involve a national face-to-face survey conducted by a reputable market research firm.

In the first stages of the work an interview schedule will be developed and tested; fieldwork and data analysis will follow. Points of departure will be the schedules used in existing international cross-sectional attitude research with men, surveys of specific gender practices such as family time-budget studies, and the results of recent life-history research on masculinities. A multi-dimensional model of gender will be used to define systematically the practices to be included: power (including violence), division

of labour, cathexis (emotional connection), and symbolization (language, imagery etc.) The fieldwork will thus build on existing theory and its results will feed into the reconceptualization of masculinities that is one of the project goals.

Interview schedules will be designed for both men and women. While most "masculinity" research studies only men, since gender is relational and interactive, a mapping study needs information from women. Further, since masculinity is enacted by women as well as by men, a comprehensive study of the social location of masculinities must include women.

Statistical analysis will be concerned with three main questions: (1) Do specific practices hang together in measurable patterns that define specific masculinities? This will be answered by item intercorrelation and factor analysis. (2) If such patterns emerge, how are they distributed between social groups in the population – comparing men and women, different regions, different SES levels, different ethnic groups – and to what extent can they be accounted for by social differences? This will be explored by constructing scales, studying bivariate relationships, and analysis of variance. (3) Can patterns of masculinity be used to predict levels of involvement in conflict (including violence), and do they mediate between social group membership and involvement in conflict? This will be answered by developing and testing multivariate correlational models, using measures of involvement in conflict and violence as dependent variables.

Study B: Transnational Masculinities. This study will examine emerging masculinities in the global arena by life-history interviews with three groups of social actors: corporate executives working for transnational companies; corporate executives involved in national or local business enterprises; public servants involved in economic regulation and the administration of the security services. The life-history method has been one of the most productive in masculinity research. It has not often been used in organizational research on gender. However recent experience has shown it is a feasible approach with business executives and military officers.

Since the study concerns emerging patterns in global arenas, it is essential to use multiple sites across the world economy. Sites must include countries at different levels of economic development, and from different culture areas. To understand the organizational contexts, it is necessary to have

multiple cases from the same (or very closely linked) site. This also makes feasible the conduct of an interview-based project in widely separated sites. These aims can be met by a design based on interviews with clusters of respondents, in places chosen to bring out economic and cultural contrasts. Those currently planned are: Developing world: South Africa; Medium development (a) Chile, (b) Turkey; Developed world (a) Japan, (b) Australia.

In each site the project will collect 40 life histories, two-thirds from the private and one-third from the public sector. The Australian component will allow links with the findings of Study A, and (with South Africa and Chile) will complete a "southern" data set of particular interest for the analysis of globalization. The total of 200 cases is significantly larger than the samples in most life-history research, but necessary for a genuinely global study.

Focussed interviews will follow a schedule already developed in pilot work, covering the four dimensions of gender defined above, and using institutional transitions (e.g. school, university, marriage, career moves) as the framework for memory. As in previous life-history work, the interview data will be analyzed as individual cases before being combined for the analysis of groups. This procedure respects the knowledgeability of respondents, and allows individuality and diversity to emerge as well as common ground.

Respondents will be chosen from the age range 30 to 45, with the intention of interviewing the group from whom the next generation of senior authority will be drawn. One-quarter of the interviews will be with women, for the same reasons as in Study A, except where there are too few women (e.g. in some security contexts). Interviews will be conducted and recorded in respondents' native languages.

Study A: Men, Women and Change – Draft Interview Agenda

The first task in the project is to develop an interview agenda suitable for a large-scale survey. The fields to be covered are:

1. Structure of production

- Career, including future plans
- Current job, hours worked, income
- Workplace gender division of labour
- Domestic work

2. Structure of power

- Experiences of authority figures, own exercise of authority
- Experiences of coercion & violence
- Citizenship participation
- Relationship with laws, regulations, impersonal authority

3. Structure of cathexis

- Marriage/partnership
- Parenthood, child care
- Friendships
- Sexual orientation and experience

4. Culture & consumption

- Education
- Gender ideologies
- Self-image and self-esteem
- Consumption practices, including media use

5. Embodiment

- Health practices and problems, including diet
- Sport and other leisure activities
- Dress and deportment

Measuring gender patterns: Rationale for interviews in "Men, Women and Change" study

Raewyn Connell, modified 13.02.2005

1. The case for quantification

The best empirical descriptions of gender configurations come from close-focus research in two "qualitative" styles. The first is, broadly speaking, ethnographic. The studies concerned need not be classic ethnographies in the sense of community studies, though some indeed are (Gutmann 1996). They may be more restricted in focus, e.g. participant observation or historical studies in schools (Foley 1990, Thorne 1993, Morrell 2001). What such studies centrally do is describe a way of life in a particular social locale, identify routine patterns of conduct, and sometimes describe exceptional events that illuminate the everyday conduct. They rely on there being a certain codification of gender relations in that setting, for instance a local vocabulary about gender, and identifiable groups of people who behave in a certain way and may attract a label. But they do not rely on the pattern being fixed – indeed the research may concern the making of a pattern, or tensions around gender that might produce change. Ethnographic studies have highlighted the diversity in definitions of gender, and in gender practices, in different historical and cultural contexts.

The second research style is, broadly speaking, psychoanalytic – at least that names its historical origin. This is research that looks back along the life-history and tries to reconstruct the course of events, the "project" in Sartre's language, that has led to a certain pattern of conduct and consciousness in the present. Research technologies in such studies vary from the classic couch-based psychoanalytic process, via the more directed clinical or life-history interview (Messner 1992), to group methods such as memory-work (Crawford et al. 1992). The centre of such research is the attempt to identify common dynamics in different people's life-courses, which will illuminate the working of the gender system. Life-history research has, more than ethnographic research, highlighted the conflicts and contradictions within gender patterns, and the changes of direction that may result.

Research in these genres has added immensely to our understanding of gender processes. For instance it has been crucial to feminist work on the education of girls, and has been the mainstay of the last fifteen years' work in "men's studies". Yet there is a severe limitation to what these styles of research are able to do – the flip-side of their strength as techniques of discovery. Their labour-intensity, both in the collecting of information and in

the work of interpretation, makes them impossible to use on a very large scale. We cannot, through these techniques, arrive at an empirically warranted account of gender patterns on the scale of contemporary (national or international) societies. We can never say how many of the people in a given country or region display such-and-such a configuration of gender practices.

Therefore the significance of the close-focus studies, however brilliant they are, remains uncertain. At best, we can make plausible guesses about what is true on the larger scale. It is a common strategy in books about gender issues to combine ethnographic description in a few locales with statistical information derived from other sources about a much broader scene (e.g. Hochschild 1989, Connell 2002), and the two do not necessarily match well. Yet some important questions about gender systems are inherently quantitative. These questions include the prevalence of specific beliefs (e.g. the claim we are now in a "postfeminist" era); the depth of ethnic, class and generational differences in gender practice; the strength of associations between rigid gender ideologies and violence – to name only three.

Sample survey techniques offer the only possibility of moving to the larger scale directly, with a practicable workload. So how can gender patterns be described using quantitative procedures?

2. The quantitative research tradition

Quantitative studies on "sex differences" exist in vast numbers – this has been a major industry in US academic psychology for about a hundred years. As the mountain of sex difference literature accumulated, and attempts to explain the findings proliferated, there have been many attempts to measure gender itself. Scale techniques became established with Terman and Miles' 1936 masculinity/femininity scale and the MMPI 1943 "Mf" scale (Constantinople 1973). These spawned many variations, critiques, and alternatives, probably the best known being Bem's (1974) "androgyny" measure. When a US feminist psychologist collected them up in the 1970s, she found 235 respectable scales of sex roles, sex stereotypes, sex role prescriptions, and related variables (Beere 1979). A decade later she found 408 (Beere 1990a, 1990b). The creation of ever more elaborate scales continues, such as the 94-item, 11-factor "conformity to masculine norms" inventory (Mahalik et al. 2003). A secondary literature comparing the different scales, or attempting to combine them in meta-analyses, now exists (e.g. Walker, Tokar and Fischer 2000, Murnen, Wright and Kaluzny 2002).

Scales that attempt to measure masculinity, femininity, or the male or female sex role, are mainly of two kinds. The first consists of items that the respondent answers by assenting to, or demurring from, some statement of opinion about a gender issue. Examples are: "By nature, women are happiest when they are making a home and caring for children"; "It's essential for a man to have the respect and admiration of everyone who knows him"...Strongly agree/ agree/ disagree/ strongly disagree, etc. Thompson and Pleck (1995), in a thoughtful review of masculinity measures, aptly call these "gender ideology" scales. In the psychological literature they are often taken to be measuring the "norms" that define the male or female sex role, and a respondent's score on the scale is then presumed to be an index of how far one conforms to the norm.

The second kind of scale asks the respondent to make a formalized self-description. The items themselves need not use gender language. An example is the Australian Sex-Role Scale (Antill et al. 1981), derived from Bem's measure, which asks the respondent to rate "...How true of you these various characteristics are..." and then lists a series of phrases or adjectives, including "love children", "competitive", "dependent", "boastful", etc. Spence and Helmreich (1978) used another popular format, bipolar self-rating items, e.g. "very rough...very gentle". Scores are usually taken to be measures of some trait or feature of the person, which is already gender-coded by the researcher (usually through prior research that showed sex differences in answers to these items, though as Constantinople [1973] forcefully argued, the logic of this as a definition of "femininity" or "masculinity" is opaque). The method assumes that personality consists of a set of traits that are stable over time, and that can be described (or at least recognized) by the person.

With both types of scale, the score attributed to each respondent is produced by summing responses across a group of items. This is a legitimate psychometric move to the extent it has been shown that the items are inter-correlated, i.e. have some common variance. Each item can then be regarded as a measure (though imperfect) of the same underlying dimension, and summing responses across multiple items produces a score that is a more focussed measure of this dimension than any individual item is, and is more useful for subsequent statistical analysis. In this basic logic, current examples of gender scales do not differ from those of the 1930s.

The technique of scale measurement, then, assumes that the object of knowledge is at a fundamental level homogeneous, whether it is a norm or a trait being measured. It is this feature of the technology of measurement,

I suspect, that accounts more than anything else for the astonishing persistence of obsolete theoretical ideas such as "sex role" and "socialization" in the psychology of gender.

Because (given a certain level of item inter-correlation) the reliability of the scale directly depends on the number of items, and because items are most likely to be inter-correlated if they say very similar things, psychometrically respectable scales tend to be both long and repetitious. This severely limits their uses. In practice, they are mainly used in two situations: in applied psychology in the "assessment" of clients for clinical treatment and job placement (a situation that does not usually lead to research reports); and in research using captive populations of university or school students who will fill in long and repetitive forms as a class assignment. Paradoxically, therefore, most published quantitative research on masculinity and femininity suffers from exactly the same problem as the qualitative research – it is focussed on a very limited social group (though a different one, since none of the ethnographic research is about US college students in psychology classes).

It is possible to move beyond this group if one is prepared to sacrifice scale characteristics, especially reliability. Short forms of some of the gender scales exist, which can conceivably be used in large-scale surveys: for instance an 8-item "Male Role Attitude Scale" (Pleck, Sonenstein and Ku 1994) used in a US national sample survey of adolescents.

More common is the use of individual attitude items, with percentages agreeing and disagreeing reported directly. This is the normal practice in commercial public opinion polling. An example concerning gender ideology is "The father of the family must be the master in his own house", an item that has been used in opinion polls in Canada, the USA and France over two decades (Adams 2001). Response percentages can be compared over time, or between demographic groups in the same survey. These exercises presume face validity of the individual item (usually without discussion). It is possible to extract an individual item from a scale and use it as a poll-type question, in the hope that its validity is guaranteed by the original scale research. This is a debatable inference, unfortunately, as the conditions of administration are so different. The main advantage of using an item from existing research is that the wording has been trialled and found to "work".

The question of item wording points to a problem that becomes more severe, the larger and more diverse is the population being sampled. The ethnographic research on gender shows distinctive local vocabularies and

meanings; this is indeed the point of the concept of "subcultures". To conduct a survey across many local populations, items have to be written in a way that makes sense to all respondents *despite* local variations in vocabularies and meanings. (Shared understanding of the resulting items is a large, and generally unexamined, presupposition in survey research.) The result is a strong tendency to write items in abstract and simplified language – abstract, because each item has to bridge across the specificities of local situations; and simplified, in order to use vocabulary that is likely to be shared by all social groups. The "father of the family" item just quoted is a good example.

The scales, whether long or short, depend for their very existence on item intercorrelations. Every scale creator reports a measure of internal consistency (e.g. Cronbach's alpha), and the universal practice, when developing a scale, is to drop items which do not add to the internal consistency score. An important logical consequence follows. Gender, as measured by scale technology, cannot be contradictory or incoherent, and even multiplicity is difficult to represent. The situation described in classical psychoanalysis, where affect is systematically ambivalent (for instance the co-existence of hatred and desire for the same object at different levels of consciousness), cannot be represented in the ordinary logic of scale construction (Frosh et al. 2001). Neither can the situation described in discursive psychology, where conflicting discursive identities are simultaneously present in a person's repertoire and are adopted strategically in different situations (Wetherell and Edley 1999).

The measures of "sex role conflict" that came into use in the 1980s do not solve the difficulty. They are in fact mis-named; they do not measure conflict within a role, but stressful experiences in trying to perform one (i.e. their measures are about toxic consequences of gender practices, not about the structure of gender practices). As Smiler (2004) observes, the scale literature has also had little success in operationalizing the plurality of masculinities, despite this plurality being a major finding in the ethnographic research.

We might summarize by saying that the conception of gender that is operationalized in both the scale and the poll-type research is an abstract pattern of difference, either in self-description or assent to statements of opinion. So far, quantitative methods do not offer a good match with relational or discursive analyses of gender. Yet without quantitative methods, we will always lack answers to central questions about gender on a society-wide scale.

3. The proposed approach to gender

The "Men, Women and Change" study will draw from this quantitative research tradition but will try to use the survey research technique in a rather different way, based on a relational model of gender and attempting to incorporate some post-structuralist insights.

Location in gender structures. Gender is, in the first place, a structure of social relations (Connell 2002). In sample survey research we are sampling respondents, not relations; but we are able to ask them about the relations they are in. If we have sampled the population correctly this should also give us a good sample of the relations (admittedly only a cross-sectional sample, lacking the dimension of time).

Our first task, then, is to study the locations in the structure of gender relations that our respondents find themselves in. Drawing on the four-fold model of gender as a social structure, we need items that assess the situation of each respondent in terms of gender power relations, the gender division of labour, emotional connections (cathexis), and symbolic relations (ideology).

No presumption is made about intercorrelations here; it may be appropriate to represent the four structures as orthogonal dimensions. I anticipate doing a multidimensional scaling exercise with these items to see if an assumption of independence holds up. This assumes the measures themselves are fairly robust, and that should be the case. The items mostly are familiar, well-tested items about relatively unambiguous facts (e.g. labour force status, parenthood, marriage, etc.)

The exceptions are the items to do with symbolism. I cannot find a "gender identity" item that will not sound ridiculous in the field ("do you consider yourself a man or a woman?"), but have written a question concerning gender attribution which, if it works, should be interesting. I have also written a question about the experience of multiple discourses, an important issue though difficult to catch concisely.

Gender practices. When we speak of "femininity" and "masculinity" we are basically speaking about configurations or patterns of gender practice (Connell 1987). "Practice" means, literally, things people do, especially the things they do regularly in everyday life. When people act, they are responding to their situation; and the situation they are in is defined (in the broad model of social action being employed here) by the structures, which represent the constraints in the temporal progression from situation to situation. Accordingly we can classify gender practices in terms of the

structures by which they are "governed". (This does not mean mechanically controlled, which would negate human agency itself; rather the structure defines what the practice addresses – the practice may be oppositional.)

To assess practices, then, we need items that ask the respondent to describe their actions, in relation to each of the four structures of gender relations. Examples: in relation to gender power relations, we ask the respondent to describe their household decision-making, and (drawing on the Wright research on class) whether they exercise workplace authority.

It is of the essence that we do not ask them to generalize about traits or aspects of the self. Rather, we ask them to generalize (in the sense of describing what is common) about actions. (Admittedly the distinction is not absolute, since "traits" may well be understood as characteristic behaviours, but holding to the distinction will help to make the questions concrete.) Again no assumption is made about common variance; again we will rely on face validity. For this reason, the more concrete and specific the questions are, the better.

This set of questions is central in the logic of the research, and is what most clearly distinguishes it from trait and role research. Concepts such as "emphasised femininity" and "hegemonic masculinity" suppose that we can define groups in the gender order in terms of patterns of gender practice. I am not yet sure what will be the best statistical approach to this, but I'd anticipate doing both a correlational analysis of the full set of practice items (i.e. across the four dimensions) and a cluster analysis to see how what groupings of people emerge given that set of items.

Embodiment. The definition of gender concerns the reproductive distinctions between human bodies and how these distinctions are reflexively brought into play in social process. (There is something curious and disturbing about the absence of embodiment issues in so much social and psychological research about gender, but I won't go into that here!)

In mapping gender patterns, then, we need to include the body-reflexive practices that arise in the "reproductive arena" as I have awkwardly called it (Connell 2002) to emphasise the openness of outcomes rather than imply biological determination. In a sample of adults we are limited as a lot of these processes are more visible in childhood and youth. However it will be possible to ask a set of questions that tap current body management, ranging from gendered self-presentation to risk-taking and health. The questions will resemble the "practice" items, and might be included in the correlational and cluster analysis with them.

Gender attitudes. There is a huge mass of scales and items about gender consciousness – far more than any other topic in the whole field – including gender-related attitudes, values, norms, ideologies, opinions, etc. A good many masculinity/femininity measures are nothing but this, being attitude scales using the classic Likert format, a "stem" statement of opinion plus an agree/disagree scale on which to rate one's own position.

The Likert format supposes a bipolar structure for every attitude. The commonest polarity is along a patriarchal/ egalitarian or traditional/ modern dimension. It would be foolish to ignore this established technology, which I think is a meaningful translation of one way that people picture their own consciousness. Accordingly we will include some items from established scales, and write some in the same format. If they scale, these items will allow conventional tests of differences in attitude between groups in the population.

However they will not be simply an unstructured agglomeration of items. These items too should cover the dimensionality of gender relations, and accordingly are classified into four groups along the same lines as the "structure" and "practice" items. Further, they will be used to examine the social contours of opinion in relation to the dominant ideological formations in contemporary Australian gender relations. I hypothesise that there are three such formations, rather than a simple patriarchal/egalitarian polarity. These formations are a "traditional" gender ideology, often with religious bases; a "progressive", feminist-influenced, ideology, often connected to a social-democratic outlook; and an ideology of gender "neutrality", which could be considered either post-feminist or neo-liberal. For each of the four dimensions of gender relations, therefore, I include three items, one focussed on each of the three ideological formations. This yields a package of 12 Likert-style items.

Though this is never discussed in methodology texts I have read, I think that a set of attitude items should also be a convincing *group of items*, in the sense that they hang together, that they have a common style which makes this section of the interview feel like a reasonable conversation, and that they should cover an attitude terrain in a believable and respectful way. That is to say, they should feel to the respondents like a serious investigation of their views on a topic where they are likely to have considered opinions. The set should not be skimpy, and should not simply leap around to disconnected topics; but it should also not have the annoying repetition-with-minor-variations that characterizes so many of the masculinity-femininity scales.

Gender discourses. There are other issues about gender consciousness indicated in the research and theoretical literature that cannot readily be studied by Likert-type attitude items. These are, most importantly,

- The co-presence of different discourses of masculinity and femininity, between which people may be able to shift for strategic reasons;
- The circulation of gender labels, types and typologies;
- The hegemonization of consciousness in the interests of dominant groups, e.g. women's consent to subordination, men's admiration for more powerful men (the more total the consensus, the less variance there will be, so it will be impossible to create scales; scales require dissensus!);
- The possible mediating role of more general ideologies in reshaping gender relations, specifically social democracy, neo-liberalism and post-modern pessimism.

The last can be handled by conventional attitude items, and the only question is whether there will be time, in a crowded interview schedule, to include them. The others will require more experimental items. I have devised two formats.

The first describes familiar types of masculinity and femininity and asks which of these the respondent admires most. This is an attempt to get at the question of hegemonic masculinities and femininities, and the possible shifts in what is hegemonic. This is difficult to assess in a sample survey context, but if these questions work, they could show up interesting differences between generations. I hope that they may also serve as "pivot" items for defining clusters of respondents, in the mapping of masculinities and femininities.

The second type of question asks the respondents whether they *recognize* a certain discourse as one that circulates in their own milieu. This is relevant to the issue of items 2/9 and 3/12, i.e. the presence of multiple discourses and the tactic of shifting between them. What I have done is use a conventional Likert-type stem (which, if well written, normally represents a familiar attitude statement), but instead of asking whether the respondent agrees with it, ask whether the respondent has recently heard this opinion expressed. (If we had time in the interview, it would be nice to ask these questions also in the agree/disagree format.) I have included two versions of gender conservatism, both the traditionalist "fixity" and the backlash "men as victims" versions.

I have omitted the question of self-consciousness in gender terms. Many of the conventional scales, as noted above, involve descriptions of the self. Most of this genre seems to me conceptually confused and empirically vague; I don't want to waste time on abstracted rating scales of masculinity/femininity. If there were a short way of picking up people's representations of themselves in gender terms, I'd be glad to use it, but I don't know of any.

Gender dynamics. The psychoanalytic tradition teaches us to think about gender historically, within the perspective of the life-history; and modern approaches to the life-history emphasise its embeddedness in societal history. We will try to capture this by a set of questions about the respondent's trajectory through the structure of gender relations. This will not give us a time-series view of gender relations (that would require panel methods, or at least repeated surveys over time). But it will give us a view of where respondents have come from, and will allow some testing of arguments about biographical antecedents of current gender practices and consciousness.

The obvious problem here is the validity of answers to retrospective questions. The uncertainty of autobiographical memory is a classic problem (Rubin 1986), and a very large one considering how much of the human sciences depend on autobiographical statements. Some of these items should be unproblematic as they will have much the same character as the "position" items in group 1, e.g. age (generation), educational level, childbearing. Others however will ask for descriptions of gender relations in childhood and the task here will be to make them as concrete and unambiguous as possible. Face validity will have to be assumed; a certain check on this will be possible for some of the items as they have analogues in the census.

Theoretical analysis also points to the dynamic character of the gender structures and their interplay. The gender order is marked by crisis tendencies that drive change. Given a longer interview, we might be able to tap the experience of contradiction with items about unease, uncertainty, anxiety in each of the gender structures. Given limitations of time, I propose to include only general items: an item about the experience of gender ambiguity, an item about the experience of change (the presumption being that any crisis tendency could trigger this), and an item about the respondent's own participation in conscious gender change.

4. Assessing sociocultural situation and conflict issues.

The survey will attempt to map gender patterns across the major contours of group difference in Australian society, exploring questions (important in the literature) about class and ethnic difference, generational change, and the impact of media and global forces. Simple factual questions are preferred, and where possible the wording of ABS items should be used to allow calibration with census data.

Since the overall research project concerns gender dynamics in conflict, violence and peacemaking, it is important to have some measures of relevant experience, practices and consciousness. A first move will be to map these across positions in the gender order, to see for instance the contours of conflict-related experience.

I don't think this is a homogeneous domain so won't make any assumptions about dimensions. If a dimension emerges, e.g. level of experience, or some kind of belligerence/pacifism, then we can usefully conduct a multiple correlation exercise to see how far it is explained by gender system variables.

There will be a focus on two areas: the experience of conflict, and practices in relation to conflict and peacemaking. The items will include both interpersonal conflict and group conflict. Since violence is, in the contemporary world, often organizational, I include an item on whether the respondent has worked for a coercive institution. The main problem is time in the interview. In relation to violence, for instance, it would be highly desirable to have separate items on domestic violence, sexual violence and public violence. These would be high on my list of replacement items if time is available or some current items can be dropped.

The analytic framework

These considerations yield the following analytic framework for the interviews. This is not intended as an order of questions for the fieldwork, but makes clear the conceptual ground the interview is intended to cover.

MWC QUESTIONNAIRE – ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK, 13.02.05

0. To be recorded for each respondent, but not part of questionnaire	a. Region b. Gender as presented
1. Sociocultural situation	1. Generation (age) 2. Country of birth 3. Ethnicity 4. Personal income 5. Occupation - ASCO 6. Educational level 7. Union membership 8. Religion 9. Relation to global society (cosmopolitanism) 10. Connection with cyberspace
2. Location in gender structures	***(a) Labour*** 1. Current domestic situation 2. Employment status 3. Workplace gender milieu ***(b) Power*** 4. Marital status (legal situation) 5. Parenthood (responsibility for children) ***(c) Cathexis*** 6. Identification with own parents 7. Hetero/homosexual identity ***(d) Symbolism*** 8. Gender attribution 9. Discursive multiplicity
3. Gender practices	***(a) Labour*** 1. Paid work hours 2. Child care hours 3. Domestic labour hours 4. Work/life balancing ***(b) Power*** 5. Workplace authority 6. Family authority ***(c) Cathexis*** 7. Sexual partnership 8. Sexual activity 9. Friendships ***(d) Symbolism*** 10. Gender performance 11. Consumption choices 12. Discursive tactics

4. Embodiment	1. Childbearing 2. Health care 3. Risk taking – alcohol 4. Diet 5. Sport and physical training 6. Grooming and beauty care
5. Gender attitudes	***(a) Labour*** 1. [T] Housewife model 2. [P] Workplace advancement 3. [N] Commitment to career ***(b) Power*** 4. [T] Father authority 5. [P] Strong motherhood 6. [N] Bosses ***(c) Cathexis*** 7. [T] Double standard 8. [P] Sexual tolerance 9. [N] Commitment to children ***(d) Symbolism*** 10. [T] Gender marking 11. [P] Models for children 12. [N] Reject stereotypes
6. Gender discourses	1. Admired masculinity options 2. Admired femininity options 3. Gender fixity (no possibility of change) 4. Men and boys as victims 5. Justice for women 6. Irrelevance of gender
7. Gender dynamics	1. Childhood family situation 2. Role model in youth 3. Left job/educ for childcare 4. How long out of workforce 5. Relationship breakdown/divorce 6. Experience gender ambiguity 7. Experience crisis tendencies 8. Participate gender reform
8. Conflict and peacemaking	1. Experience of interpersonal violence (victim) 2. Experience of community conflict 3. Fear of terrorism 4. Practice of interpersonal violence (perp) 5. Worked for coercive institution 6. Means of resolving conflicts 7. Optimism about peacemaking

REFERENCES

Adams, Michael. 2001. What makes us different: patriarchal attitudes are flourishing south of the border, but Canadians are showing a marked divergence of opinion. *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 4 July.

Antill, John K., John D. Cunningham, Graeme Russell and Norman L. Thompson. 1981. An Australian sex-role scale. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 33 (2): 169-183.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. 1996. *Time Use Survey – Household Form*. Commonwealth of Australia.

Bem, Sandra L. 1974. The measurement of psychological androgyny. *J. Consult. and Clin. Psychol.* 42 (2): 155-162

Beere, Carole A. 1979. *Women and Women's Issues: A Handbook of Tests and Measures*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Beere, Carole A. 1990. *Gender Roles: A Handbook of Tests and Measures*. Westport: Greenwood.

Beere, Carole A. 1990. *Sex and Gender Issues: A Handbook of Tests and Measures*. New York: Greenwood.

Connell, R.W. 1987. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R.W. 2002. *Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Constantinople, Anne. 1973. Masculinity-femininity: an exception to a famous dictum? *Psychological Bulletin*, 80 (5): 389-407.

Crawford, June, Susan Kippax, Jenny Onyx, Una Gault and Pam Benton. 1992. *Emotion and Gender: Constructing Meaning from Memory*. London: Sage.

Foley, Douglas E. 1990. *Learning Capitalist Culture: Deep in the Heart of Tejas*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gutmann, Matthew C. (1996). *The Meanings of Macho: Being a Man in Mexico City*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hochschild, Arlie. 1989. *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home*. New York: Viking.

International Social Survey Program. 2000. *ISSP Family 2000: Final Source Questionnaire*. Available online at www.issp.org.

Mahalik, James R. and six others. 2003. Development of the conformity to masculine norms inventory. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 4 (1): 3-25.

Messner, Michael A. (1992). *Power at Play: Sports and the Problem of Masculinity*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Morrell, Robert. 2001. *From Boys to Gentlemen: Settler Masculinity in Colonial Natal 1880–1920*. Pretoria, University of South Africa.

Morrison, Anita, Debbie Headrick, Fran Wasoff and Sarah Morton. 2004. *Family Formation and Dissolution: Trends and Attitudes among the Scottish Population*. University of Edinburgh Centre for Research on Families and Relationships, Research Findings No. 43.

Murnen, Sarah K., Carrie Wright and Gretchen Kaluzny. 2002. If "boys will be boys," then girls will be victims? A meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex Roles*, 46 (11/12): 359-375.

National Centre in HIV Social Research (University of New South Wales) and Australian Research Centre in Sex, Health and Society (La Trobe University). n.d. *Living as Men: A Sydney and Melbourne Survey of Men and their Bodies*. Sydney and Melbourne: self-published questionnaire form.

Pleck, Joseph H., Freya L. Sonenstein and Leighton C. Ku. 1994. Attitudes toward male roles among adolescent males: a discriminant validity analysis. *Sex Roles*, 30 (7-8): 481-501.

Rubin, David C., ed. 1986. *Autobiographical Memory*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Smiler, Andrew P. 2004. Thirty years after the discovery of gender: psychological concepts and measures of masculinity. *Sex Roles*, 50 (1/2): 15-26.

Spence, Janet T. and Helmreich, Robert L. 1978. *Masculinity & Femininity: Their Psychological Dimensions, Correlates and Antecedents*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Thompson, Edward H., Jr and Joseph H. Pleck. 1995. Masculinity ideologies: a review of research instrumentation on men and masculinities. Pp. 129-163 in Ronald F. Levant and William S. Pollack, ed., *A New Psychology of Men*. New York: Basic Books.

Thorne, Barrie. 1993. *Gender Play*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Walker, Donald F., David M. Tokar and Ann R. Fischer. 2000. What are eight popular masculinity-related instruments measuring? Underlying dimensions and their relations to sociosexuality. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 1 (2): 98-108.

Wetherell, Margaret and Edley, Nigel. 1999. Negotiating hegemonic masculinity: Imaginary positions and psycho-discursive practices. *Feminism and Psychology, 9*(3): 335-356.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alber, J. (1995) 'A framework for the comparative study of social services', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 5, 131-149.

The Amsterdam Treaty (1999). The European Union.

Andersson, S. (2003) *Ordnande praktiker. En studie av status, homosocialitet och manligheter utifrån två närpolisorganisationer*, Stockholm: Stockholms universitet, Pedagogiska institutionen.

Anttonen, A. and Sipilä, J. (1996) 'European social care services: Is it possible to identify models?', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 6, 87-100.

Arranz, F. (2005) *Spain 2005 Update on National Report* EU FP6 Co-ordination Action on Human Rights Violation (CAHRV) Sub-network 2, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Aslanbeigu, N., Predssman, S. and Summerfield, G. (1994) *Women in the Age of Economic Transformation: Gender Impact of Reform in Post-Socialist and Developing Countries*, London: Routledge.

Bagarozzi, D. and Giddings. C.W. (1983) 'Conjugal violence: A critical review of current research and clinical practices'. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 11, 3-15.

Balkmar, D. and K. Pringle (2005a) *Sweden National Report on Research on Men's Practices*, EU FP6 Co-ordination Action on Human Rights (CAHRV) Sub-network 2, Centre for Gender Studies, Stockholm University and Dept. of Sociology, Social Work and Organization, Aalborg University, Denmark. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Balkmar, D. and K. Pringle (2005b) *Sweden National Report on Statistical Information on Men's Practices*, EU FP6 Co-ordination Action on Human Rights (CAHRV) Sub-network 2, Centre for Gender Studies, Stockholm University and Dept. of Sociology, Social Work and Organization, Aalborg University, Denmark. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Balkmar, D. and K. Pringle (2005c) *Sweden National Report on Law and Policy Addressing Men's Practices*, EU FP6 Co-ordination Action on Human Rights (CAHRV) Sub-network 2, Centre for Gender Studies, Stockholm University and Dept. of Sociology, Social Work and Organization, Aalborg University, Denmark. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Balvig, F. and Kuvsgaard, B. (2006) *Vold og overgreb mod kvinder. Dansk rapport vedrørende deltagelse i International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS)*, København: Københavns. Universitet/Justitsministeriets Forskningsenhed.

Bandura, A. (1973) *Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bange, D. (2002) 'Definitionen und Begriffe', in D. Bange and W. Körner (eds.) *Handwörterbuch Sexueller Missbrauch*, ~~Göttingen~~: Högrefe, 47-52.

Bast-Petterson, R., Bach, E., Lindström, K., Toomingas, A. and Kiviranta, J. (eds.) (1995) *Research on Violence, Threats and Bullying as Health Risks among Health Care Personnel*, Copenhagen: TemaNord.

Bessant, J. (1998) 'Women in academia and opaque violence', Paper at Winds of Change and the Culture of Universities, International Conference, Sydney, University of Technology, July.

Bhatti-Sinclair, K. (1994) 'Asian Women and Violence from Male Partners'. In C. Lupton and T. Gillespie (eds.) *Working with Violence*, London: Macmillan, 75-95.

Björkqvist, K., Österman, K. and Hjelt-Bäck, M. (1994) 'Aggression among university employees', *Aggressive Behavior*, 20, 173-184.

Brandes, H. and Bullinger, H. (eds.) (1996) *Handbuch Männerarbeit* [Manual for working with men], Weinheim: Psychology of Publishing House Union.

Breines, I., Connell, R.W. and Eide, I. (eds.) (2000) *Male Roles, Masculinities and Violence: A Culture of Peace Perspective*, Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

Brod, H. and Kaufman, M. (eds.) (1994) *Theorizing Masculinities*, Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

Brottsförebyggande Rådet (Brå) (2005) National study of rapes reported to the police, BRÅ-report 2005:7, Stockholm: Brottsförebyggande Rådet.

Brownmiller, S. (1975) *Against Our Will*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Brückner, M. (1998) *Wege aus der Gewalt gegen Frauen und Mädchen*, Frankfurt, Fachhochschulverlag.

Carrigan, T., Connell, R.W. and Lee, J. (1985) 'Towards a new sociology of masculinity', *Theory and Society*, 14(5), 551-604.

Chernova, J. (2000) *Russian Federation National Report on Research on Men's Practices. Workpackage 1*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Chernova, J. (2001) *Russia National Report on Statistical Information on Men's Practices. Workpackage 2*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Christensen, E. and Koch-Nielsen, I. (1992) *Vold ude og hjemme – en undersøgelse af fysisk vold mod kvinder og mænd* [Violence in and out of the home: an investigation of physical violence against women and men], Copenhagen: Danish National Institute of Social Research, 92:4.

Christoffersen, M.N. (2000) 'Who become convicted for rape?: A longitudinal study of 1966-birth cohorts followed from the age of 14-to-27 years old', Paper presented at the 28th Annual Conference of The European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control, 31 August-3 September. Retrieved from http://www.sfi.dk/sw1193.asp 28 June, 2005

Cleaver, F. (ed.) (2002) *Masculinities Matter! Men, Gender and Development*, London and New York: Zed.

Coffey, A. and Atkinson, P. (1996) *Making Sense of Qualitative Data: Complimentary Research Strategies*, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Connell, R.W. (1993) 'The big picture: Masculinities in recent world history', *Theory and Society*, 22(5), 597-623.

Connell, R.W. (1995) *Masculinities*, Cambridge: Polity.

Connell, R.W. (1998) 'Men in the world: Masculinities and globalization', *Men and Masculinities*, 1(1), 3-23. Connell, R. (2004) 'Masculinities, change and conflict in global society: Project outline – July 2004', Sydney: University of Sydney.

Connell, R.W. (2005a) 'Globalization, imperialism and masculinities', in M. Kimmel, J. Hearn and R.W. Connell (eds.) *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, Ca., 71-89.

Connell, R. (2005b) 'Measuring gender patterns: Rationale for interviews in "Men, Women and Change" study, modified 13.02.05', Sydney: University of Sydney.

Connell, R.W., Hearn, J., and Kimmel, M. (2005) 'Introduction', in M. Kimmel, J. Hearn, and R.W. Connell (eds.) *Handbook of Studies on Men and* Masculinities, Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage, 1-12.

Connell, R.W. and Messeschimidt, J.W. (2005) 'Hegomonic masculinity. Rethinking the concept', *Gender and Society*, 19(6), 829-859.

Coordination Action on Human Rights Violations, Annex 1 – Description of Work. December 5, 2004. Proposal/contract number 506348.

Cornwall A. and White S.C. (eds.) (2000) Special Issue. 'Men, Masculinities and Development: Politics, Policies and Practice', *IDS Bulletin* 31(2).

Cowburn, M. and Pringle, K. (2001) 'Pornography and men's practices', *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 6, 52-66.

Crime and Social Deviance in Latvia. A Collection of Statistical Data, Riga: Statistical Yearbook. (1993–1999).

The Danish Health and Morbidity Survey 2000 (SUSY 2000).

Desai, M. (2006) 'From autonomy to solidarities: Transnational feminist political strategies', in K. Davis, M. Evans and J. Lorber (eds.) *Handbook of Gender and Women's Studies*, London: Sage, 457-468.

Dominelli, L. (1991) *Women Across Continents: Feminist Comparative Social Policy*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Donaldson, M. (1993) 'What is hegemonic masculinity?', *Theory and Society*, 22(5), 643-657.

Dworkin, A. (1982) *Pornography: Men Possessing Women*. London: Women's Press.

Duncan, S. (1994) 'Theorizing differences in patriarchy', *Environment and Planning A*, 26, 1177-1194.

Duncan, S. (1995) 'Theorizing European gender systems', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 5(4), 263-284.

Duncan, S. (2001) 'Introduction. Theorising Comparative Gender Inequality', in S. Duncan and B. Pfau-Effinger (eds.) *Gender, Work and Culture in the European Union*, London and New York: Routledge, 1-23.

Edgardh, K. (2001) *Adolescent sexuality and sexual abuse, a Swedish perspective,* Venhälsan, Institution Södersjukhuset, Stockholm: Karolinska Institutet.

Edleson, J.L., Eisikovits, Z. and Guttman, E. (1985) 'Men who batter women: a critical review of the evidence', *Journal of Family Issues,* 6(2), 229-247.

Eichler, M. (1980) *The Double Standard: A Feminist Critique of Feminist Social Science*, London: Croom Helm.

Enloe, C. (1990) *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Relations*, London: Pluto; Berkeley: University of California Press.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Esping-Andersen, G. (ed.) (1996) *Welfare States in Transition*, London: Sage.

Ferguson, H. (2000) *Ireland National Report on Research on Men's Practices. Workpackage 1*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Ferguson, H. (2001a) 'Ireland', in B.M. Schwartz-Kenney, M. McCauley and M. Epstein (eds.) *Child Abuse: A Global View*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing.

Ferguson, H. (2001b) *Ireland National Report on Statistical Information on Men's Practices. Workpackage 2*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org.

Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition*. New York and London: Routledge.

Gelles, R.J. (1974) *The Violent Home*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Gelles, P.J. (1983) 'An exchange/social control theory', in D. Finkelhor, R.J. Gelles, G.T. Hotaling and M.A. Straus (eds.) *The Dark Side of Families*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Gemuenden, J. (1996) *Gewalt gegen Maenner in heterosexuellen Intimpartnerschaften* [Violence against males in heterosexual intimate relationships], Marburg.

Gilmore, D. (1990) *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity*, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Goldstein, J.H. (1989) 'Beliefs about human aggression', in J. Groebel and R.A. Hinde (eds.) *Aggression and War. Their Biological and Social Bases*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gondolf, E.W. (1985) *Men Who Batter: An Intergrated Approach for Stopping Wife Abuse*, Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications.

Greig, A., Kimmel, M. and Lang, J. (2000) *Men, Masculinities and Development: Broadening Our Work Towards Gender Equality*, New York: UNDP, Gender in Development Monograph Series #10. Available at: http://www.undp.org/gender/resources/UNDP_Men_and_Masculinities.pdf

Hagemann-White, C., Katenbrink, J. and Rabe, H. (2006) *Combatting Violence against Women. Stocktaking Study on the Measures and Actions Taken in Council of Europe Member States*, Strasbourg: Equality Division, Directorate General of Human Rights. Council of Europe. Available at: http://www.coe.int/T/E/Human_Rights/Equality/PDF_CDEG(2006)3_E.pdf

Hanmer, J. (1990) 'Men, power and the exploitation of women', in J. Hearn and D. Morgan (eds.) *Men, Masculinities and Social Theory*, London and New York: Unwin Hyman/Routledge, 21-42.

Hanmer, J. and J. Hearn (1999) 'Gender and welfare research', in F. Williams, J. Popay and A. Oakley (eds.) *Welfare Research: A Critical Review*, UCL Press, London, 106-130.

Hanmer, J., Radford, J. and Stanko, E.A. (eds.) (1989) *Women, Policing and Male Violence: International Perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Harcourt, W. (2001) (ed.) (2001) Special Issue 'Violence Against Women and the Culture of Masculinity', *Development: the Journal of the Society for International Development*, 44(3).

Harder, M. and Pringle, K. (eds.) (1997) *Protecting Children in Europe: Towards a New Millennium*, Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.

Hearn, J. (1987) *The Gender of Oppression: Men, Masculinity and the Critique of Marxism*, Brighton: Wheatsheaf; New York: St. Martin's.

Hearn, J. (1992). *Men in the Public Eye: the Construction and Deconstruction of Public Men and Public Patriarchies*, London and New York: Routledge.

Hearn, J. (1996a) 'Deconstructing the dominant: Making the One(s) the Other(s)', *Organization*, 3(4), 611-626.

Hearn, J. (1996b) 'Is masculinity dead? A critique of the concept of masculinity/masculinities', in M. Mac an Ghaill (ed.) *Understanding Masculinities*, Buckingham: Open University Press, 202-217.

Hearn, J. (1997) 'The implications of critical studies on men', *NORA. Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*, 5(1), 48-60.

Hearn, J. (1998) *The Violences of Men. How Men Talk About and How Agencies Respond to Men's Violence to Women*, London: Sage.

Hearn, J. (1999) 'A crisis in masculinity, or new agendas for men?', in S. Walby (ed.) *New Agendas for Women*, London: Macmillan, 148-168.

Hearn, J. (2003) 'Men: power, challenges of power and the 'big picture' of globalisation', in I. Novikova and D. Kambourov (eds.) *Men and Masculinities in the Global World: Integrating Postsocialist Perspectives*, Helsinki: Kikimora Publishers, Aleksanteri Institute, 45-74.

Hearn, J. (2004a) 'From hegemonic masculinity to the hegemony of men', *Feminist Theory*, 5(1), 97-120.

Hearn, J. (2004b) 'Education as intervention against men's violence to Women', in M. Eliasson (ed.) *Undoing Harm: International Perspectives on Interventions for Men Who Use Violence Against Women*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 15-36.

Hearn, J. (2006) 'The implications of information and communication technologies for sexualities and sexualised violences: Contradictions of sexual citizenships', *Political Geography*, 25(8), 944-963.

Hearn, J., Iovanni, L., Pringle, K., Bjerén, G., Novikova, I., Šmídová, I., Arranz, F., Ferguson, H., Kolga, V., Müller, U., Oleksy, E., Balkmar, D., Helfferich, C., Lentz, I., Wojtaszek, M.M., Jyrkinen, M. and Pičukāne, E. (2006a) *Developing research strategy on men's violences in Europe: Planning the structure and content of a draft for a framework for methodology*. Workpackage 9. Co-ordination Action on Human Rights Violations. Hanken, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, Helsinki, Finland, and Aalborg University, Denmark.

Hearn, J., Jyrkinen, M., Iovanni, L. Novikova, I., Pringle, K., Bjerén, G., Šmídová, I., Arranz, F., Ferguson, H., Kolga, V., Müller, U., Oleksy, E.H., Balkmar, D., Helfferich, C., Lenz, I., Wojtaszek, M.M. and Pičukāne, E. (2006b) *D25 First draft Methodological Report SN 2*. Workpackage 9. Co-ordination Action on Human Rights Violations. Helsinki: Hanken, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration.

Hearn, J. and Lattu, E. (2000) *Finland National Report on Research on Men's Practices. Workpackage 1*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Hearn, J., Lattu, E., and Tallberg, T. (2001) *Finland National Report on Statistical Information on Men's Practices. Workpackage 2*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Hearn, J., Jyrkinen, M. and Lattu E., with Niemi, H. (2005) *Finland 2005 Update on National Report, with the focus on men's violences*, EU FP6 Co-ordination Action on Human Rights Violation (CAHRV) Sub Network 2, Helsinki: Hanken, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org/

Hearn, J., Müller, U., Oleksy, E., Pringle, K., Chernova, J., Ferguson, H., Holter, Ø.G., Kolga, V., Novikova, I., Pitch, T., Ventimiglia, C., Lattu, E. and Olsvik E. (2000) *Summary Report on Workpackage 1 on Ten National Reports on Research on Men's Practices: Deliverable 2*, EU FPV Thematic Network, 'The Social Problem of Men', Report to the European Commission. Helsinki: Hanken, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org/

Hearn, J., Müller, U., Oleksy, E., Pringle, K., Chernova, J., Ferguson, H., Holter, Ø.G., Kolga, V., Novikova, I., Ventimiglia, C., Lattu, E., Tallberg, T., Millett, J. and Olsvik, E. (2001) *Summary Report on Workpackage 2 on Ten National Reports on Statistical Information on Men's Practices: Deliverable 2*, EU FPV Thematic Network, 'The Social Problem of Men', Report to the European Commission. Helsinki: Hanken, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org/

Hearn, J., Müller, U., Oleksy, E., Pringle, K., Chernova, J., Ferguson, H., Holter, Ø.G., Kolga, V., Novikova, I., Pitch, T., Ventimiglia, C., Lattu E. and Olsvik E. (2000) *Summary Report on Workpackage 1 on Ten National Reports on Research on Men's Practices: Deliverable 2*, EU FPV Thematic Network, 'The Social Problem of Men', Report to the European Commission. Helsinki: Hanken, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org/

Hearn, J., Müller, U., Oleksy, E., Pringle, K., Chernova, J., Ferguson, H., Holter, Ø.G., Kolga, V., Novikova, I., Ventimiglia, C., Lattu, E., Tallberg, T., Millett, J. and Olsvik, E. (2001a) *Summary Report on Workpackage 2 on Ten National Reports on Statistical Information on Men's Practices: Deliverable 2*, EU FPV Thematic Network, 'The Social Problem of Men', Report to the European Commission. Helsinki: Hanken, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, Helsinki. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org/

Hearn, J., Müller, U., Oleksy, E., Pringle, K., Chernova, J., Ferguson, H., Holter, Ø.G., Kolga, V., Novikova, I., Ventimiglia, C., Lattu, E., Tallberg, T., Millett, J. and Olsvik, E. (2001b) *Summary Report on Workpackage 3 on Ten National Reports on Law and Policy on Men's Practices: Deliverable 5*, EU FPV Thematic Network, 'The Social Problem of Men', Report to the European Commission. Helsinki: Hanken, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org/

Hearn, J., Müller, U., Oleksy, E., Pringle, K., Chernova, J., Ferguson, H., Holter, Ø.G., Kolga, V., Novikova, I., Ventimiglia, C., Lattu, E., Tallberg, T., Millett, J. and Olsvik, E. (2002a) *The European Research Network on Men in Europe: The Social Problem and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities: Policy Option Paper I: National Options and Priorities*, EU FPV Thematic Network, 'The Social Problem of Men', Report to the European Commission. Helsinki: Hanken, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, Helsinki. .

Hearn, J., Müller, U., Oleksy, E., Pringle, K., Chernova, J., Ferguson, H., Holter, Ø.G., Kolga, V., Novikova, I., Ventimiglia, C., Lattu, E., Tallberg, T., Millett, J. and Olsvik, E. (2002b) *The European Research Network on Men in Europe: The Social Problem and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities: Policy Option Paper II: EU, European and Transnational Options and Priorities*, EU FPV Thematic Network, 'The Social Problem of Men', Report to the European Commission. Helsinki: Hanken, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, Helsinki,

Hearn, J., Müller, U., Oleksy, E., Pringle, K., Chernova, J., Ferguson, H., Holter, Ø.G., Kolga, V., Novikova, I., Ventimiglia, C., Lattu, E., Tallberg, T., and Olsvik, E. (2004) *The European Research Network on Men in Europe: The Social Problem and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Volumes 1 and 2*, Brussels: European Commission. Available at: http://improving-ser.jrc.it/default/show.gx?Object.object_id=TSER----0000000000000121D&_app.page=show-TSR.html

Hearn, J., Novikova, I., Pringle, K., Šmídová, I., Bjerén, G., Jyrkinen, M., Iovanni, L., Arranz, F., Ferguson, H., Kolga, V., Müller, U., Oleksy, E.H., Balkmar, D., Helfferich, C., Lenz, I., Wojtaszek, M.M., Pičukāne, E., Rosa, V. (2007) *Methodological Framework Report SN 2*, FP6 Co-ordination Action on Human Rights Violation, Sub Network 2, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, Helsinki, Final Report to the European Commission, Available at: http://www.cahrv.uni-osnabrueck.de/reddot/Methodological_Framework_web.pdf, http://www.cromenet.org/

Hearn, J. and Pringle, K., with members of Critical Research on Men in Europe (2006/2009) *European Perspectives on Men and Masculinities: National and Transnational Perspectives*, Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hearn, J. and Pringle, K. (2006) 'Studying men in Europe', in J. Hearn and K. Pringle, with members of Critical Research on Men in Europe *European Perspectives on Men and Masculinities: National and Transnational Perspectives*, Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 1-19.

Hearn, J. and Pringle, K. (2006) 'Violences', in J. Hearn and K. Pringle, with members of Critical Research on Men in Europe *European Perspectives on Men and Masculinities: National and Transnational Perspectives*, Houndmills, UK. Palgrave Macmillan, 149-169.

Hearn, J., Pösö, T., Smith, C., White, S. and Korpinen J. (2004) 'What is child protection? Historical and methodological issues in comparative research on [Lastensuojelu] child protection', International Journal of Social Welfare, 13(1), 28-41.

Hearn, J. and Whitehead. A. (2006) 'Collateral damage: Men's 'domestic' violence to women seen through men's relations with men', *Probation Journal*, 53(1), 38-56.

Heitmeyer, W. (ed.) (1996) *Die bedrängte Toleranz: ethnisch-kulturelle Konflikte, religiöse Differenzen and dir politisierter Gewalt*, Frankfurt/M.

Heitmeyer, W. (1997a) *Was treibt die Gesellschaft auseinander?* Frankfurt/M.

Heitmeyer, W. (1997b) *Was hällt die Gesellschaft zusammen?* Frankfurt/M.

Heiskanen, M. (2006) 'Miesten naisille tekemän väkivallan kehitys ja kokonaiskuva' [Development and overview of men's violence aganinst women], in M. Piispa, M. Heiskanen, J. Kääriäinen and R. Sirén. (2006) *Naisiin kohdistunut väkivalta 2005* [Violence against women 2005 in Finland], Oikeuspoliittisen tutkimuslaitoksen julkaisuja 225, Publication Series No 51. Helsinki: Oikeuspoliittinen tutkimuslaitos HEUNI, 19-40.

Heiskanen, M. and Piispa, M. (1998) Usko, toivo. Hakkaus. Kyselytutkimys miesten naisille tekemästä väkivallasta [Faith, hope, battering. Survey on mens' violence against women], Helsinki: Oikeus 1998:2. Statistics Finland and Council for Equality between Women and Men.

Hester, M., Kelly, L. and Radford, J. (eds.) (1996) *Women, Violence and Male Power*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Hester, M. and Pearson, C. (1998) *From Periphery to Centre: Domestic Violence in Work with Abused Children*, Bristol: Policy Press.

Higate, P. (ed.) (2002) *Military Masculinities: Identities and the State*, Connecticut: Greenwood.

Hiillos, M. (2004) *Personnel Managers and Crisis Situations. Emotion-handling Strategies*, Ekonomi och Samhälle No 136. Helsinki: Hanken, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration.

Hobson, B. (ed.) (2002) *Making Men into Fathers: Men, Masculinities and the Social Politics of Fatherhood*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holmlund, M. (1996) *Perceived Quality in Business Relationships*, Publications of Hanken No 66. Helsinki: Hanken, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration.

Holter, Ø.G. (1989) *Menn* [Men], Oslo: Aschehoug.

Holter, Ø.G. (1997) *Gender, Patriarchy and Capitalism. A Social Forms Analysis*, Oslo: University of Oslo.

Holter, Ø.G. and Aarseth, H. (1993) *Menns Livssammenheng*, Oslo: Ad Notem Gyldendal.

Holter, Ø.G. and Olsvik, E. (2000) *Norway National Report on Research on Men's Practices. Workpackage 1*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Holter, Ø.G. (2001a) *Norway National Report on Statistical Information on Men's Practices. Workpackage 2*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Honkatukia, P., Niemi-Kiesiläinen, J and Näre, S. (eds.) *Lähentelyistä raiskauksiin. Tyttöjen kokemuksia häirinnästä ja seksuaalisesta väkivallasta* [From sexual approaches and harassment to rapes. Girls' experiences of harassment and sexual violence], Helsinki: Nuorisotutkimusverkosto, 137-168.

Horsfall, J. (1991) *The Presence of the Past: Male Violence in the Family*, North Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Hotaling, G.T. and Sugarman, D.B (1986) 'An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of Knowledge', *Violence and Victims,* 1(2), 101-124.

Howell, S. and Willis, R. (eds.) (1990) *Societies at Peace*, Routledge, New York.

http://www.cromenet.org

http://improving-ser.jrc.it/default/show.gx?Object.object_id=TSER----0000000000000121D&_app.page=show-TSR.html

Humphreys, C., Carter, R., Eriksson, M., Haller, B., Hanmer, J., Hester, M., Kirwill, L., Lovett, J., Lunneman, K., Rabe, H., Logar, R., Seith, C. and Thiara. R.K. (2006) *The justice system as an arena for the protection of human rights for women and children experiencing violence and abuse*. Co-ordination Action on Human Tights Violations, European Commission 6th Framework Programme, Project No. 506348. Available at: http://www.cahrv.uni-osnabrueck.de/reddot/CAHRVreportJusticeSystems(3).pdf

Husso, M. (2003) *Parisuhdeväkivalta. Lyötyjen aika ja tila* [Violence in intimate relations. Time and space of the battered], Tampere: Vastapaino.

Iovanni, L. and Pringle, K. (2005a) *Denmark National Report on Research on Men's Practices*, EU FP6 Co-ordination Action on Human Rights (CAHRV) Sub-network 2, Aalborg: Department of Sociology, Social Work and Organization, Aalborg University, Denmark. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Iovanni, L. and Pringle, K. (2005b) *Denmark National Report on Statistical Information on Men's Practices*, EU FP6 Co-ordination Action on Human Rights (CAHRV) Sub-network 2, Aalborg: Department of Sociology, Social Work and Organization, Aalborg University, Denmark. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Iovanni, L. and Pringle, K. (2005c) *Denmark National Report on Law and Policy Addressing Men's Practices*, EU FP6 Co-ordination Action on Human Rights (CAHRV) Sub-network 2, Aalborg: Department of Sociology, Social Work and Organization, Aalborg University, Denmark. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Itzin, C. (ed.) (1992) *Pornography: Women, Violence and Civil Liberties*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Itzin, C. (1996) 'Pornography and the organisation of child sexual abuse', in P. Bibby (ed.) *Organized Abuse: the current debate*. London: Ashgate.

Itzin, C. (1997) 'Pornography and the organization of intrafamilial and extrafamilial child sexual abuse: developing a conceptual model', *Child Abuse Review*, 6(2), 94-106.

Itzin, C. (ed.) (2000) *Home Truths about Child Sexual Abuse: Influencing Policy and Practice. A Reader.* London: Routledge.

Jungnitz, L., Lenz, H.-J., Puchert, R., Puhe, H. and Walter, W. (2004) *Violence against Men. Men's Experiences of Interpersonal Violence in Germany – Results of a Pilot Study*, Berlin: Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth.

Jyrkinen, M. (2005) *The Organisation of Policy Meets the Commercialisation of Sex. Global Linkages. Policies, Technologies.* Economy and society No 146. Helsinki: Hanken, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration. http://www.hanken.fi/portals/pubmanager/pdf/146-951-555-882-4.pdf

Jyrkinen, M. and Ruusuvuori, L. (2002) 'Sukupuolistunut väkivalta' [Gendered violence], in M. Heikkilä and M. Kautto (eds.) *Suomalaisten hyvinvointi.* Helsinki: STAKES, National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health, 408-425.

Kelleher and Associates and O'Connor, M. (1995) *Making the Links*, Dublin: Women's Aid.

Kelly, L. (1987) 'Sexual violence as a continuum', in J. Hanmer and M. Maynard (eds.) *Women, Violence and Social Control*, London: Macmillan, 46-60.

Kelly, L. (2006) *Benefits and Limitations of Human Rights Frameworks: The Case of Interpersonal Violence.* Analytic report on the CAHRV cross-cutting workshop, Valencia, June 2006. The report was prepared within CAHRV and funded through the European Commission, 6th Framework Programme, Project No. 506348.

Keskinen, S. (2005) *Perheammattilaiset ja väkivaltatyön ristiriidat. Sukupuoli, valta ja kielelliset käytännöt* [Family professionals and discrepancies of working with violence. Gender, power and discoursive practices], Tampere: Tampere Universtity Press.

Kimmel, M., Hearn, J. and Connell, R.W. (eds.) (2005) *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*, Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage.

Kolga, V. (2000) *Estonia National Report on Research on Men's Practices. Workpackage 1.* HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Kolga, V. (2001) *Estonia National Report on Statistical Information on Men's Practices. Workpackage 2*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Krienert, J.L. (2003) 'Masculinity and crime: A quantitative exploration of Messerschmidt's hypothesis', *Electronic Journal of Sociology*, 2, 1-19.

Kroon, S. and Sturm, J. (2000) 'Comparative case study research in education: Methodological issues in an empirical-interpretative perspective', *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 3(4/2000), 559-576.

Laukkanen, M.-E. (1998) *Kuhinaa kulisseissa. Kun suomalainen mies myy potenssiaan* [Behind the scenes. When the Finnish man sells his potency], Stakes Raportteja 231. Helsinki: Stakes, Sosiaali- ja terveysalan tutkimus- ja kehittämiskeskus.

Laukkanen, M.-E. (2000) *Suomalainen päivälehdistö seksikaupan foorumina*. [The Finnish daily press as a forum for the sex trade], Helsinki: Reports of the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health 2000:12.

Lautrup, C. (2005) "*Det skal ikke bare være en krop mod krop-oplevelse: En sociologisk undersøgelse om prostitutionskunder*" [It shouldn't be just a body-to-body experience: A sociological investigation of the buyers of prostitution services], Copenhagen: Videns- & Formidlingscenter for Socialt Udsatte [Danish Centre for Research on Social Vulnerability].

Lees, J. and Lloyd, T. (1994) *Working with Men Who Batter Their Partners (An Introductory Text)*, London: Working with Men/The B Team.

Leira, A. (1992) *Welfare States and Working Mothers: The Scandinavian Experience*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leira, A. (1994) 'Combining work and family: Working mothers in Scandinavia and the European Community', in P. Brown and R. Crompton (eds.) *Economic Restructuring and Social Exclusion*, London: UCL Press, 86-107.

Lempert, J. and Ölemann, B. (1995/1998) "...dann habe ich zugeschlagen". Gewalt gegen Frauen. Auswege aus einem fatalen Kreislauf ["...and then I hit her". Violence against Women. Ways to escape a fatal circle], Hamburg and Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.

Lenz, H.-J. (1966) *Spirale der Gewalt. Jungen und Maenner als Opfer von Gewalt* [Spiral of violence. Boys and men as victims of violence], Berlin.

Lewis, J. (1992) 'Gender and the development of welfare regimes', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 2(3), 159-173.

Lewis, J. and Ostner, I. (1991) 'Gender and the evolution of European social policies', paper at CES Workshop on Emergent Supranational Social Policy: The EC's Social Dimension in Comparative Perspective. Center for European Studies: Harvard University.

LOKK (2003) *When hopes and dreams turn into nightmares: A report on violence committed by Danish men against foreign women and children*. Copenhagen: Danish National Organization of Shelters for Battered Women and Their Children, November 2003.

Lundgren, E., Heimer, G., Westerstrand, J. and Kalliokoski A.-M. (2001) *Captured Queen: Men's violence against women in "equal" Sweden – a prevalence study*, Stockholm: Fritzes Offentliga Publikationer, 20-21.

Madsen, D.H. (2005) 'Minority women abuse and residence permits in Denmark', in *Trapped between Law and Life. Report on Abused Minority Women in the Nordic Countries*, Roskilde: The Danish Research Center on Gender Equality, Roskilde University, 15-29.

Mangan, J. and Walvin, J. (eds.) (1987) *Manliness and Morality*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Mason, J. (2002) *Qualitative Researching.* 2nd Edition. London: Sage.

Martinez, M., Schröttle, M., Condon, S., Springer-Kremser, M., Timmerman, G., Hagemann-White, C., Lenz, H-J, May-Chahal, C., Penhale, B., Reingardiene, J., Brzank, P., Honkatukia, P., Jaspard, M., Lundgren, E., Piispa, M., Romito, P., Walby, S. and Westerstrand, J. (2005) *Report on the state of the research on prevalence of interpersonal violence, and its impact on health and human rights available in Europe*. Coordination Action on Human Rights Violations, Workpackage 5, Deliverable 6.

Martinez, M., Schröttle, M., Condon, S., Springer-Kremser, M., Timmerman, G., Hagemann-White, C., Lenz, H-J, May-Chahal, C., Penhale, B., Reingardiene, J., Brzank, P., Honkatukia, P., Jaspard, M., Lundgren, E., Piispa, M., Romito, P., Walby, S. and Westerstrand, J. (2006) *State of European research on the prevalence of Interpersonal violence and its impact on health and human rights*. Coordination Action on Human Rights Violations, European Commission 6th Framework Programme, Project No. 506348. Available at: http://www.cahrv.uni-osnabrueck.de/reddot/CAHRVreportPrevalence(1).pdf

Matějů, P., Straková, J. et al. (2006). *Ne/rovné šance na vzdělání*. (Un/Equal chances to education.) Praha: Academia.

McMahon, A. (1993) 'Male readings of feminist theory: The psychologization of sexual politics in the masculinity literature', *Theory and Society*, 22(5), 675-696.

Messerschmidt, J.W. (1993) *Masculinities and Crime: Ctitique and Reconceptualisation of Theory*, Latham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Metz-Göckel, S. and Müller, U. (1986) *Der Mann*, Weinheim and Basel: Die Birgitte Studie.

Miedzian M. (1992) *Boys will be boys. Breaking the link between masculinity and violence*. Virago, London.

Minssen, A. and Mueller, U. (1998) *Attraktion und Gewalt. Psychogenese und Soziogenese maennlicher Gewaltbereitschaft gegenueber Frauen* [Attraction and violence. Psychogenesis and Sociogenesis of male disposition for violence against women], Opladen: Leske & Budrich.

Minutes of Sub-network 2 Meetings, 25th September 2004, Osnabrück, and 27th September 2005, Paris.

Morrell, R. (ed.) (2001) *Changing Men in Southern Africa*, London: Zed.

Morrell, R. and Swart, S. (2005) 'Men in the Third World: Postcolonial perspectives on masculinity', in M. Kimmel, J. Hearn and R.W. Connell (eds.) *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*, Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage, 90-113.

Munday, B. (1996) 'Introduction: Definitions and comparisons in Europe', in B. Munday and P. Ely (eds.) *Social Care in Europe*, Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall Europe, 1-20.

Müller, U. (2000) *Germany National Report on Research on Men's Practices. Workpackage 1*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Müller, U. (2001) *Germany National Report on Statistical Information on Men's Practices. Workpackage 2*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Müller, U. (2005) *Germany 2005 Update on National Report* EU FP6 Co-ordination Action on Human Rights (CAHRV) Sub-network 2, Department of Sociology, University of Bielefeld, Germany. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Müller, U. and Schröttle, M. (2004) *Health, Well-being and Personal Safety of Women in Germany. A Represenattive Study of Violence against Women in Germany*, Berlin: Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth. Available at: http://www.cahrv.uni-osnabrueck.de/conference/SummaryGermanVAWstudy.pdf

the network newsletter (2000) Special issue 'Gender and Masculinities' (British Council), 21.

Nikunen, M. (2005) *Surman jälkeen itsemurha. Kulttuuriset luokitukset rikosuutisissa* [Suicide after murder. Cultural classifications in crime news], Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Nordberg, M. (2000) 'Hegemonibegreppet och hegemonier i mansforskningsfältet', in Folkesson, P., Nordberg M., Smirthwaite, G. (eds.) *Hegemoni och mansforskning*, Karlstad: Karlstad University.

Novikova, I. (2000) *Latvia National Report on Research on Men's Practices. Workpackage 1*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Novikova, I. (2001) *Latvia National Report on Statistical Information on Men's Practices. Workpackage 2*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Novikova, I. and Kambourov, D. (eds.) (2003) *Men and Masculinities in the Global World: Integrating Postsocialist Perspectives*, Kikimora Publishers, Aleksanteri Institute, Helsinki.

Novikova, I., Pringle, K., Hearn, J., Müller, U., Oleksy, E., Chernova, J., Ferguson, H., Holter, Ø.G., Kolga, V., Lattu, E., Tallberg, T. and Ventimiglia, C. (2003) 'Men, "Europe" and Post-socialism', in I. Novikova and D. Kambourov (eds.) *Men and Masculinities in the Global World: Integrating Postsocialist Perspectives*, Helsinki: Kikimora Publishers, Aleksanteri Institute, 75-102.

Novikova, I., Pringle, K., Hearn, J., Müller, U., Oleksy, E., Chernova, J., Ferguson, H., Holter, Ø.G., Kolga, V., Lattu, E., Tallberg, T. and Ventimiglia, C. (2005) 'Men, masculinities and 'Europe'', in M. Kimmel, J. Hearn and R.W. Connell (eds.) *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 141-162.

Näre, S. (1994) 'Pornografiakeskustelusta bordellikeskusteluun. Kaupallinen seksi vietti- ja rakkauseetoksen taistelukenttänä' [From pornography discourse to brothel discourse]. In Sara Heinämaa and Sari Näre (eds.) *Pahan tyttäret. Sukupuolitettu pelko, viha ja valta* [Daughters of evil. Gendered fear, hate and power], Tampere: Gaudeamus.

Näre, S. (1995) *Etnopsykoanalyyttisia näkökulmia sukupuolikulttuuriin* [Ethnopsychoanalytical viewpoints on gender culture], Helsinki: Research Reports No 229, Department of Sociology, University of Helsinki.

O'Connor, C. (1996) 'Integrating feminist and psychological systemic approaches in working with men who are violent towards their partners: The Cork Domestic Violence Project', *Feedback*, 7 (1).

O'Connor, J.S. (1993) 'Gender, class and citizenship in the comparative analysis of welfare state regimes: Theoretical and methodological issues', *British Journal of Sociology*, 44, 501-518.

O'Neill, M. (1996) 'Researching prostitution and violence: towards a feminist praxis', in M. Hester, L. Kelly and J. Radford (eds.) *Women, Violence and Male Power*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Oleksy, E. (2000) *Poland National Report on Research on Men's Practices. Workpackage 1*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Oleksy, E. (2001) *Poland National Report on Statistical Information on Men's Practices. Workpackage 2*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Oleksy, E. H. and Różalska, A. M. (2005) *Poland 2005 Update on National Report* EU FP6 Co-ordination Action on Human Rights (CAHRV) Sub-network 2, Women's Studies Centre, University of Aódz, Poland. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Orloff, A.S. (1993) 'Gender and the social rights of citizenship: State policies and gender relations in comparative research', *American Sociological Review*, 58, 303-328.

Ouzgane, L. and Coleman, D. (1998) 'Postcolonial masculinities: Introduction', *Jouvert: A Journal of Postcolonial Studies*, 2(1). Available at: http://social.chass.ncsu.edu/jouvert/v2i1/con21.htm

Ouzgane, L. and Morrell, R. (eds.) (2005) *African Masculinities: Men in Africa from the Late Nineteenth Century to the Present*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Piispa, M. (2005) *Väkivalta ja Parisuhde* [Violence and marriage], Helsinki: Statistics Finland.

Piispa, M., Heiskanen, M., Kääriäinen, J. and Sirén, R. (2006) *Naisiin kohdistunut väkivalta 2005* [Violence against women 2005 in Finland], Oikeuspoliittisen tutkimuslaitoksen julkaisuja 225, Publication Series No 51. Helsinki: Oikeuspoliittinen tutkimuslaitos HEUNI.

Pease, R. and Pringle, K. (eds.) (2001) *A Man's World: Changing Men's Practices in a Globalized World*, London: Zed.

Popay, J., Hearn. J. and Edwards. J. (eds.) (1998) *Men, Gender Divisions and Welfare*, London: Routledge.

Pringle, K. (1995) *Men, Masculinities and Social Welfare*, London: UCL Press.

Pringle, K. (1998a) *Children and Social Welfare in Europe*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Pringle, K. (1998b) 'Men as carers', in Popay, J., Hearn, J. and Edwards, J. (eds.) *Men, Gender Divisions and Welfare*, London: Routledge, 312-336.

Pringle, K. (2000) *UK National Report on Research on Men's Practices. Workpackage 1*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Pringle, K. (2005) 'Neglected issues in Swedish child protection policy and practice'. In M. Eriksson, M. Hester, S. Keskinen and K. Pringle (eds.) *Tackling Men's Violence in Families*, Bristol: Policy Press, 155-171.

Pringle, K. and Harder, M. (1999) *Through Two Pairs of Eyes: A Comparative Study of Danish Social Policy and Child Welfare Practice*, Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.

Pringle, K. and Hearn, J. (2005) 'Situational factors and violence', Panel presentation, CAHRV Conference, Paris, September.

Pringle, K., Hearn, J. Ferguson, H., Kambourov, D., Kolga, V., Lattu, E., Müller, U., Nordberg, M., Novikova, I., Oleksy, E., Rydzewska, J., Šmídová, I., Tallberg, T. and Niemi, N. (2006/2013) *Men and Masculinities in Europe*, London: Whiting & Birch, rev. ed., 2013, includes:

J. Hearn and K. Pringle 'Introduction: Men in Europe'

D. Kambourov 'Bulgaria: Men and Balkan modernity?'

I. Šmídová 'Czech Republic: Domination and silences'

V. Kolga 'Estonia: Societal context and transitions'

J. Hearn, E. Lattu, T. Tallberg and H. Niemi 'Finland: Gender dominance, gender equality and gender-neutrality'

U. Müller 'Germany: Traditionalism and difference, unification and diversification'

H. Ferguson 'Ireland: Men and masculinities in a late-modern society'

I. Novikova 'Latvia and the (re)creation of nationhood'

E. Oleksy and J. Rydzewska 'Poland: Gender relations in the "New Europe"'

M. Nordberg 'Sweden: The gender equality paradise?'

K. Pringle 'United Kingdom: the problems that men create and the problems that men experience'

Pringle, K., Hearn, J., Novikova, I. and Kambourov, D. (2006) 'Social exclusion', in J. Hearn and K. Pringle, with members of Critical Research on Men in Europe (2006) *European Perspectives on Men and Masculinities: National and Transnational Perspectives*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pringle, K. and Pease, B. (2001) 'Afterword', in B. Pease and K. Pringle (eds.) *A Man's World?* London: Zed, 245-252.

Rai, S., Pilkington, H. and Phizaclea, A. (eds.) (1992) *Women in the Face of Change: The Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China*, London: Routledge.

Råkil, M. (ed.) (2002) *Menns vold mot kvinner. Behandlingserfaringer og kunnskapsstatus*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget (Aschehoug).

Pringle, K., Raynor, A. and Millett, J. (2001) *UK National Report on Statistical Information on Men's Practices. Workpackage* 2. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Rice, M. (1990) 'Challenging Orthodoxies in Feminist Theory: A Black Feminist Critique', in L. Gelsthorpe and A. Morris (eds.) *Feminist Perspectives in Criminology*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 57-69.

Ronkainen, S. (1998) *Sukupuolistunut väkivalta ja sen tutkimus Suomessa. Tutkimuksen katveet valokeilassa* [Gendered violence and its research in Finland. Focus on gaps in research], Naistutkimusraportteja 2/1998.

Ronkainen, S. (1999) *Ajan ja paikan merkitsemät. Subjektiviteettti, tieto ja toimijuus* [Made in time and space. Subjectivity, knowledge and agency], Gaudeamus: Helsinki.

Ronkainen, S. (2001) 'Gendered violence and genderless gender', *Kvinder, Kön och Forskning*, 10(2), 45-57.

Rowbotham, S. (1979) 'The Trouble with Patriarchy', *New Statesman*, 98, 970-971.

Sainsbury, D. (ed.) (1994) *Gendering Welfare States*, London: Sage.

Sainsbury, D. (1996) *Gender, Equality and Welfare States*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sainsbury, D. (ed.) (1999) *Gender and Welfare State Regimes*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schröttle, M. (1999) *Politik und Gewalt im Geschlechterverhältnis. Eine empirische Untersuchung über Ausmaß, Ursachen und Hintergruende von Gewalt gegen Frauen in ostdeutschen Paarbeziehungen vor und nach der Deutschen Vereinigung*, Bielefeld.

Sheffield, C. (1987) 'Sexual terrorism: the social control of women'. In B.B. Hess and M.M. Ferree (eds.) *Analysing Gender: A Handbook of Social Science Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 171-183.

Siemieńska, R. (2006) 'Violence' Report 12, prepared within the project sponsored by Phare PL 2002/ 000-580-01.04.02, *Wzmocnienie polityki równego traktowania kobiet i mężczyzn* [Strengthening of the Equal Treatment of Women and Men Policy].

Sipilä J. (ed.) (1997) *Social Care Services: The Key to the Scandinavian Welfare Model*, Avebury. Aldershot.

Šmídová, I. (2005a) 'Cultures of violence and cultures of care', Panel presentation, CAHRV Conference, Paris, September.

Šmídová, I. (2005b) *Czech Republic National Report on Research on Men's Practices*

EU FP6 Co-ordination Action on Human Rights (CAHRV) Sub-network 2, School of Social Studies, Masaryk Universit, Brno, Czech Republic. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Šmídová, I. (2005c) *Czech Republic National Report on Statistical Information on Men's Practices*. EU FP6 Co-ordination Action on Human Rights (CAHRV) Sub-network 2, School of Social Studies, Masaryk Universit, Brno, Czech Republic. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Šmídová, I. and Baslarova I. (2005c) *Czech Republic National Report on Law and Policy Addressing Men's Practices* EU FP6 Co-ordination Action on Human Rights (CAHRV) Sub-network 2, School of Social Studies, Masaryk Universit, Brno, Czech Republic. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Socialstyrelsen (2002) *Unga förövare och unga offer – en kartläggning av sexuella övergrepp*, [Young perpetrators and young victims – mapping sexual abuse] Stockholm: Socialstyrelsen.

Stanko, E. (1994) 'Challenging the problem of men's individual violence', in T. Newburn and E. Stanko (eds.) *Just Boys Doing Business: Men, Masculinities and Crime*, London: Routledge, 32-45.

Straus, M.A. (1979) 'Measuring intrafamily conflicts and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CTS) Scale', *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 41, 75-88.

Straus, M.A., Gelles, R.J. and Steinmetz, S. (1980) *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family*, New York: Anchor Press.

Sweetman, C. (1997) 'Introduction', *Gender and Development*, 5(2), 2-7.

Swirsky, R. and Jenkins, C. (2000) 'Prostitution, pornography and telephone boxes', in J. Radford, M. Friedberg and L. Harne (eds.) *Women, Violence and Strategies for Action*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Tifft, L. (1993) *Battering of Women: The Failure of Intervention and the Case for Prevention*, Boulder, CO: Westview.

Tjeder, D. (2003) *The Power of Character: Middle-class Masculinities, 1800–1900*, Stockholm: Stockholm University.

Trifiletti, R. (1999) 'Southern European welfare regimes and the worsening position of women', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 9, 49-64.

Tyyskä, V. (1995) *The Politics of Caring and the Welfare State: the Impact of the Women's Movement on Child Care Policy in Canada and Finland, 1960–1990*, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, ser B, tom 277.

UNDP Human Development Report (1999) Available at: http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/1999/en/

UNDP Human Development Report (2005) Available at: http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2005/

Vartia, M. (1995) 'Bullying at workplaces', in R. Bast-Petterson, E. Bach, K. Lindström, A. Toomingas, and J. Kiviranta (Eds.), *Research on Violence, Threats and Bullying as Health Risks Among Health Care Personnel*, Copenhagen: TemaNord, 29-31.

Ventimiglia, C. (1987) *La Differenza Negata. Ricerca sulla Violenza Sessuale in Italia*. Milano: Angeli.

Ventimiglia, C. and Pitch, T. (2000) *Italy National Report on Research on Men's Practices. Workpackage 1*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Ventimiglia, C. and Pitch, T. (2001) *Italy National Report on Statistical Information on Men's Practices. Workpackage 2*. HPSE-CT-1999-0008 EU FPV Thematic Network: The Social Problem of Men and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. Available at: http://www.cromenet.org

Walby, S. (1986) *Patriarchy at Work: Patriarchal and Capitalist Relations in Employment*, Cambridge: Polity.

Walby, S. (1990) *Theorizing Patriarchy*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Walby, S. (1997). *Gender Transformations*, London. Routledge.

Walby, S. and Allen, J. (2004) *Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Stalking: Findings from the British Crime Survey*, London: Home office.

Watson, D. and Parsons, S. (2005) *Domestic Abuse of Women and Men in Ireland: Report on the National Study of Domestic Abuse*, Dublin: The National Crime Council in association with the Economic and Social Research Institute.

West C. and Zimmermann, D.H. (1987) 'Doing gender', *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 125-151.

Whitehead, A. (2005) 'Man to man violence: How masculinity may work as a dynamic risk factor', *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 44(4), 411-422.

Whitehead, S.M. (2002) *Men and Masculinities: Key themes and new directions*, Cambridge: Polity.

Woodward, A. (1996) 'Multinational masculinities and European bureaucracies', in D.L. Collinson and J. Hearn (eds.), *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Managements*, London: Sage, 167-185.

Young, I.M. (1990). *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Zulehner, P.M. and Volz, R. (1998) *Männer im Aufbruch. Wie Deutschlands Männer sich selbst und wie sie Frauen sehen*, Ostfildern: Schwabenverlag.

AUTHORS

Fátima Arranz Lozano, Professor of Sociology, University Complutense of Madrid, Spain.

Dag Balkmar, Postdoctoral Researcher, Gender Studies, Linköping University, and formerly Researcher, Gender Studies, Stockholm University, Sweden.

Gunilla Bjerén, Professor of Gender Studies, Stockholm University, Sweden.

Raewyn Connell, University Professor, University of Sydney, Australia.

Harry Ferguson, Professor of Social Work, Nottingham, University, and formerly Professor of Social Work, University of West of England, Bristol, UK, and Professor of Social Policy and Social Work at University College, Dublin, Ireland.

Jeff Hearn, Guest Research Professor in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, based in Gender Studies, Örebro University, Sweden; Professor of Management and Organisation, Hanken School of Economics, Helsinki, Finland; Professor of Sociology, University of Huddersfield, UK; and formerly Professor of Gender Studies (Critical Studies on Men), Linköping University, Sweden.

Cornelia Helfferich, Professor of Sociology, Evangelische Fachhochschule Freiburg, Germany.

LeeAnn Iovanni, Academic Officer, The Engineering, Science and Medicine Faculties, Lecturer, and formerly Postdoctoral Researcher, Department of Sociology and Social Work, Aalborg University, Denmark.

Marjut Jyrkinen, Acting Professor in Gender Studies, Helsinki University, and formerly Postdoctoral Academy Fellow, Hanken School of Economics, Helsinki, Finland.

Voldemar Kolga, Professor of Psychology, and Dean of the Faculty of Psychology. University Nord, Tallinn, Estonia. He was previously Professor of Personality and Developmental Psychology, and Chair and Head of the Women's Studies Centre at University of Tallinn, Estonia.

Ilse Lenz, Professor Emerita of Sociology, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany.

Ursula Müller, Professor Emerita of Sociology and Women's Studies, Bielefeld University, Germany.

Irina Novikova, Professor in the Department of Culture and. Literature, and Director of the Centre of Gender Studies, University of Latvia, Latvia.

Elżbieta H. Oleksy, Professor of Humanities, Director of Women's Studies, and formerly Dean of the Faculty of International Studies and Political Science, Łódź University, Poland.

Elizabete Pičukāne, formerly Lecturer, Gender Studies and Sociology, University of Latvia, Latvia.

Keith Pringle, Professor of Sociology with reference to Social Work, Uppsala University, Sweden; Honorary Professor at the Centre for Lifelong Learning, Warwick University, UK; Adjungered Professor, Aalborg University, Denmark; Affiliated Professor of Social Work, Mälardalen University, Sweden; Professor Emeritus in Social Policy and Social Work, London Metropolitan University, UK; and formerly Professor of Social Work, Aalborg University, Denmark, Professor of Sociology, Mälardalen University, Sweden; Professor of Social Work, Aalborg University, Denmark, and Professor of Comparative Social Policy, University of Sunderland, UK.

Victoria Rosa, Researcher, Department of Sociology, University Complutense of Madrid, Spain.

Iva Šmídová, Assistant Professor in Gender Studies, and formerly Head of Gender Studies in the Department of Sociology, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic.

Marek M. Wojtaszek, Assistant Professor at the Faculty of International and Political Studies, Łódź University, Poland.

www.oru.se

ISSN 1103-2618
ISBN 978-91-7668-985-1