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Abstract

This thesis examines young people's views about male violence and specifically domestic violence. There are various theoretical analyses of domestic violence, but it is argued that the feminist analysis has the most to contribute to understandings because only the feminist critique centralises gender and locates it within the power and control framework. The radical feminist analysis, which is applied in this thesis, argues that domestic violence is supported ideologically and structurally through patriarchy and thus, all male violence must be recognised as part of the same phenomenon of an abuse of power and control. The radical feminist approach also argues that male gender behaviour, or 'masculinity', as currently socially constructed, is central to male violence. Often the research on masculinity legitimates male gender behaviour and the radical feminist perspective argues that there has to be a critical analysis of masculinity in order not to be complicit in perpetuating the hegemony of masculinity and male gender behaviour. It is thus argued that an understanding of normative masculinity is essential to understanding male violence against women. This study's focus on young people made it necessary to critique the literature on young people and the development of gender roles particularly in relation to masculinity.

Recent studies have identified that, despite the recent domestic violence campaigns and interventions, young people have an exceptionally high tolerance and expectation of male violence. In order to explore this, focus group interviews were conducted with 77 young people in ten different secondary schools in Glasgow. The primary research aim was to investigate whether young people conceptualise violence as integral to normative masculinity. It is hoped that the findings of this research project may build upon the current understandings of domestic violence and may be used to optimise the efficacy of future intervention projects with young people.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

1.0: Introduction
Locally, nationally and globally\(^1\), male violence against women and children is a significant social problem (Stanko, 1985; Kelly, 1988a; Kelly and Radford, 1996; WHO, 1997, 1998; Mirrlees-Black, 1999; Home Office, 2001, 2003a). The manifestations are myriad and the outcomes have profound direct implications for the men, women (and children) involved, and for welfare services, the criminal justice system, the health system, the education system, the political system and the ways in which young people are socialised into adult women and men. Male violence is a gendered phenomenon often disguised through usage of gender neutral terminology such as ‘spousal abuse’, ‘date rape’, ‘sexual harassment’ ‘child sexual abuse’ and ‘marital rape’ (Hague and Malos, 1998). This thesis argues that fundamentally all these forms of violence and abuse have two consistent characteristics: the majority of perpetrators are male and the majority of victims are female. In this thesis, a radical feminist analysis of male violence is applied, which conceptualises male violences as consequences of a patriarchal power structure which perpetuates a system of gender inequality (see Section 1.1). This thesis critiques male violence on an individual level by examining interpersonal male violence (with a specific focus on domestic violence\(^2\)), and on an ideological and structural level through an analysis of the power mechanisms of patriarchy, or male domination.

Since the 1970s, there has been a proliferation of literature naming and condemning male violence, specifically from feminist theorists and activists, and recently there has been a particular emphasis on domestic violence. The prevalence and incidence

\(^1\) Much of the research on a global scale uses various methodological approaches and research designs which makes direct comparisons problematic. However, global figures suggest a remarkably similar pattern of abuse with between 1 in 5 and 1 in 3 women experiencing male violence and abuse in countries as disparate as the USA, Barbados, Antigua, Kenya, Japan, New Zealand and the Netherlands (see Williamson, 1999, PhD Thesis, unpublished).

\(^2\) This thesis will use the terms domestic violence and domestic abuse interchangeably, to refer to the same phenomenon. In Scotland, the preferred terminology is domestic abuse whilst in England it is domestic violence. The empirical research was conducted in Scotland where the participants used the former term and much of the literature uses the latter, which is why both terms are utilised.
of domestic violence is not diminishing and it is estimated that one in four women will experience domestic abuse at some point in her life and every week, two women are killed by their present or former partner (Home Office, 1999a; Council of Europe, 2002; Home Office 2003a).

Various theoretical analyses of male violence examine the influence of socio-economic impacts, environmental factors and psychosocial issues in order to explain interpersonal violence (including domestic violence). It is argued in this thesis that whilst these issues may affect the propensity for violence, these explanations are inadequate because they do not recognise the central significance of the gendered dynamics of domestic violence. Thus, they do not acknowledge the social and political effect of male violence which is, arguably, to exert power and control. In contrast, the theoretical analysis utilised in this thesis argues that domestic violence may be exacerbated by other issues but primarily gender power is the most significant factor. Consequently, gender constructions and behaviours, and primarily male gender behaviour, are examined in order to investigate the relationship of 'masculinity' to male violence.

It is argued that the present social construction of masculinity assimilates male violence into a gendered 'norm' and thus, there is almost a cultural expectation that violence is characteristic of normative (or hegemonic) masculinity. This hypothesis is substantiated through the statistics on male violence and the findings of the few research studies conducted with young people specifically on male violence such as those by Kelly and colleagues (1991), Burton and Kitzinger with Kelly and Regan (1998), Dublin Women's Aid (1999) and Mullender and colleagues (2002). These studies all report similarly high levels of tolerance and expectations of male violence against women by young people. The statistic which is most oft quoted and which was presented to the young people in the empirical research was the Zero Tolerance Trust (1998) finding which identifies that one in two young men and one in three young women believe that male violence against women and forcing a woman to have sex is acceptable in certain circumstances (Butler et al, 1998). This research project focuses on young people's attitudes and expectations of male violence.

---

3 The Zero Tolerance Trust (1998) research was conducted with 2,039 young people, aged between 14 and 21, in Fife, Manchester and Glasgow: for full bibliographic reference see Burton et al, 1998.
because they are a generation who have grown up in an environment that explicitly denounces male violence in many ways, and who have been exposed to local and national (in the UK context) campaigns and policy that challenges this violence. However, significantly, these young people still seem to have exceptionally high tolerance levels of male violence against women.

The empirical work for this project involved group interviews which were conducted in Glasgow in ten different secondary schools and involved 77 young people aged between fifteen and eighteen years who were both female and male. The decision to work in Glasgow was due to the knowledge of various campaigns tackling domestic violence by the Scottish Executive, Glasgow City Council and the visibility of the Zero Tolerance Trust campaign (see Section 2.3.1, Chapter 2). Therefore, this research project is investigating the disjuncture between the social, legal and political condemnation of male violence and young people’s apparent acceptance of it. As such, this study investigates whether male violence is assimilated into normative cultural expectations of masculinity and whether young people conceptualise violence as integral to normative masculinity. Thus, the empirical research explored four central research questions:

1. How is masculinity constructed?
2. What are young peoples’ understandings of male violence?
3. Do young men and women accept male violence as part of male gender identity?
4. What is the relationship between masculinity and violence and how is this translated in interpersonal relationships?

The theoretical framework of this thesis is located within a radical feminist perspective, and as such there are central concepts which are integral to an understanding of male violence, gender constructions, and power relations. It should be clarified that there are different interpretations and applications of radical feminism and ‘feminism’ generally which are dynamically related but which have different foci of analyses including the structural, political, social, and economic inequalities which confront women (Jackson, 2001). The theoretical framework informing this thesis has derived from radical feminist theoretical ideology: some
elements of it have been retained, some modified and some rejected. Thus, the particular radical feminist theoretical perspective used in this thesis may not be reflective of all radical feminism, and is not meant to be so (see Editorial, *Trouble and Strife*, 1993). The central units of investigation in this thesis are male violence and gender construction which is conducted from a particular radical feminist perspective, but this does not mean that all radical feminists are centrally concerned with this or indeed no other type of feminist is working in this area (see Segal, 1990; Hague and Malos, 1998). It simply means that the theory which is applied, comes from a radical feminist framework, but this does preclude the existence of other radical feminists who may challenge this theoretical construction or application (Douglas, 1990; Richardson, 1996).

It is often convenient to compartmentalise feminists but the reality is often much more complex. Whilst many radical feminists understand that other ‘oppressions’ impact on women’s (and men’s) lives, such as those related to class, ethnicity, ‘race’, age, (dis)ability and sexuality for example, others, including the author, argue that whilst these areas may intersect with, and impact upon, each other, the most significant ‘oppression’ is that based on gender (Rowland and Klein, 1990; Bell and Klein, 1996; Robinson, 2003). The analysis which informs the theoretical framework of this thesis centralises gender and argues that women and men experience power differentially based along the gender division and thus it is the power component of the (culturally constructed) differences between women and men which has primary significance (Rowland and Klein, 1990). In relation to this perspective, it is argued that women and men can be conceptualised as belonging to two, opposing, sex classes based on their differential, actual and potential, access to power (Firestone, 1970; Dworkin, 1974, 1997; Rowland and Klein, 1990).

It is central to the theoretical framework of this thesis that male violence is conceptualised as fundamental in the subjugation of women. As such, this theoretical approach prioritises male violence as one of the central organising principles that keeps women subordinated and therefore, positions male violence as central to the analysis and critique of patriarchy (male domination) (Kelly, 1988a; 1988b).

---

4 See the edited Bell and Klein (1996) collection for radical feminist discussions of how women are ‘doubly’ disadvantaged through the multiple oppressions which they face.
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Rowland and Klein, 1990; MacKinnon, 1996; Richardson, 1996; Thompson, 2001). Thus, the radical feminist ideology concentrates attention on the significance of male violence both as a form of collective domination (patriarchal) and as domination on an interpersonal level (through domestic violence) and how these relate to each other.

These issues outlined above are integral to the theoretical framework of this thesis, and define the way in which male violence and gender constructions, particularly masculinity, have been understood and examined. This chapter will thus explicate some of the issues raised above and will define patriarchy, gender and sex categories and the sex class analysis in more detail below. The penultimate section of this chapter will summarise the content of the following nine chapters of this thesis before a final conclusion is presented.

1.1: Patriarchy and Male Dominance

This thesis uses the term patriarchy to represent the gendered system of male domination which serves, and is supported by, men (Lovenduski and Randall, 1993). Often, patriarchy is used interchangeably with 'male dominance' whereby '[p]atriarchy is the oppressing structure of male domination' which is the application used in this thesis (Rowland and Klein, 1990: 273, emphasis in original). Furthermore, in this thesis, the analysis of patriarchy concentrates on male violence against women and how it is applied in the domestic setting (see Chapters 2 and 3). Walby, for example, argues that there are six structures in which patriarchy operates: paid work, housework, sexuality, culture, violence and the state (Walby, 1990: 16). It is accepted that patriarchy influences all these aforementioned areas and intersects with other social divisions such as class, 'race', ethnicity, sexuality and (dis)able-bodiedness, but due to the central concern here with gender and male violence, patriarchy is discussed in relation to these two issues.

Patriarchy has two interrelated facets comprising of a system of gender inequality and hierarchy (men dominate women) and of generational hierarchy (older men dominate younger) whereby traditionally it was the patriarch of the immediate and extended family who wielded the power (Millett, 1970; Hearn, 1987, 2001; Kelly, 1988a; Lovenduski and Randall, 1993).
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[patriarchy is] the power of the fathers: a familial-social, ideological, political system in which men – by force, direct pressure or through ritual, tradition, law, and language, customs, etiquette, education, and the division of labour, determine what part women shall or shall not play, and in which the female is everywhere subsumed under the male. It does not necessarily imply that no woman has power, or that all women in a given culture may not have certain powers. (Rich, 1977: 57)

It should be understood however, that patriarchy is differentially experienced by men, with varying degrees of power and influence held by men, but women, as a group are collectively disadvantaged in relation to men. Hearn argues that some men are also subordinated and that other socio-economic and political issues moderate the influence and distribution of patriarchal power and privilege.

Patriarchy, therefore, is affected by socio-economic and political change but these stratifying divisions such as class, ‘race’, sexuality and ethnicity intersect with, and can contribute to (or undermine) the influence of male domination and how it impacts on individual men’s experiences (Millett, 1970; Rowland and Klein, 1990).

Furthermore, according to Rowland and Klein (1990), patriarchy naturalises the ‘differences’ between women and men such that the ‘naturally’ inferior position of women is internalised by both women and men, resulting in the perpetual socialisation of men and women into accepting the inevitable ‘differences’ (read inequalities) between women and men, which renders any challenge to this system extremely problematic. After all, who can challenge the ‘fact’ that there are differences between the sexes? Thus, patriarchy makes ‘difference’ synonymous with ‘unequal’ and the inequality is presented as incontestable and based on a biological imperative. According to Rowland and Klein, this socialisation (and
power) process, manifests itself in 'femininity' and 'masculinity' in which appropriate gender behaviour, and location in the hierarchy, are prescribed with resultant benefits or losses, depending on the ascribed gender and thus, 'masculine' and 'feminine' support the established power imbalance (Rowland and Klein, 1990: 278).

As argued, the affectations of masculine and feminine are socially constructed and constructed in such a way as to valorise most things 'male' and devalue most things 'female' (see Chapters 7, 8 and 9). This socialisation process is key because both men and women have a propensity to perpetuate women's inferiority, which means that women apparently 'consent' to their subordinate position - but this is not to suggest that women accept their position (Millett, 1970). It is not so much that women acquiesce but that the power of patriarchy is ubiquitous, because it is assimilated and naturalised to such an extent that it becomes almost invisible. Indeed, MacKinnon argues that patriarchy is 'metaphysically nearly perfect. Its point of view is the standard for point-of-viewlessness, its particularity the meaning of universality' (MacKinnon, 1989: 116-7). However, patriarchy is challenged by women and men, but as feminists have shown, and women have experienced, male violence can be utilised to reinforce patriarchal divisions and patriarchal ideology if necessary.

In order to maintain the more powerful position and so feed on their need of women without being consumed by it, men as a powerful group institutionalise their position of power. This involves the need to structure institutions to maintain that power, the development of an ideology to justify it, and the use of force and violence to impose it when resistance emerges. (Rowland and Klein, 1990: 297)

Patriarchy, therefore, operates as an ideology and as a practice (Dobash and Dobash, 1979). As argued above, the ideology of patriarchy is implicated in the sex discrimination, misogyny and inequalities that women experience in relation to men, even though women's experiences are differential and some women may have some power, in relation to their class or ethnic position for example. There is thus a mutually supportive relationship whereby patriarchy has institutional and structural support, and supports the structures which serve to perpetuate male domination (Dobash and Dobash, 1979).
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The argument is, therefore, that the ideological and institutional support for patriarchy naturalises sex differentiations and power imbalances predicated upon these. In relation to male violence, this partly explains why such violence is often conceptualised as individual transgressions rather than as part of a power structure serving the interests of the sex class men (see Section 1.4 and Chapters 2 and 3).

We are not accustomed to associate patriarchy with force. So perfect is its system of socialization, so complete the general assent to its values, so long and so universally has it prevailed in human society, that it scarcely seems to require violent implementation. ... And yet ... control in patriarchal societies would be imperfect, even inoperable, unless it had the rule of force to rely upon, both in emergencies and as an ever-present instrument of intimidation. (Millett, 1970: 44-5)

It is central to this thesis, and to feminist interpretations, that male violence is understood as a mechanism for men to exert power and control over women, and it serves to support an ideology of male domination (although this may not be recognised by the perpetrators). Thus, in everyday relations, male domination ideology (patriarchy) serves to legitimate the male's right to control 'his' female partner (and children) which may be done through violence and abuse: '[p]atriarchy encourages male violence against women and children by legitimising men's rights to control women and adults' rights to control children. Physical force and the threat of violence are routinely employed if other means of control fail' (Bart and Moran, 1993: 235). The introduction of the influence of male violence to the perpetuation of patriarchal stratification, or male domination, is discussed further in Chapters 2 and 3.

1.2: The Sociological Challenges to Gender

One of the first sociological acknowledgements of the differences between men and women, which departed from biological models, was the 'Sex Role' theory of the 1970s and 1980s (Connell, 1993). This Sex Role theory was developed from Talcott Parson's analysis of the 1940s and 1950s, which argued that women and men

---

5 It is argued that Sex Role theory was influenced by the Masculine/Feminine (M/F) scale that was developed in the 1930s. This scale was predicated on a conceptualisation of masculine and feminine as two opposing (and interdependent) sets of characteristics and was used to determine someone's 'gender'. Whilst there are numerous criticisms of this scale, it marked a departure from purely biologistic interpretations of gender and as such, is perceived by some, to be the forerunner of Sex Role theory (see Edley and Wetherell, 1996).
are socialised into ‘contrasting normative sex roles’ and the ‘instrumental’ and ‘expressive’ roles, which he described, were understood ‘as necessary for the socially functional sexual division of labor within the nuclear family’ (McMahon, 1993: 627). Parker summarises the central tenets of Sex Role theory to be:

[c]entred primarily around functionalist notions of the nuclear family and the ‘instrumental’ and ‘expressive’ roles portrayed therein, this paradigm accepts that sexual differentiation is a socially constructed phenomenon occurring via an individual internalisation of familial and wider societal expectations in terms of ascribed sex roles. (Parker, 1996: 142)

Delamont argues that the Sex Role model suggests that boys ‘learn’ normative masculinity through primary and secondary socialisation. Primary socialisation occurs in the family home through ‘sanctions, rewards and imitation of the male parent’ and secondary socialisation is effected in schools through the same methods but through male teachers and peers (Delamont, 1990, cited in Nilan, 2000: 54). A central criticism of this analysis is that describing sex role acquisition as a product of socialisation ignores the power differentials attached to men/women, male/female and masculine/feminine. Brittan argues that this itself is an underestimation of what is encompassed in gender socialisation: ‘socialisation is not simply about the acquisition of roles, but rather it is about the exercise of power by one group over another group’ (Brittan, 1989: 45).

According to Kimmell, Sex Role theory signified a move away from an understanding of gender characteristics emerging from a ‘biological imperative’ to an acknowledgment of the ‘acquisition’ of gender characteristics (Kimmell, 1990: 95). Indeed, the theoretical move can be regarded almost simply as a move from the biological to the social and, furthermore, the Sex Role model facilitated an understanding of sex roles based on a contrast between male and female (Connell, 1993).

However, whilst Sex Role theory developed understandings of gender based on social constructionist roles, it was located in a functionalist framework and did not fully recognise the significance, or presence, of power (Carrigan et al, 1987; Hearn and Collinson, 1994). The quotation below is a summary of the limitations of Sex Role theory by Connell which encapsulates the criticisms argued in this thesis:
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Sex-role theory is drastically inadequate as a framework for understanding gender. The role concept analytically collapses into an assertion of individual agency; it squeezes out the dimension of social structure. It gives no grip on the distribution of power, on the institutional organization of gender, on the gender structuring of production. Role theory rests on a superficial analysis of human personality and motives. It gives no grip on the emotional contradictions of sexuality, or the emotional complexities of gender in everyday life. (Connell, 1993: 599)

In a later piece of work, Connell argues that the whole concept of Sex Role theory could be understood as a political response (patriarchal backlash?) to the increasing emancipation of women because it validated 'male characteristics' whilst associating less valued characteristics with women (Connell, 1995). Indeed, this argument suggests that sex role characteristics do not objectively exist but are socially constructed and created to reflect assumptions about women and men: '[i]n a vicious circle, culturally and socially determined gender perceptions will be reflected in gender roles, which in turn reinforce communally and unconsciously held perceptions of gender' (Visser, 2002: 529).

In the 1970s and 1980s feminists also began to challenge sex role theories and argued that gender was less of a 'role' than a constructed demarcation with associated power differentials whereby 'gender' was fundamentally a relational concept (see Delphy, 1984, cited in Jackson, 1999). This thesis argues that gender constructions are inherently related with one deriving meaning from the other, and it is also argued that these constructions are not benign because men, and the 'masculine', have more power (and influence and importance) than women and the 'feminine'. Indeed, it is a central contention of this thesis that men and the 'masculine' are constructed as the 'norm' against which women and the 'feminine' are regarded as the 'other' (de Beauvoir, 1974 [1949]).

1.3: The (Power) Relationship Between Sex and Gender Categorisations

The constructs of gender and sex are contested concepts and it is argued in this thesis that both are socially constructed in a way that validates male privilege, and thus perpetuates gender inequalities. Oakley (1972) was one of the first feminists to use the concept of 'gender' rather than 'sex' to argue that masculinity and femininity (as
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6 This argument is reminiscent of ancient philosophical ruminations over the worth and value of men/masculine over women/feminine (see Pateman, 1970).
associated with gender) are socially constructed models which should be
differentiated from biological sex differences.

At the most fundamental level, gender is considered as a way in which men and
women act out the roles ascribed to them on the basis of their sex, so that sex is
associated with men and women (i.e. biological), and gender with male and female
(i.e. assigned, societal divisions) (Ewing and Schacht, 1998). Both concepts are thus
continually placed within the parameters of what has been termed the 'bipolar gender
matrix' (Butler, 1990).

Hearn argues that gender is intrinsically linked to sex categories and that gender is a
constructed division based on sex categorisations (Hearn, 1987). Thus, Hearn
recognises that as gender is socially constructed, so too are the distinctions based in
previously held biological or 'natural' 'sex' divisions. West and Zimmerman
emphasise the similarities between the social constructions of both sex and gender
and also identify the differences between them.

Sex is a determination made through the application of socially agreed upon
biological criteria for classifying persons as females or males. ... Gender, in
contrast, is the activity of managing situated conduct in light of normative
conceptions of attitudes and activities appropriate for one's sex category. (West and
Zimmerman, 1991: 14, emphasis in original)

Just as gender roles are a socially ordered and constructed set of categorisations, so
too are the construction of sex categories. Petersen (1998) identifies the
constructionist elements of categories, including those deemed 'natural', and the way
in which feminists have argued that knowledge, power and theoretical constructions
are intimately related and shaped by ideology.

Although, in the broader culture, natural knowledge and social knowledge have
appeared as mutually exclusive, it has become increasingly clear that all knowledge,
including biological knowledge, is socially produced and reflects prevailing
assumptions about normal embodiment and subjectivity. Feminists, for instance,
have recently pointed out that knowledge about 'sex' and 'sex difference' is shaped
by cultural constructions of gender. (Petersen, 1998: 2, emphasis in original)

Therefore, it is not the case that women are inherently less powerful or less
important, but the stratified bipolarity creates a gender hierarchy which situates men
as dominant and women their inferior. Thus, existent social, political, economic and
cultural inequalities between women and men were/are integrated into these constructions of sex and gender. Ewing and Schacht argue that this duality allows for inequalities to be perpetuated, 'The dichotomy of male and female also provides an important ontological blueprint for pre-existing inequalities' (Ewing and Schacht, 1998: 3).

Two issues emerge in relation to sex/gender categories: the first is in relation to the apparent ‘naturalness’ of gender/sex; and the second is in relation to power. Arguably, it was feminists who introduced the concept of power into the social constructionist views of gender and argued that it is this presence of power that facilitates and encourages the hierarchical bipolar dichotomy (MacKinnon, 1993; Brod, 1994). This argument should not be confused with a biological reductionism of all men and all women into two discrete categories (based on biological differences), but it regards the power demarcations as facilitating a collectivisation amongst women due to their lack of formal and substantive access to, and usage of, power (Dworkin, 1987; Richardson, 1996). Similarly men can cohere around a common interest of having access to power in ways which are denied to women (see Section 1.4). It is thus inaccurate to argue that all radical feminist analyses perpetuate an essentialist framework (see Richardson, 1996). The radical feminist analysis applied in this thesis is critiquing current differentials as already situated within the gender binary framework. In this analysis the sex/gender dichotomy is already existent and this particular non-essentialist radical feminist approach problematises this based on the power differentials inherent to it (Rowland and Klein, 1990, 1996).

Current gender constructions benefit men and men gain material rewards from this, which Connell terms the ‘patriarchal dividend’, and the ‘material pay off’ that men differentially receive from the gender binary (Connell, 1998: 226; see Section 1.1). Some men may argue that they do not receive this ‘dividend’ and indeed not all men are more powerful or privileged than women but the current gender order is constructed to benefit men over women in general. Any resistance to accepting the social constructedness of gender and sex categories could be interpreted as an effective method of naturalising differences and power inequalities.
Kimmell argues that this lack of recognition by men of their gender status is often not deliberate but is a result of the assimilation of the 'normalness' of gender (Kimmell, 1990). Kimmell further argues that gender is almost 'in invisible' to men, in terms of their own position, because it is so taken-for-granted that it is almost not seen at all, and even less so in a critical way, which supports the analysis of men as the 'norm' as argued above (see Section 1.2; Kimmell, 1990).

It is not suggested that biological foundations do not impact on 'sex' divisions between women and men. Instead the argument is that biology itself is not independent from social construction or interpretation; indeed Oakley modifies her initial argument (see above) and argues that 'biology is socially constructed' (Oakley, 1994: 25, emphasis added). In earlier work, Oakley differentiates the differences and commonalities between sex and gender classifications:

'Sex' is a biological term: 'gender' a psychological and cultural one. Common sense suggests that they are merely two ways of looking at the same division and that someone who belongs, say, to the female sex will automatically belong to the corresponding 'feminine' gender. In reality this is not so. To be [masculine or feminine] is as much a function of dress, gesture, occupation, social network and personality, as it is of possessing a particular set of genitals. (Oakley, 1972:158)

Hester argues that whilst sex is developed from a biological basis, it is the social meaning attached to categories which gives them their significance (Hester, 1992). She argues, therefore, that sex and gender can thus be used interchangeably because it is not the biological differences which are significant but the social meanings attached to them: this understanding is applied in this thesis (Hester, 1992; see also MacKinnon, 1993).

1.4: 'Women' and the Sex Class Analysis

As argued above, it is not the biological differences between women and men which are problematic but, instead, it is the social implications and cultural meanings attached to them (in relation to power) (Hester, 1992). This analysis leads some radical feminists to conceptualise men and women as belonging to two distinct sex classes because, according to Riger, 'women share a status as members of a subordinate group' (Riger 1994: 275, cited in Schacht and Ewing, 1998: 130).
Two of the main works which are historically presented as reflecting early radical feminist analyses are Kate Millett's (1970) *Sexual Politics* and Shulamith Firestone's (1970) *The Dialectic of Sex.* They were described as radical feminist because both Millett and Firestone focused on the sex/gender system as the central site of women's oppression (Firestone, 1970; Millett, 1970; Tong, 1989; Jackson, 1998). Firestone, focused on women's reproductive role (as opposed to the Marxist emphasis on productive roles) and argued that the most significant class distinction was not between bourgeoisie and proletariat but between men and women, and from this she developed the sex class analysis (Firestone, 1970). Thus, Firestone's argument developed from the biological reproductive differences between women and men, and in this sense does seem to reflect a level of essentialism. In a refutation of an essentialist position Dworkin argues that the 'class' analogy is appropriate because, just as the proletariat serve the bourgeoisie in the interests of capitalism (in the Marxist analysis), women serve men 'sexually and reproductively' in the interests of patriarchy (in the radical feminist analysis) (Dworkin, 1974, 1997). This 'sex class' analysis is absolutely crucial for some radical feminists, and is often what differentiates it from other feminisms because those radical feminists who utilise the sex class analysis are asserting that gender difference/oppression has more import than all other oppressive organisational systems:

> the [radical feminist] analysis begins with the feminist raison d'etre that women are a class, that this class is political in nature, and that this political class is oppressed. From this point on, radical feminism separates from traditional feminism. ... [the] male/female system [is] the first and most fundamental instance of human oppression, ... all other class systems are built on top of it. (Ti-Grace Atkinson, 1974: 41 cited in Rowland and Klein, 1996: 12)

The sex class analysis argues that women's primary oppression is predicated on their differential access to power, based on their sex status, but radical feminists also recognise that other delineations such as ethnicity, socio-economic class, 'race', sexuality and (dis)ability for example, may impact on women's status and further compound (or alleviate) their oppression (as women) (Richardson, 1996). Related to this is the acknowledgement that not all men have 'equal' access to power (see
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7 It is sometimes argued that Firestone's work was an example of Marxist feminism because she used a Marxian framework but positioned the theory around women's reproductive role, based on an understanding of Engel's analysis of productive and reproductive roles in the family (Firestone, 1970). This is illustrative of the difficulty of compartmentalising feminists into specific categories.
Section 1.1). However, these factors do not negate the fact that this system based on gender hierarchy overall privileges men over women.

This particular sex class analysis is therefore not biologically deterministic, because, as argued above, it is the social meanings attached to ‘women’ and ‘men’ that form the distinctions and mediate access to power (Dworkin, 1987; Richardson, 1996; MacKinnon, 2001; Thompson, 2001). Therefore, whilst women and men have disparate experiences, both between and amongst themselves, the overall access to power facilitates the recognition of women as a collectivity, in relation to the ideological and institutional support for the domination of men, and for men’s greater (potential) access to power.

Comprised of all its variations, the group women can be seen to have a collective social history of disempowerment, exploitation and subordination extending to the present. To be treated “as a woman” in this sense is to be disadvantaged in these ways incident to being socially assigned to the female sex. (MacKinnon, 1996: 47-8)

Therefore to utilise the sex class analysis and to refer to ‘women’ and ‘women’s experiences’ does not essentialise or homogenise women but instead it illustrates how women are collectively disempowered: ‘[i]t shows that women are a political group – oppressed, subordinated, and unequal’ (MacKinnon, 2001: 710). Maynard (1995) argues that the category ‘woman’ is used in a constructivist way to challenge structural inequalities that women experience, rather than in an essentialist way to unify women based on their sex.

Whilst some feminists, including radical feminists, endorse essentialism to varying extents, it is argued in this thesis that an essentialist position precludes and prohibits any political or social challenge because it bases women and men’s differential experiences in the confines of immutable biological differences (Rowland and Klein, 1990; Lienert, 1996; Thompson, 2001). Furthermore, for many radical feminists, an essentialist position would be oppositional to the activist agenda of feminist politics which conceptualises male dominance and female subordination as social constructions with possibilities for change. Furthermore, if biologically based critiques were accepted then male violence would simply be a biological inevitability
of maleness, which would make any investigation or challenge to it futile (Lienert, 1996; Richardson, 1996).

Within most radical feminist writing it is abundantly clear that sexuality and gender difference is understood to be socially constructed, not biologically determined, and that, contrary to what many seem to want to believe, radical feminists have consistently challenged essentialist conceptions of sexuality and women. (Richardson, 1996: 144-5)

Many radical feminists accept that clearly there are biological differences between women and men, but argue that it is not the differences which make women unequal, but it is the cultural meanings attached to them which have devalued women and privileged men. Furthermore, the radical feminist application of the sex class analysis identifies that women and men, in a patriarchal system, have differential access to power. Many radical feminists also incorporate a material analysis of women’s oppression because they recognise that class, age, ‘race’ and ethnicity, for example, impact on how women are advantaged or disadvantaged in society and how the ‘multiple intersections’ of these factors affect life experiences (Bell and Klein, 1996: xxi). Fundamentally, radical feminists argue that men benefit from patriarchy (to varying degrees) and women are disadvantaged in this system (Maynard, 1995; Bell and Klein, 1996). Whilst this position appears to perpetuate the essentialist categories which some radical feminists have rejected, the existing polemic construction of men as the ‘norm’ and women as ‘other’ (against which the norm is measured) perpetuate this dichotomy within which patriarchy is produced and reproduced and it is this which is challenged in this thesis.

1.5: Thesis Structure and Chapter Overview
This thesis comprises both theoretical and empirical work: consequently, the methodology involved library-based study, literature reviews and analyses of the literature studied, in addition to the original empirical inquiry. The first five chapters are theoretical discussions of the literature. Chapter Two discusses male violence against women from a radical feminist ideological position. It argues that male violence is ubiquitous on local, national and global scales, which substantiates its conceptualisation as epidemic, and describes how feminists ‘named’ and politicised male violence. It is argued that Kelly’s conceptualisation of male violence as a
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continuum facilitates an understanding of the interconnection of the different manifestations of male violence (Kelly, 1988a). Chapter Three focuses on domestic violence and three explanatory models for domestic violence are discussed. It is argued that Individualistic and Sociological models are insufficient at accounting for the prevalence and gendered nature of domestic violence although Sociological models are more comprehensive in their analyses than Individualist explanations, but ultimately are also unsatisfactory. This chapter argues that the feminist explanation for domestic violence, which centralises gender, power and control, is the most efficacious analysis because it incorporates elements from Individualistic and Sociological models but keeps gender as central. It is also argued that the feminist analysis makes the connections to constructions of gender and the gendered nature of the public/private and the significance of the ‘family’. Masculinity, or male gender behaviour, is the central focus of Chapters Four and Five. Chapter Four analyses the literature on masculinity which has emerged since the 1970s. A central argument in this literature is that there are various constructions of masculinity but hegemonic masculinity is the normative form by which all other constructions are judged. It is argued that a fundamental flaw in much of this work is the tendency to disembody men from masculinity and thus ‘masculinity’ is problematised instead of the material practices of men. This has profound implications for analyses of male violence, and for understandings of the effects on the (embodied) victims (Hearn, 1996a). Chapter Five concentrates on the literature written on masculinities in relation to young people which is relevant to the empirical work with young people in the field study. A central feature in this literature is that young men and women display differential gender behaviour and conform, and aspire, to a traditional gender model in which the male is dominant. The young men in this literature identified with the hegemonic form of masculinity, which was constructed as heterosexist, homophobic and ‘macho’. This chapter also addresses young people’s views of interpersonal male violence.

Before the empirical findings are presented and discussed in Chapters Seven and Eight, Chapter Six discusses some central methodological issues in relation to the empirical work. This chapter is separated into three parts. Part One addresses methodological issues in relation to the feminist methodological research paradigm. The second part addresses key methodological issues in relation to conducting
research with young people. Part Three discusses the practicalities and methods for conducting the empirical research and discusses the issues involved in achieving feminist, child-centred, focus group research with young people in schools. Chapters Seven and Eight present the empirical findings from the focus group interviews with the young people. Chapter Seven addresses their views of gender constructions and gender differences and behaviours. Chapter Eight concentrates on the young people's views of domestic abuse and male violence in interpersonal relationships. Chapter Nine specifically consolidates the research findings with the theoretical literature and returns to the initial aim of this study to investigate the interrelationship of male violence and masculinity. The final chapter, Chapter Ten, concludes this thesis with some implications, and recommendations, for future policy and interventions.

1.6: Conclusion

This chapter has discussed some of the theoretical issues and concepts that are central to the feminist theoretical framework which informs this research project. It is, however, impossible within the constructs of a Ph.D. thesis to address all significant issues and thus in order to centralise the key points, some other topics have been removed.

A factor integral to a radical feminist ideological position is that theory and practice should not be compartmentalised as two discrete phenomena. Instead, theory should inform practice and practice should be integral to theory (Rowland and Klein, 1990; Kelly, 1994/95; Bell and Klein, 1996). This thesis is concerned with young people's understandings of male violence against women and it is impossible to investigate this phenomenon without a recognition of the practical work which is conducted in this area. In the UK, there is a substantial lack of research with young people about their experiences and views of male violence although there are some notable exceptions (see Kelly et al, 1991; Kenway and Fitzclarence, 1997; Burton et al, 1998; Holland et al 1998; Dublin Women's Aid, 1999; Mullender et al, 2002). This research project aims to present an original theoretical contribution to knowledge, which can be used to inform practice in the field and has the potential to be used to inform interventions with young people in relation to male violence.
Chapter 2
Violence Against Women

2.0: Introduction

Building on the arguments presented in the Chapter 1, this chapter will argue that male violence against women (and children) can be conceptualised as a 'defining feature of a patriarchal society' (Kelly and Radford, 1990: 238). This feminist interpretation argues that male violence against women is, therefore, not aberrant, deviant behaviour but an enaction of male gender behaviour that is socially sanctioned within a patriarchal ideology which justifies male supremacy (Herman, 1990). This chapter argues that the prevalence of male violence, on a systemic level, benefits men, even though not all men are violent, because it contributes towards the maintenance of male domination which keeps women in a state of subordination (Millett, 1970; Dworkin, 1974, 1997; Dobash and Dobash, 1979, 1998b; Bart and Moran, 1993e; MacKinnon, 2001; Thompson, 2001).

Taken together, the plethora of male violences can reinstate male dominance and female submission, although the particular form of violence may differ (Kelly, 1988a; Hearn, 1998a). In this chapter the terminology of sexual violence is applied to define all male violence against women because it identifies that the sex class men perpetrate violence against the sex class women (see Section 1.4, Chapter 1). In this definition, sexual violence therefore represents violence by men against women, rather than strictly sexualised violence (Kelly, 1988a). One definition of sexual
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8 It is argued, in this thesis, that violence between men is not the same phenomenon as violence by men towards women because the meanings and intentions of it are often different (although it is acknowledged that violence between men can often be about power and control and assertion of authority). Similarly, it will be argued that violence by women towards men, whilst not endorsed, is qualitatively different from violence by men towards women. This is because male violence is linked to power and control between the genders, and exists because we have a society which is stratified according to sex/gender. Therefore, even if women, as the subordinate class, use the same forms of 'control', in this case violence towards men, it does not have the same meaning because women do not have the same structural or ideological power as men. Therefore, male violence towards women is significant precisely because it is supported by a power structure, and thus even if women use the same means as men, the power balance can not be inverted so that the implications, ramifications and meanings of this violence are different. Obviously this is not meant to diminish the violence which is done by women towards men (or children).
violence, which is still widely applied by feminists, is Kelly’s definition which states that:

sexual violence includes any physical, visual, verbal or sexual act that is experienced by the woman or girl, at the time or later, as a threat, invasion or assault, that has the effect of hurting her or degrading her and/or takes away her ability to control intimate contact. (Kelly, 1988a: 23, emphasis in original)

This definition clearly places sexual violence as integral to the various forms of male violence, which is not strictly limited to specific sexual or physical acts. This issue of naming male violence is particularly salient because often what is defined as ‘domestic violence’ incorporates sexualised violence, such as rape, and thus, in reality, it is often extremely problematic to attach discrete definitions when one is describing an experiential history of violence/abuse. In order to address this issue, this chapter uses Kelly’s (1988a) analysis of the ‘continuum of violence’ in addition to conceptualising male violence as a form of power and control predicated on gender differentials, as constructed within patriarchal ideology.

In order to substantiate this argument, this chapter will outline the development of public recognition and extent of male violence, particularly in the UK (although there is reference to global statistics). It also discusses the recent developments in Glasgow because this is where the fieldwork was conducted. Whilst the following chapter concentrates on domestic violence, this chapter will present the similarities in the various forms of male violence and will refer to rape and child sexual abuse, as well as domestic violence, in order to substantiate the claim that all male violence is on a continuum. In this chapter, the discussion of male violence is designed to show the interconnectedness of these violences and only the feminist analyses of these violences are considered.

Before proceeding with this chapter it is important to explain some of the terminology which is used. The term ‘victim’ is used but it is understood that the word has been problematised by feminists because it can reduce women to a victim status and the term ‘survivor’ is often preferred. This term ‘victim’ is used in this thesis for two reasons: firstly, it is used in line with official crime statistics whereby those who experience a crime are ‘victims’; and secondly it is used politically, and
advisedly, in this context, in order to show that the women have been victims of 
criminal behaviour – regardless of whether the abuse/violence they experienced was 
officially classed as criminal (Thompson, 2001). Furthermore, some feminists argue 
that it is important to use the terminology of ‘victim’ because it identifies that 
women have been subject to a crime or abuse and that it can be empowering for 
women to have their experience named as such:

feminism’s exposure of the victimization of women is intended to challenge it, not 
maintain it. If it cannot be named, it cannot be challenged. And the project of 
women creating for ourselves non-exclusionary and non-oppressive ways of being 
human is sufficient evidence that feminism does not define women only as victims. 
This kind of objection fails to take into account the sense of power, triumph and 
relief which comes with seeing the world clearly. It fails to take into account the 
pressing need we have to see just how bad things really are, and the sense of 
liberation which comes with knowledge. It ignores the political necessity of 
knowing what we are up against if we are to do anything about it. Those fearful of 
confining women to perpetual victimhood seem to have forgotten (or never to have 
known) the relief of hearing one’s oppression named as oppression, rather than 
merely as a personal, idiosyncratic failing. ... This is a vital step in the process of 
extricating oneself from oppressive conditions. (Thompson, 2001: 57, emphasis in 
original)

In this context, the term ‘victim’ is used to criminalise the violence/abuse and not to 
disempower or ‘victimise’ women. It is, however, accepted that in many contexts, 
the term ‘survivor’ is more appropriate, or preferred.

A second point of clarification of terminology is needed with respect to definitions of 
violence. Whilst it has been stated above that the term sexual violence is used to 
refer to the range of men’s violence, in its various manifestations, feminists have 
redefined some normative male behaviour as violence/abuse and have argued that 
women’s definitions of the violence/abuse should be primary rather than legal or 
medical definitions (Williamson, 2000). This point is addressed more 
comprehensively below (see Section 2.2).

2.1: Putting Male Violence onto the Public Agenda
Largely as a result of second wave feminism in the 1970s, male violence was put 
onto the public agenda as an issue which needed critical examination and state 
intervention (Dobash and Dobash, 1992; Bart and Moran, 1993e). There is, 
however, evidence that activists and campaigners in the nineteenth and earlier
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twentieth centuries were also working against male violence (Brownmiller, 1975; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Jeffreys, 1985; Clark, 1987). It was principally the feminists of the 1970s who made male violence a public concern, as opposed to an individualised, private or 'family issue,' and reconceptualised this as an abuse of power and control (Bart and Moran, 1993e; Kelly and Radford, 1996).

As a result of this, the 1970s witnessed a huge growth in services for women who were escaping male violence in the UK, the USA, Canada and many other countries (Hague et al, 2001). Feminists in the USA and the UK established considerable numbers of telephone crisis lines and refuges for women who had experienced violence (largely without state funding) with the first rape crisis line opening in America in 1971 (Kelly, 1988a). The first refuge for women experiencing domestic violence in England was set up in 1972 at Chiswick Women's Aid, and was rapidly followed by many others set up by Women's Aid groups (and other non-affiliated ad hoc refuges or 'safe houses' were also opened) (Kelly, 1988a). The first refuges for American women were opened in 1974 in Minnesota (Women's Advocates) and Transition House in Boston in 1976 (although claims differ on the exact sequence) (Dobash and Dobash, 1987; Kelly, 1988a; Hague and Malos, 1998).

Concurrently, the prevalence and incidence of male violence started to be recognised (although it was contested) on a global level, by governmental agencies, and a variety of declarations and strategies were ratified by various governments and organisations. One of the first measures was developed at the 1985 Nairobi World Conference on Women, which emphasised domestic violence in its Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women9, and the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women10 in 1993 was a recognition of the extent of male violence. This followed the identification in 1992 by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)11 of gender-based violence as a form of discrimination that 'seriously inhibits women's ability to enjoy rights and freedoms on a basis of equality with men'. This was the first time that male violence against women had been conceptualised as a human
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9 see http://www.un.org/womenwatch/confer/nfls.htm
11 see http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/commit.htm
rights violation by the UN (Stark, forthcoming). In 1994, the United Nations appointed a Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women\textsuperscript{12} and in 1995, at the World Conference of Women in Beijing the \textit{Platform for Action}\textsuperscript{13} committed governments to take action both on violence against women and on women's unequal status (Hague and Malos, 1998). In 1998, rape was declared a war crime under the Geneva Convention which was largely as a result of feminist agitation (Lees, 2002). Latterly, the various declarations and initiatives have incorporated a feminist analysis of male violence: for example, the European Commission conducted an awareness raising campaign in 1999-2000 on violence against women and based its campaign on the understanding that 'in the EU, one women in five has at least once in her life been the victim of violence by her male partner' (European Campaign to Raise Awareness of Violence Against Women; see Dobash \textit{et al}, 2000; Gillan and Samson, 2000).

Whilst the effectiveness of these strategies are still debated, on a symbolic level they are extremely important because they formally recognised that male violence is an issue for many women, in many countries. Furthermore they placed male violence onto the public agenda and recognise that male violence against women is linked to women's social, political and economic inequality, and overall gender status.

However, it is particularly problematic to collate accurate comparable global statistical data on sexual violence, and some researchers working in this area argue that official statistical gathering methodologies are often incompatible with, and unsuitable for, gaining accurate statistical information (Kelly, 1988a). One reason for the discrepancy in global statistics is related to the use of research methodology which may not be appropriate for obtaining information on such a personal, distressing and dangerous area. The definitions of male violence may also vary culturally and thus, comparisons may not be entirely meaningful (Garcia-Moreno, 2003). However, Garcia-Moreno and colleagues, on behalf of WHO, are currently conducting an innovative and unique multi country survey into domestic violence which is using a methodology that may make global comparison meaningful and possible (Garcia-Moreno, 2003).

\textsuperscript{12} see http://www.un.org/rightsldpi1772e.htm
\textsuperscript{13} see http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform/plat1.htm
On a national level, the discrepancy in statistical evidence may also be reflective of formal (criminal justice or medical) definitions of male violence which may exclude certain behaviours from being classified as violence (Williamson, 2000). This is particularly the case for instances of emotional or psychological abuse, which if the 'abuse' is looked at discretely may seem insignificant, and would not classify as criminal behaviour (such as a male partner who dictates what his partner can wear or where she can go, which is often symptomatic of domestic abuse; see Stark, forthcoming).

Additionally, the cultural attitudes of the police for example (particularly in the past) often minimised abusive male behaviour, such as domestic violence, as activities that did not want warrant police intervention because of its 'private nature'. Whilst some officers may still hold this opinion this is formally no longer the collective response of the police and Strathclyde Police, for example, now have a much more interventionist approach and there are now five specialist/fast-track Domestic Violence Courts in Cardiff, Derby, Leeds, West London and Wolverhampton (Radford, 1987; Home Affairs Committee: Domestic Violence, 1993; Plotnikoff and Woolfson, 1998; Hague and Malos, 1998).

2.2: 'Naming' Male Violence
As argued above, congruent with the radical feminist theoretical framework of this thesis, male violence is conceptualised as all violence, actual and threatened, which serves to induce fear, hurt, or to control women and children (Radford et al, 2000). It is argued that Kelly's (1988a) analysis of the 'continuum of violence' is extremely important as an analytical tool and conceptual framework for understanding the range of male violences and for identifying the interconnectedness of this behaviour (Kelly, 1988a; Hearn, 1998a).

Kelly developed the 'continuum of violence' to illustrate that all forms of male violence are serious and that it can be inappropriate and unhelpful to create 'hierarchies' or 'more or less' scales of abuse/violence. Importantly, the continuum
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14 Which is responsible for the Greater Glasgow area.
locates women's definitions of their experiences as primary, rather than to impose meaning, which may serve the interests of men (as those with the power to define, and whose interests male violence serves) rather than in the interests of the victims/survivors of the abuse/violence. Additionally, the continuum facilitates the naming of seemingly innocuous behaviour as part of men's intention to control: '[t]he concept of a continuum can enable women to make sense of their own experiences by showing how “typical” and “aberrant” male behaviour shade into one another' (Kelly, 1988a: 75). The continuum also circumvents the problem of classifying experiences of male violence as discrete behaviour such as 'rape' or 'domestic violence' because it allows women to recognise their experience as violence/abuse without deciding what category it fits into (Kelly, 1988a).

Naming is an important and political endeavour because, according to Kelly, '[n]aming involves making visible what was invisible, defining as unacceptable what was acceptable and insisting that what was naturalized is problematic' (Kelly, 1988a: 139). Feminists argue that naming should reflect, rather than disguise or minimise, the violence:

In the development of the feminist movement, women have seized the power of naming. This is a revolutionary power because in naming (describing) what is done to us (and inevitably to children and men as well), we are also naming what must change. The act of naming creates a new world view. The power of naming resides in the fact that we name what we see from the basis of our own experience within and outside patriarchal culture, simultaneously. (Ward, 1984: 212)

Feminists argued, for example, that it was essential to name domestic violence as male violence, and as criminal activity and to extrapolate the meaning of this violence. It was also argued that, contrary to the historical view of domestic violence as a private issue between husbands and wives, it should be recognised as a public issue necessitating intervention (see Chapter 3; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Hague and Malos, 1998).

The power of 'naming' sexual violence in such a way that reflects women's experiences of it is particularly significant in relation to sexual harassment, for example. This form of male violence/abuse was not named as such until the 1970s when feminists campaigned to get this behaviour (usually workplace related)
recognised as sexual violence. This move was significant both politically and ideologically, because it established a feminist understanding that what was once conceptualised as acceptable, although unwanted, male behaviour was reconceptualised as unacceptable sexualised harassment. This was hugely significant because it meant problematising what was previously ‘commonly assumed to be “normal” behaviour between women and men’ (Stanko, 1985: 60).

For many (radical) feminists, sexual violence was recognised as intrinsic to the power and control mechanism that supported a system of male domination and was reconceptualised as a public concern (Kelly, 1988a; Editorial, Trouble and Strife, 1993; Thompson, 2001). However, as the dominant political and socio-economic group, and as the group with more access to, and influence in, institutional and state organisations, men’s definitions of ‘their’ violences were generally accepted over women’s whereby there was ‘a conflict between men’s power to define and women’s truth’ (Kelly, 1988a: 138). The consequence of men providing the definitions of violence meant that it was not in men’s interests, as the dominant class, to recognise the prevalence of male violence, and thus definitions tended to reflect only the most extreme forms of violence: ‘[i]t is in men’s interests, as the perpetrators of sexual violence, that definitions of forms of sexual violence be as limited as possible’ (Kelly, 1988a: 156).

These limited definitions of sexual violence have implications for the statistical data reflecting the prevalence and incidence of male violence and arguably, much of the official data is an under-representation (Kelly and Radford, 1996). The next section will discuss the data on sexual violence and will argue that the levels of violence constitute epidemic proportions whereby an extremely large number of women are affected and a substantial number of men are implicated (even though not all men are perpetrators).

2.3: The Extent of Male Violence
This section will apply Kelly’s continuum of violence analysis to argue that, whilst there are various manifestations of sexual violence, there are significant similarities which facilitate an understanding of how these different forms of violence/abuse are
interdependent and mutually supportive. This analysis is predicated on the (radical) feminist understanding that sexual violence, in whatever expression, shares some features: 'the basic common character underlying the many different forms of violence is the *abuse, intimidation, coercion, intrusion, threat and force men use to control women* ' (Kelly, 1988a: 76, emphasis in original). The theoretical understanding of sexual violence, applied in this thesis, is encapsulated in the quotation below:

In bringing sexual assault to the public attention, feminist thinkers have offered not only documentation but also a social analysis of the problem. In a feminist analysis, sexual assault is understood to be intrinsic to a system of male supremacy. In support of this contention, feminist theorists have called attention to the social legitimacy of many forms of sexual assault and to the glorification of even extreme sexual violence in the dominant culture. ... Moreover, feminists theorists suggest that sexual assault serves a political function in preserving the system of male dominance through terror, thus benefiting all men whether or not they personally commit assaults (Brownmiller, 1975; Griffin, 1971). The unanswered question posed by feminists is not why some men rape, but why most men do not. (Herman, 1990: 177-178)

This section will address the issues raised in the quotation above, and for illustrative purposes will refer to domestic violence, rape and child sexual abuse in order to argue that there are similarities in these forms of sexual violence. This also substantiates the central critique of this thesis which argues that these male abuses of power serve to perpetuate a gender-based hierarchical system which is supported by the patriarchal ideology of male supremacy.

### 2.3.1: Domestic Violence

Of all violent crime which women experience, just under half (43 per cent) is domestic (Mirrlees-Black, 1999 cited in Diamond, 2000/2001: 16). The official UK government statistics reveal that one in four women experience domestic violence at some point in their lives and two women are killed per week by their partner or former partner (Home Office, 1998, 2003a; Wang, 2000/2001). In 1996, the British Crime Survey (BCS) reported that, 'since 1981, the largest increase in violent crimes has been in incidents of domestic violence' although this increase appears to

---

15 As argued, it is suggested that for an accurate picture, one should accept that government statistics on domestic violence will be an underestimation, although the British Crime Survey is actively seeking ways to improve data collection on domestic violence (Mirrlees-Black, 1999; Stanko, 2000).
have levelled out now. The BCS, however, acknowledges that this is still an underestimation of the extent of domestic violence as it contends that ‘domestic violence is the least likely violent crime to be reported to the police. Only one out of three crimes resulting in injury are reported’ (Home Office, 1996). These findings are reflected in the 2000 BCS where it is reported that still only one in three (31 per cent) victims of domestic violence contact the police, but that overall, domestic violence accounted for one in every twenty crimes (Stanko, 2000: 1). A key point to note is that these statistics on domestic violence only reflect those incidents resulting in physical harm, and do not, therefore, include other forms of non-physical violence or abuse such as emotional, sexual, psychological, or financial control. A further point is that different sources quote different statistical data for domestic violence incidents: for instance, the 1998 BCS included a self-report section on domestic violence through use of a computer-assisted self-interviewing questionnaire (CASI)\(^\text{16}\) which found that ‘4.2% of women and 4.2% of men had been physically assaulted by a current or former partner in the last year’ (Mirrlees-Black, 1999). This emphasises the difficulties in obtaining and collating accurate statistical data on domestic violence which is discussed further in Chapter 3. In this thesis, as explained more fully in the next chapter, it is argued that there is gender asymmetry in domestic violence and that women, rather than men, are more likely to be the victims of domestic violence (see Chapter 3).

2.3.1.1: Government Reforms, Responses and Interventions to Domestic Violence

Recently, the UK government, and the Scottish Parliament have implemented policy changes to tackle domestic violence more effectively which are partially informed by feminist analyses. Indeed Hearn and colleagues argue that ‘[i]n the United Kingdom, “domestic violence” has both received far more attention and has been more defined as a gendered crime in recent government guidance and legislation than any other kind of men’s violence’ (Hearn et al, 2002c: 211).

In July 1999 the Home Office partially took over the issue of male violence against women from the Women’s Unit in the Cabinet Office and the government

\(^{16}\) See http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs/r86.pdf
departments together published *Living Without Fear – An Integrated Approach to Tackling Violence Against Women*, which focused on domestic violence. The Inter Departmental Group on Domestic Violence was changed to the Inter Departmental Group on Domestic Violence and Violence Against Women, which reflected an awareness of all forms of male violence (Pringle *et al*, 2001a). This initiative was developed with the publication of *The Home Office Agenda on Violence Against Women* in December 1999, which emphasised the gendered nature of domestic violence and contains the statistic that 'one woman in four reports experiencing domestic violence at some time in her life' (Pringle *et al*, 2001a: 90-93). In their analysis of the recent policy developments by the government, Pringle and colleagues argue that, whilst the government appears to be accepting the feminist analysis of domestic violence, there is little recognition of the impact of this in women's lives. For example, the government initiative on child contact, *Making Contact Work*, has no reference to domestic violence (Pringle *et al*, 2001a). However, in June 2003, the Home Office published the *Safety and Justice: the Governments Proposal on Domestic Violence* white paper (applicable to England and Wales) which is a development of the 2002 *Justice for All* white paper (Home Office, 2003b). In this proposal, the government states that one in four women and one in six men 'will suffer domestic violence at some point in their lives' and it defines domestic violence as 'any violence between current or former partners in an intimate relationship wherever and whenever the violence occurs. The violence may include physical, sexual, emotional and financial abuse' (Home Office, 2003b). The government has three strategies for approaching domestic violence, which are prevention, protection and justice, and support and are key priorities in the *Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Bill*, which went before the House of Lords on 1st December 2003.\(^\text{17}\) The Bill is a welcomed measure and includes introducing jail sentences for breaking non-molestation orders; imposing restraining orders where the defendant has been acquitted; giving victims statutory rights; and establishing an independent commissioner for victims (Home Office Press Release, 2003). The Bill is very much situated within criminal justice reform but there are also civil law proposals including the extension of non-molestation orders to couples who have never married or co-habited (Home Office Press Release, 2003). Whilst the Bill is

\(^{17}\) see http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200304/ldbills/006/2004006.htm
welcomed, the Women's Aid Federation England and Wales, among others, has some reservations with it and would like to see further measures including lengthening the time period attached to non-molestation and occupation orders, for example (Women's Aid Briefing Paper, 2004). Women's Aid supports the move to give the police the power to arrest 'on suspicion of assault' but argue that the police should have additional powers such as 'barring perpetrators from the house [where his partner lives] for up to 10 days' (Women's Aid Briefing Paper, 2004: 5).

Overall, Women's Aid express concerns about the implementation of the proposed measures and argue that without proper judicial training the new procedures may not be effectively executed (Women's Aid Briefing Paper, 2004).

The Scottish approach, which has much relevance to this thesis, has been more informed by the feminist analysis, which may be a result of the increased profile of the Zero Tolerance campaign on male violence, which has run in areas where 80 percent of the Scottish population live (Gillan and Samson, 2000: 346; Pringle et al., 2001a). The Zero Tolerance Trust is an awareness raising campaign which was launched in 1992 by Edinburgh District Council Women's Committee and 'identifies the link between different forms of male violence including rape, child sexual abuse and domestic violence' (Kitzinger and Hunt, 1993). The campaign involved posters, leaflets and postcards all challenging male violence and the myths surrounding it (Kitzinger and Hunt, 1993). Gillan and Samson of the Zero Tolerance Trust state that the Scottish Executive has been proactive and has secured funding for tackling domestic violence since its inception in 1998 and made male violence a priority issue: '[i]t has released £3 million pounds to establish a domestic abuse service development fund with local authorities being asked to match funds, and Scottish Homes putting in £2 million for capital expenditure on refuge provision' (Gillan and Samson, 2000: 348). Resultant from this commitment was the development and implementation of the domestic abuse training pack for children in schools 'Action Against Abuse ... There's No Excuse', which has been introduced into some of the state schools in Glasgow. The 'Action Against Abuse Pack' was funded and implemented by Glasgow City Council Education Services in 1999 (with consultation from other organisations) and in 2000 the post for an Education Worker to implement the pack and provide training for teachers was created. The Director of Education, Ken Corsar, explains in the introduction to the pack that it is based on the
premise that ‘education has a crucial role to play in challenging high acceptance levels of violence and developing attitudes of mutual tolerance and respect for others’. The pack has fourteen lessons developing issues based on conflict, power, violence, domestic violence, relationships, child sexual abuse, rape and sexual assault, and are used differentially depending on the year group of pupils. Whilst the *Action Against Abuse* pack was positively received, not all schools implemented it because state schools have devolved power and Glasgow City Council has no mandate to implement the pack if the schools oppose it.\(^{18}\)

The strategy against domestic abuse has not been developed in isolation and over the last ten years there have been numerous initiatives in Glasgow. In 1991, the police issued their *'Hitting Home'* report on domestic abuse and in the same year the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) report emphasised the need for multi-agency work for effective results. Also, in 1998, there were a series of television adverts challenging domestic abuse.

The establishment of the Scottish Parliament in 1999 was particularly significant for domestic abuse because Maureen McMillan MSP introduced one of the first Private Members Bills on domestic abuse which became the *Protection from Abuse (Scotland) Act 2001*. Also in 1999, the *Domestic Abuse Service Development Fund* (DASDF) was implemented and fifty-eight different projects were funded in thirty-one Local Authorities, including Glasgow. In November 2000, the *Scottish Strategy on Domestic Abuse* was launched, a three year plan, which involved pledging £18.3 million, with £10 million going towards refuges; £4.5 million for the action plan; £3 million for the domestic abuse fund and £800,000 for Scottish Women’s Aid.

Concurrently, the *Zero Tolerance* Charitable Trust *'Respect'* pack was being implemented, which targeted young people and their understandings of relationships, gender issues, and domestic abuse, in order to challenge young people’s attitudes and acceptance of domestic abuse. As mentioned above, the *Zero Tolerance* campaign recognises the links between different forms of male violence and emphasises power

---

\(^{18}\) Much of this information came from meetings with various council members including a meeting with Jean Murphy on 29\(^{th}\) August 2001 at Glasgow City Chambers. Additionally the information on the 'National Strategy' was from Lesley Irvine of the Scottish Executive and was given, in a paper, at the 'Respect in Relationships' Conference on 12\(^{th}\) March 2002 in Glasgow City Chambers.
and control elements of male violence/abuse. The Respect pack is based on primary intervention so that attitudes are changed before young people become adults and cement fixed ideas about violence, abuse and gender relations and includes publicity material, a CD rom, primary and secondary school material, informal educational intervention, and training material for adults delivering the pack. The pack was first piloted in 2001 in Glasgow and Edinburgh and at the time the Social Justice Minister, Jackie Baillie pledged a commitment to implementing it in all Scottish schools (Zero Tolerance Trust Update 2001, no publishing details available). The Respect intervention therefore developed after, and in response to, the findings of the initial research (Burton et al, 1998). This research with young people found that one in two young men and one in three young women thought that it was acceptable in some circumstances for a man to hit a woman or force her to have sex in some circumstances and 36% of boys thought that they might use violence in future relationships.

Whilst all these policy initiatives are clearly welcomed, there remains some concern with them. As Gillan and Samson argue, ostensibly there appears to be an assimilation of the feminist critique of male violence but the ideology of the policy initiatives were predicated on a crime reduction strategy which remained focused on stranger violence and thus did not accept the realities of the levels of interpersonal violence:

Both the Home Office and the Scottish Office had developed policy initiatives on violence against women under the crime prevention/community safety agenda. The Positive Steps initiative produced leaflets and posters targeting women which offered women advice on how to stay safe. Women were advised to stay away from dark, unlit streets and to ‘keep an escape kit at the ready’. (Gillan and Samson, 2000: 341)

Despite the recognition of domestic violence, this information initially promoted a safety strategy that effectively advised women to keep out of the public sphere (see Section 3.1, Chapter 3). Furthermore, this approach served to teach women avoidance techniques rather than tackling the actual violence of men: ‘[t]his reinterpretation of the problem led to crime prevention policies aimed at reducing women’s fear of crime, rather than attempting to reduce men’s perpetration of it’ (Hester et al, 1996: 10, cited in Gillan and Samson, 2000: 341). This interpretation
therefore focuses on changing women's behaviour rather than challenging men's: "[a]lthough it was men's behaviour which was creating the problem, it was women who had to change their behaviour in order to bring the problem under control" (Gillan and Samson, 2000: 342). In addition to the ideology of these policy initiatives it also remains the case that there does not seem to be any significant reduction in the amount of male violence nor a substantial increase in the conviction rates of perpetrators (Dobash et al, 2000; Hanmer, 2000; Itzin, 2000).

If women are to be protected, then it is critical that domestic violence is recognised as a serious problem. ... The criminal nature of domestic violence behaviour needs to be recognised. The symbolic and denunciatory relevance of the law relating to domestic violence is important. Men who commit serious and violent offences against women should be duly processed and made responsible for their behaviour. (Heery, 2001: 15)

Arguably, the frequently ineffectual interventions of the police and the criminal justice system, though now improving, are reflective of systems which historically supported a man's right to control his household, as he deemed appropriate (see Section 3.2, Chapter 3; Dobash and Dobash, 1979). Furthermore, changes in the law do not, in themselves, challenge fundamental (patriarchal) ideological beliefs that support a male dominance model and therefore the law itself cannot, or will not, "eliminate patriarchal attitudes and behaviours' held by the law makers and enforcers (Kelly and Radford, 1996: 31).

Furthermore, if feminist definitions of abusive behaviour are accepted, which involve naming the 'low level' everyday forms of male violence as abuse rather than strictly focusing on the more extreme cases of violence, then interventions would perhaps involve 'criminalizing much of the interaction between men and women' (Kelly and Radford, 1996: 31). Thus, unless the law and policy makers recognise the insidiousness of male violence, the law cannot ever be fully effective in challenging such violence and can only serve to curb the more extreme excesses which transgress (ostensibly) acceptable normative masculine behaviour (Radford et al, 2000)."
2.3.2: Rape

Susan Brownmiller (1975), Kate Millett (1970) and Diana Russell (1982) were amongst the first feminist writers to redefine rape as a form of male domination rather than just an extreme form of sexual assault.

Early feminist analysts of rape (...) asserted that rape is not, as the common mythology insists, a crime of frustrated attraction, victim provocation, or uncontrollable biological urges. Nor is it one perpetrated only by an aberrant fringe. Rather, rape is a direct expression of sexual politics, a ritual enactment of male domination, a form of terror that functions to maintain the status quo. (Caputi, 1993: 7)

Griffin (cited in Kelly, 1988a: 23) argues that 'rape is not a sexual crime but a violent, political act' and that for women the threat or potentiality of rape 'functions as a form of social control which affects all women'. Griffin identifies the anomaly whereby women who are fearful of rape by strangers turn to their male partners for protection: however, ironically, their partners are statistically more likely to rape them than the stranger on the street (Griffin, cited in Kelly, 1988a: 23; Hanmer and Saunders, 1983). The radical feminist Catherine MacKinnon (1989), develops the analysis of rape but argues that rape is a sexual act because, in a heterosexual patriarchal culture, female submissiion and male dominance is how the sexes interact. Thus, for MacKinnon, and for many feminists, rape is an extreme form of the eroticisation of the heterosexual dominance and submission model, which means that rape is not simply violence but is sexualised violence (MacKinnon, 1989).

Brownmiller's (1975) book is regarded as a major text on rape because she documented how historically and transnationally, rape has served as the means through which men have controlled women: both through actual rape and the threat of rape (Brownmiller, 1975). Therefore, for Brownmiller, rape is quintessentially not about sex but about power and control in a sexualised form of violence: '[rape] is nothing more or less than a conscious process of intimidation by which all men keep all women in a state of fear' (Brownmiller, 1975: 15, emphasis in original).

The official government literature of the 1970s emphasised that women were more at risk from strangers on the street and, accordingly, women should be fearful when out alone, particularly at night (see Section 2.3.1.1). Wilson (1983) cites two pieces of
research from the late 1970s, which confirmed that in most cases of rape, the victim knew her assailant and that the majority of the rapes were premeditated (Wilson, 1983). Indeed Wilson argues that, contrary to the stereotype, the average rapist is an 'ordinary' man and thus, for Wilson, rape is conceptualised as unexceptional male behaviour rather than as extreme behaviour:

Most rapists are quintessentially ordinary. It is not so much that they are 'rapists'; rather they have simply, as 'normal' men, raped someone. Rape for most men is not a compulsion, but is an incidental and not very remarkable act. It emphatically does not set them off from other men. (Wilson, 1983: 60)

The statistical evidence on rape suggests that it is particularly prevalent but it has exceptionally low conviction rates, indeed rape cases have the lowest conviction rates of all types of crime – both violent and non-violent (British Medical Association 1998, cited in Itzin, 2000; Johnson, 1998; Mooney 2000). According to UK Home Office statistics (1999), over the last ten years, reported rape has increased by 165 per cent but the conviction rate has actually decreased from 24 per cent to 9 per cent (Itzin, 2000). Indeed, in a fifteen year period, the conviction rate for rape has decreased from 24 per cent in 1985, to 17 per cent in 1990, to 12 per cent in 1995 to a mere 8 per cent in 2000 (Home Office Statistics cited in Lees, 2002: Appendix 1). Recent research findings from the Home Office found that in 2002 there were 27 per cent more reported rapes as compared with 2001 but concurrently the conviction rate of rapists had further fallen to only 6 per cent in 2002 (Viner, 2003).

The following data from the Rape Crisis Federation of Wales and England (2003) (an organisation for England and Wales that deals directly with women who have experienced rape) illustrates the inverse relationship between the number of incidents and the number of convictions for rape:

- 1 in 4 women suffer rape or attempted rape.
- The most common rapists are current and ex-husbands or partners.
- 1 in 7 married women, and 1 in 3 divorced or separated women, said they had been forced to have sex.
- 97% of callers [to Rape Crisis Help-Lines] knew their assailant.
- 91% of women told no one, and less than 7% of callers reported to the police.
- Between 1996 and 1997, the number of women reporting rape increased by over 500%.

---

20 The actual figures, as reported in The Guardian, state that in 2001, there were 8,990 reported rape cases and in 2002 this increased to 11,441 (Travis, 2003).
These figures demonstrate that the incidents of reported rape are increasing but the levels of conviction are simultaneously decreasing. The issue of why rape perpetrators are not convicted is a complex issue and one which is beyond the remit of this thesis. However, Lees argues that 'the British criminal justice system is systematically allowing rapists to go free, ... [and] more and more rapist are getting away with it' (Lees, 2002: xi).21

One factor that Lees (2002) identifies as having central significance is that a higher proportion of women are reporting that they were raped by someone they know (which is reflected in the Rape Crisis Federation statistics above) and that these rapes often occur in the victim's home. In a criminal justice context, this is significant, because, 'these are precisely the cases where it is most difficult to secure a conviction' (Lees, 2002: xii). According to Lees (2002) the government statistics report a reduction in reported 'stranger' rapes and an increase in rapes by men known to the women which they term 'intimate' rapes: 'the Home Office studies [show] that reported stranger rapes decreased from 39% of the total reported in 1985 (Lloyd and Walmsley, 1989) to 12% in 1996 (Harris and Grace, 1999)' (Lees, 2002: xii). Furthermore, 'there has been a marked increase in the proportion of what the Home Office term 'intimate' rapes, between those such as relatives, friends and work colleagues. These increased from 30% to 50% between 1985 and 1996 (Harris and Grace, 1999)' (Lees, 2002: xii).22 Indeed, the Home Office Research Study (No. 196) Investigating and Prosecuting Rape in the 1990s, found that, in 1996 in a survey of rape cases by the police, in only 12 per cent of all the rape cases 'did the victim not know the perpetrator' (cited in Pringle et al, 2001a: 153, emphasis added). Therefore, arguably, rapists are 'normal' men who rape women, rather than deviant pathological anti-social men. This substantiates the feminist argument that 'women are most at risk from men they know and that rape is culturally dictated rather than deviant behaviour' (Lees, 2002: xiii). Indeed Lees argues that, in the criminal justice

21 It may be of significance that, of the total 107 High Court judges, only 6 are women (Viner, 2003).
22 The category of 'intimate' rapes includes rape in marriage which became a criminal offence [in England and Wales] in 1991, although it was only in 1997 that the House of Lords in R.v.R. upheld the Court of Appeal's decision that rape can be committed in marriage (see R.V.R. (1997) 4 All ER 481 HJ) (Lees, 2002: xii-xiii). In Scotland, rape in marriage became a criminal offence in 1982 (Rape Crisis Federation).
system, the fact that a woman knows her assailant is often taken as a ‘mitigating’ factor, and, is a central reason why rapists are not convicted:

such cases [intimate rapes] tend to be seen as less serious rapes and are less likely to be prosecuted. Professor Jennifer Temkin (1997a), for example, found that the Crown Prosecution System (CPS) are more inclined to drop cases where there is a marital relationship. ... There is also evidence that overall sentencing levels are lower in cases where the victim and offender were known to each other before the rape, and in some cases, at least, the courts appear to have explicitly treated such a relationship as a mitigating factor (Sentencing Advisory Panel, 2001b). (Lees, 2002: xiii)

This, arguably, is the central point of the radical feminist conceptualisation and analysis of rape. Rape happens to a significant number of women, and women often are in relationships with/are married to these men, which is in contradiction to much of the media/personal safety messages which emphasise that it is the unknown stranger rapist, out in the street, that pose the most threat to women. This has the implicit, and often explicit, associated message of keeping women in the private sphere of the home. By perpetuating the message that women are safer in the home, it excludes women from the public sphere and keeps it available for men. This has the result of ensuring that women are doubly ‘policed’ by the state in the public sphere and by the state and individual men in the home (see Section 3.1, Chapter 3).

Women’s lives are circumscribed and controlled by violence. The man who does not want his wife, sister, or daughter to go out alone because he fears for her safety may benefit from the limits on her activities. Why hasn’t men’s concern for women’s safety been institutionalised to thwart assaults? The law and its administration reflect men’s preference for insulating women from the assaults of strangers by confinement rather than by making public space safe. (Bart and Moran, 1993d: 148, emphasis in original)

The resultant situation is that women cannot know which men are, or are not, capable of rape which places women in a very vulnerable position, and leaves individual women having to guard themselves from attacks. To be safe, therefore, women have to regard all men with caution, even though, as Bart and Moran state: ‘[o]f course, not all men are rapists. But the dilemma for women, ... is to be able to sort out the dangerous from the safe men’ (Bart and Moran, 1993d: 156). Stanko reiterates this point:
Try as they might, women are unable to predict when a threatening or intimidating form of male behaviour will escalate to violence. As a result, women are continually on guard to the possibility of men's violence. (Stanko, 1985: 1)

This is not meant to imply that women are, at all times, alert to danger, but that the awareness of the potential of violence (from male strangers) is normalised into women's existence and experience so that, for many women, this state of alert, is acculturated into their everyday behaviour. However, it may be that women are least expecting male violence/abuse from partners with the added paradox that these are the most likely perpetrators:

We know that sexual danger is an everyday reality for women. It structures our lives (Gordon and Riger, 1988; Stanko, 1990), yet it is so interwoven into our identities as women that we hardly notice it. Women routinely assume that they must always be on their guard against assaults from men. (Bart and Moran, 1993d: 148)

Therefore, the fact that some men rape, and that patriarchal institutions do little to challenge this behaviour, suggests that all men reap Connell's 'patriarchal dividend' (Connell, 1995). The effect is that women are literally controlled and subjugated both directly by sexual violence, and indirectly through the fear of the violence (Stanko, 1985). Of course, not all women are fearful of rape or sexual violence, and not all women live in a 'patriarchal' household, but rape and all sexual violence serves to perpetuate a system of male dominance which overall, structurally and ideologically, supports patriarchy, which, in turn, works in the interests of men.

2.3.3: Child Sexual Abuse

Just as rape is a gendered crime committed almost exclusively by men, so too is the sexual abuse of children.

The best currently available data indicate that for women, the risk of being raped is approximately one in four, and that for girls, the risk of sexual abuse by an adult is greater that one in three (Russell, 1984). Boys appear to be at lower, but still

---

23 This section is going to concentrate on the sexual abuse of children rather than other forms of abuse such as neglect or physical or emotional abuse — although often both physical and emotional abuse are part of the sexual abuse of children. However, whilst this section locates men as the primary perpetrators of sexual abuse, women/mothers are often responsible for the physical abuse or neglect of children. A discussion of this issue is beyond the remit of this thesis but see Korbin (1986, 1989), Wolfer and Gelles (1993), Featherstone (1996, 1999), Robinson (1998), Krane and Davies (2000) for discussions of motherhood and mothers as perpetrators.
substantial, risk of sexual assault by older boys or men (Finkelhor, 1979). The findings that most victims are female and that the vast majority of offenders are male have been reproduced in every major study. (Herman, 1990: 177)

In addition to the gendered dimension of child sexual abuse, there is the further characteristic of the abuser being an adult and the victim a child which reflects the dual dimension of hierarchical and generational patriarchal control (see Section 1.1, Chapter 1; Finkelhor, 1983). Stanko identifies three distinguishing features of child sexual abuse: 'in over 90-97 per cent of the cases, the offender is male; in over 87 per cent of the cases, the assaulted is female; [and] the incidence is grossly underestimated' (Stanko, 1985: 24). The following quotation, is reproduced at length because it encapsulates some of the key features and problems with ascertaining the levels of child sexual abuse:

Retrospective Prevalence Surveys within general adult populations always reveal far higher levels of CSA [child sexual abuse] than official crime statistics. The most quoted retrospective British prevalence study is that carried out by Liz Kelly and colleagues amongst young people (Kelly et al 1991). This study used successively narrower definitions of sexually abusive experiences in childhood to gauge the differences in reported prevalence levels. Using the broadest definition produced figures of 1 in 2 for females and 1 in 4 for males. What is striking is that when the researchers used a considerably narrower definition (excluding exhibitionism, abuse attempts which were successfully resisted and "less serious" - a problematic concept - forms of abuse committed by peers), they still obtained figures of 1 in 5 for females and 1 in 14 for males. As for gender of perpetrators, this study suggested that 95% of adult perpetrators were male and 85% of non-adult perpetrators were male. (Pringle et al, 2001a: 154)

Whilst the statistics for the occurrence of child sexual abuse vary, the most conservative estimates are at least 1 in 5 for girls (see Pringle et al, 2001, above) and 1 in 14 for boys (Kelly et al, 1991; Seymour, 1998; Pringle et al, 2001). Furthermore, Hearn and colleagues reiterate Pringle and colleagues' comments above and state that the official statistics are invariably underestimations: 'retrospective prevalence surveys within general adult populations always reveal far higher levels of child sexual abuse than official crime statistics' (Hearn et al, 2002b: 24). However, what remains consistent is that the vast majority of perpetrators are male and the fact that girl children are more often the victims than boy children: 'between 90% and 99% of offenders are male and between 90% and

---

24 This survey was conducted with 1244 young people aged between 16 and 21 years (Kelly et al, 1991).
25 Kelly and colleagues argue that variable prevalence rates for child sexual abuse are directly connected to the particular definition of abuse employed in the research project (Kelly et al, 1991).
99.7% of victims are female' (Seymour, 1998: 415). Seymour further establishes, through reference to various studies, that in the vast majority of cases, the perpetrator is known to the victim, usually a father, uncle or brother: '[a]pproximately 85% of offences are committed by a relative or trusted friend of the child' (Seymour, 1998: 415). A noticeable feature in the UK government approach to child sexual abuse is that policy or research reports often minimise the fact that this abuse is gendered and the abuser is often known to the child:

little recognition is afforded to the predominantly gendered nature of child sexual abuse in governmental documents or legislation, although the gendered profile of perpetrators is virtually commonplace as knowledge in research, practice, and (to some extent) public domains. In the United Kingdom, there have been numerous official inquiries into cases of child sexual abuse. Hardly any of them acknowledge one of the few relatively clear facts from research about this crime, namely, that it is overwhelmingly committed by men or boys. (Hearn et al, 2002c: 211-2)

Whilst the sexual abuse of children, usually female, by adult men is a particularly despicable crime (using gender and generational power to abuse) the overall impact of it is arguably the same as the other forms of sexual violence discussed above (Oakley, 1994). Indeed, feminist analyses of this abuse argue that it is debatable whether this would exist, at least to the same extent, if it were not predicated on an ideological justification of the supremacy of men over women, and (male) adults over children. Thus, the radical feminist analysis argues that child sexual abuse is a 'manifestation of the oppression of females inherent in patriarchy' (Seymour, 1998: 416). Indeed for some radical feminists:

[c]hild sexual abuse is an expression of male power over females and, as such, is seen as a logical extension of the nature of patriarchy. As Rush (1974) comments, "the sexual abuse of children, who are overwhelmingly female, by sexual offenders, who are overwhelmingly male adults, is part and parcel of the male dominated society which overtly and covertly subjugates women" (p. 73). (Seymour, 1998: 416)

There are numerous suggested explanations and excuses for many forms of sexual violence, but child sexual abuse is often the form of abuse that is most difficult for people to accept – particularly the prevalence and incidence of it. However, similar to victims of rape, within the criminal justice system, there is often little 'justice' for victims of child sexual abuse, whether the victims present as children or adult

26 See Seymour (1998) for further discussion and references on this.
survivors. Seymour argues, in the quotation below, that this should be expected because, if it is accepted that all sexual violence is part of the patriarchal system, and serves to perpetuate male domination which works in the interests of men (as a sex class), then men cannot possibly be expected to implement sanctions against members of their sex class who enforce this male domination (which protects their position).

Child sexual abuse reflects and reproduces the inequalities inherent in patriarchy. It is partly for this reason that most males are loath to recognize the extensive proportions of child sexual abuse, its detrimental effects on victims, or to undertake a committed attack on its existence. Males can hardly be expected to be committed to destroying the existence of something that serves to maintain their own position of power in society. (Seymour, 1998: 417).

A point that is often little acknowledged is that children often actively resist this abuse and thus the prevention strategy of telling children and young people to ‘Say No’ is ineffectual because clearly some of them already are doing so. What is needed therefore, is a prevention strategy that ‘requires finding ways to stop abusers abusing’ (Kelly et al, 1991: 4).

2.4: The Intersection of Sexual Violence or The Continuum in Practice

As was argued in the introduction to this chapter, it is not always possible to discretely separate out the different forms of sexual violence, even though this has been attempted. It has also been argued that the various manifestations of sexual violence all perpetuate male domination ideology and that the perpetuation of this violence occurs precisely because we live in a patriarchal culture. This section will thus identify how these forms of sexual violence impact on each other and will argue that they are mutually supporting, and are thus, inextricably linked.

27 A recent example of this is reported in the Guardian newspaper of the newly appointed Children’s Minister who accused an adult victim of child sexual abuse, of being an ‘extremely disturbed person’ when he disclosed his abuse (Batty, 2003). This statement suggests that the victim’s testimony is perhaps not strictly credible. This is despite the fact that the victim is a government consultant on the New Deal for Communities and advisor to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (Batty, 2003). However, even if the victim did not have such a high profile job, it is perhaps inexcusable for the Children’s Minister to question the credibility of people who disclose abuse and is an example of the lack of justice for survivors.
The foundational argument to substantiate the claim that the multifarious forms of male violence are mutually dependent and supporting is located in the analysis that they assert power and control. Stark and Flitcraft (1985) argue that where there is domestic violence in the household there is also the likelihood of some form of child abuse, either sexual, physical or both. Kurz argues that control and power are the primary defining features of sexual violence:

Stark and Flitcraft (1985), in their review of medical records, found that children whose mother is battered are more than twice as likely to be physically abused as children whose mother is not battered. They also believe that purposive violence by male intimates against women is the most important context for child abuse. In sum, for feminists, family violence is a direct outcome of men's attempts to maintain control over the powerless members of the family - women and children. (Kurz, 1993a: 263)

Indeed Itzin, in the quotation below, identifies that the Women's Aid movement in the UK argues that on one level domestic violence is, in itself, also child abuse, and that the occurrence of domestic violence can be an indication that the children in these households are also being abused (see also Kelly and Radford, 1996). Women's Aid therefore reject the formalised demarcations between the different manifestations of male violence and abuse.

The links between domestic violence and child abuse were recognised initially amongst children in refuges with their mothers. The Women's Aid movement conceptualises domestic violence as child abuse in the form of emotional damage inflicted on children who are caught up in living with the abuse of their mothers (Hague et al, 2000; Harwin and Barren, 2000). Research has now established a very high co-occurrence of domestic violence and child abuse of 40-60 per cent. (Itzin, 2000: 359, emphasis in original)

The BCS 1998 figures also suggest that many children are involved in domestic violence which is happening in their homes, even if they are not directly involved in it: ‘[e]very day thousands of children witness cruelty and violence behind closed doors. More than a third of children of domestic violence survivors are aware of what is going on and this rises to a half if the women have suffered repeat violence’ (Home Office, 1998). The following quotation identifies the overlap between domestic violence, rape and the murder of women by partners or ex-partners.

It is not always recognised that rape is a common form of domestic violence and is linked to other forms of physical and psychological violence. Stark and Flitcraft (1996: 130) in their review of research on violence against women confirmed Lachman’s 1978 conclusion that ‘almost a third of all homicides take place within
the immediate family, another 21 per cent in romantic triangles or lovers’ quarrels and 27 per cent among less intimate friends and relatives.’ A similar picture emerges from the criminal statistics for England and Wales for 1999. Out of 213 adult women homicides, 119 were killed by their current or former cohabitant spouse or lover. In Scotland too, Soothil et al, (1999) found that females were at considerably more risk than males in a partnership while males were at greater risk in other situations. In sum, at least half of all homicides of women were directly or indirectly domestic. (Lees, 2002: xv)

These findings are confirmed in a local study in North London by Mooney (1993) who found that ‘a third of women will experience a form of “domestic violence” in their lifetime and that just over 20% are raped by a husband or partner’ (cited in Pringle et al, 2001a: 153). Additionally, Hague and Malos (1998: 7) cite an American study which found that a third of the sample of women who had been physically assaulted by their partner had also been raped by them.

There is therefore considerable overlap amongst these types of sexual violence and it is arguable that if men are physically assaulting their partner there is every possibility that this abuse may also be sexualised and similarly there is every possibility that rape involves some form of physical violence. Whilst it is conceptually pragmatic to separate these forms of violence in order to collate data or analyse the extent and form of the violence/abuse, it is theoretically more efficacious to conceptualise all of these manifestations of male violence as corollaries of the same model of men’s abuse of power, which functions to perpetuate power differentials (Itzin, 2000).

2.5: Conclusion

This chapter has argued that all forms of male violence are mutually supporting and perpetuate existing power differentials and patriarchal ideology, which is supported by institutional patriarchy. It is also argued that the prevalence and incidence of sexual violence is such that it is ‘normalised’ and assimilated into the lives of men and women (and children) to the extent that male violence is ‘an integral part of women’s lives’ (Stanko, 1985: 70).

Furthermore, the perpetrators of this violence are not deviant, aberrant individuals but more often, partners, husbands, brothers, lovers and colleagues, who in every other respect appear as competent ‘normal’ men. This is precisely the anomaly
because, as Stanko (1985) argues, sexual violence is what men do and what women expect. Kelly argues that the ‘dominant male discourse also functions to naturalize and to justify ideologically men’s violence towards women and the power relations which underpin the use of force in gender relations’ (Kelly, 1988a: 138). Thus, men’s violence is not seen in its totality and is often reduced to individualised accounts of aberrant behaviour, which presents a partial (and distorted) depiction. Indeed, Lees argues that rapists, for example, have no mental illness or social deviancy but are ‘ordinary’ men: ‘[s]tudies of convicted rapists have indicated that such men are not pathological (see Scully, 1990)’ (Lees, 2002: xiii).

Not only is the view of sexual violence committed by strangers misleading, it is also dangerous because it keeps women in the private sphere of the home (by being alarmist about the potential threat and dangers in the streets) even though the home is the most dangerous place for many women and children (Stanko, 1985). Lees identifies how the message of the safety and sanctity of the home, as often promoted by the current Labour government, is in direct contrast to women’s reality of sexual violence:

This view of sexual violence as taking place predominantly in the home is at odds with the key messages of the Labour government which, as Kelly and Humphries (2000: 20-1) argue, include the following: that violence is widespread, but danger is located away from the home; the two-parent heterosexual family is to be defended as a safe and protected institution; it is the erosion of the nuclear family which is at the heart of the breakdown of community; and that men are increasingly alienated, their masculinity undermined by the changing position of women. (Lees, 2002: xvi)

Not only does this contradict the reality of male violence but it also serves to relocate the blame for any male ‘misdemeanour’ onto women by virtue of the negative impacts of women’s equality on men and their masculinity (this issue is discussed in Chapters 7, 8 and 9). Furthermore, by not accepting and challenging sexual violence, it is passing on a dangerous message to young people about the acceptability and inevitability of sexual violence in their lives as young (and adult) women and men. Flood, below, cites two Australian surveys that questioned young men about sexualised violence and found that between a third and a quarter of the young men surveyed thought that coercive sex or rape was acceptable:

28 This is not meant to imply that violence and abuse are not perpetrated by strangers in the street. Indeed, the public sphere, like the home, is also a dangerous place for women.
In a 1997 survey by Family Planning Australia, nearly a third of the 15-25 year old males interviewed agreed that it was "okay for a male to force a female to have sex" in one or more of a range of situations (Golding & Friedman 1997). In a Brisbane study of Year Nine boys, nearly one in three believed that it is "okay for a boy to hold a girl down and force her to have sexual intercourse" if she has "led him on", while one in five boys were unsure. One quarter of the boys thought that it was acceptable to force a girl to have sex if she gets him sexually excited, and another fifth were unsure (Domestic Violence Resource Centre 1992). (Flood, 2003: 4)

These statistics replicate the data of the Zero Tolerance survey (1998) as previously quoted (see Section 2.3.1.1; Section 1.0, Chapter 1). Therefore the criminal justice system, which does not effectively sanction sexual violence, and some of the government literature which contradicts the statistical evidence on sexual violence (with respect to the potentiality of harm in the home), means that male violence and male domination are sanctioned, endorsed and perpetuated. Indeed, whilst criminal justice reform would be welcomed, it is argued that there has to be an ideological change so that power differentials and male dominance are no longer regarded as acceptable. Until that happens it is difficult to imagine the eradication of sexual violence: ‘[a] future free of the threat and reality of sexual violence requires nothing less than the total transformation of patriarchal relations’ (Kelly and Radford, 1996: 247).

The next chapter will focus more specifically on domestic violence and will discuss, in more detail, the feminist analyses of domestic violence.
Chapter 3
Domestic Violence: Issues and Explanations

3.0: Introduction
Following on from the last chapter, this chapter will concentrate specifically on domestic abuse/violence. It is argued that the feminist analysis recognises the dual effect of domestic violence both in establishing power and control on an individualised basis, and on an institutional level to maintain patriarchal ideology or male dominance.

As was discussed in the previous chapter, the terminology relating to domestic violence is contested. There is an implicit understanding that the term domestic violence (and domestic abuse) relates to violence committed between people who are, or were in, an intimate relationship with each other (Hague and Malos, 1998). The term domestic violence makes no reference to gender but it is now generally understood by those who use it that it is usually male partners or ex-partners who are abusing females. The following definition, below, is the understanding of domestic violence which is applied in this thesis:

In the British context, domestic violence is usually regarded as violence between adults who are (or have been) in an intimate or family relationship with each other, most often a sexual relationship between a woman and a man. The evidence and the lived experience of most of us point to the fact that, overwhelmingly, the recipients of the violence are women and the perpetrators are men. Various research studies have estimated that between 90 and 97 per cent of domestic violence is perpetrated against women by men. (Hague and Malos, 1998: 3-4)

Historically, in the UK, this phenomenon was referred to as wife beating and in the USA it is often called wife, or woman, battering, although the abuser does not necessarily have to be married to the abused. One of the more problematic terms, in this context, comes from non-feminist analysis of domestic violence which refer to it as ‘family violence’ (Hague and Malos, 1998; Section 3.3). Contrary to the conventional view of violence, which confines the term to physical acts, domestic violence can take multiple forms ranging from physical assault, sexual assault, psychological, mental and emotional abuse and financial control, and other
(ostensibly innocuous) controlling behaviours such as dictating what women can wear, or with whom they can talk, for example (Hague and Malos, 1998; Stark, forthcoming).

As has been argued, historically the abuse of women by their husbands was regarded as part of the marriage relationship and was thus behaviour that was perceived not to warrant intervention (Dobash and Dobash, 1979). As argued in Chapter 2, intervention often only occurred when the violence was 'excessive', otherwise it was regarded as a 'private affair between husband and wife' (Hague and Malos, 1998: 49). However, since the 1970s domestic violence has been recognised as a significant social problem and various explanatory models, such as individualised models, sociological explanations and feminist analyses, have developed to explain it (Hague and Malos, 1998; Section 3.3). Whilst there have been useful contributions from the individualised and sociological models, and they have added much to the debate and understanding of domestic violence, it is argued that if domestic violence is to be fully understood and challenged then the feminist explanation, with its focus on power and control, must be used.

Whilst the feminist analysis focuses on gender it is not a unifactorial account but argues that male violence is an expression of male gender role behaviour sanctioned by a male dominance ideology:

The feminist analysis of wife-beating is, at heart, a critique of patriarchy. The central argument is that the brutalisation of an individual wife by an individual husband is not an individual or "family" problem. It is simply one manifestation to the system of male domination of women which has existed historically and cross-culturally. Societal tolerance of wife-beating is a reflection of patriarchal norms which, more generally, support male-dominance in marriage. Traditional marriage, in turn, is a central element of patriarchal society. (Yllo, 1983: 277-278)

Consequently, this chapter will present and discuss the feminist analysis of domestic violence and will argue that the public and private divide, and the familial setting (and relationship), are intrinsic to domestic abuse and that the patriarchal ideology of male domination and female subordination is critical to understandings of domestic violence.29

29 All references to 'families' are based on a heterosexual adult relationship, unless otherwise stated.
3.1: Public and Private Space

Within the criminal justice system, the relationship between the victim and the assailant of a crime should have no bearing on its treatment and according to Bibbings, domestic violence incidents are 'technically no different from other interpersonal violence' (Bibbings, 2000: 251). However, as was argued in the previous chapter in relation to rape, often the relationship between the victim and perpetrator is of such significance that it can be treated as a mitigating factor (Lees, 2002). Furthermore, for feminists, the conceptualisation of domestic violence, as opposed to violence committed between strangers, is problematically embedded in perceptions of how public space and private space are conceptualised by the criminal justice system:

One of the earliest insights of feminism was the recognition that the public/private distinction is an ideological construct which confines important aspects of the subordination of women to the domain of the 'private', and allows some of the most violent manifestations of the power of men over women to go unrecognised and unchecked. The feminist slogan 'The personal is political' both acknowledges and challenges that dichotomy. A feminist politics involves struggling to make the 'private' woes of women 'public'. It involves, too, identifying the numerous ways in which the 'public sphere' men value is dependent for its continued existence on the unpaid, unacknowledged and unreciprocated work of women. And it involves elucidating the ways in which the 'public' penetrates the 'private' – home, family, bedroom, and the individual psyches of women and men. (Thompson, 2001: 7, emphasis in original)

It has generally been accepted that law regulates public space but behaviour in the private space, such as the home, was historically for individuals (which in a patriarchal culture equates with the male head of the household), to regulate themselves (within some legally prescribed parameters). In effect, this should translate to more regulation in the public sphere and thus more regulation of men because they have historically dominated this sphere. Concurrently, it should mean less regulation of women who were confined to the private sphere. In reality, however, male dominance and violence supported by a complicit state regulates women's' behaviour in the public sphere and also in the private sphere under the auspices of husbands/partners, who are also supported by state institutions and ideology. In other words, public and private patriarchy regulates women in both

---

30 It is acknowledged that some feminists argue that domestic violence is different from other stranger crimes and should be regarded differently (but not less seriously) within the criminal justice system.

It is therefore highly problematic for the state to be effectual in protecting women from domestic violence, because the private sphere of the home is, ‘another "protected" space for violent men’ (Bibbings, 2000: 244). Indeed, Edwards (see also Chapter 2; Lees, 2002) identifies how this ideology has permeated the police force and criminal justice system to the extent that violence against intimates is regarded as a substantively lesser crime than that between strangers:

The public/private dichotomy translates back into police perceptions that reinforce the conventional opinion that violence against wives or female partners is in certain ways distinct from violence towards non-family-members in the street. ... even with criminal jurisdiction, the form and content of the law and the regulation of violent conduct has made a clear distinction in the regulation between behaviour on the streets and behaviour in the home. (Edwards, 1989: 49)

Atkins and Hoggett (1984: 137) reiterate this point by arguing that whilst ‘unprovoked street violence resulting in appreciable injury’ gets a custodial sentence, the situation of unprovoked violence in the home traditionally did not warrant a police visit (although this has changed now, see Section 2.1, Chapter 2). As Kelly and Radford argue, it is not the relationship between the perpetrator and victim which should be central to the treatment of the crime but the assault itself (Kelly and Radford, 1996).

3.2: The Family
As argued above, feminists contend that women’s role in the family, both historically and currently, within the context of heterosexuality, is central to understanding domestic violence.

It is not possible to understand wife beating today without understanding its past and the part the past plays in contemporary beliefs and behaviors. The essence of wife beating cannot, however, be distilled merely from a description of ancient wife beating practices or from a reiteration of the laws specifying chastisement. Understanding requires an account of how wife beating fits into the family and into the entire society. It also requires an examination of the individual and institutional factors that reveal why wives, and not husbands, were beaten. (Dobash and Dobash, 1979: 32)
Dobash and Dobash chronicle the historically subordinate position of women in the family and how this subordinated role was reflected in various ways including appropriate behaviour, housewifery, and relationships with others (Dobash and Dobash, 1979). Indeed the Dobash’s analysis is confirmed through the research that has established that the home is where women and children are most at risk of violence and abuse (Stanko 1985; Gillan and Samson, 2000; Lees, 2002), which is why it is important to understand women’s position in the context of heterosexual, familial relationships.

It is still true that for a woman to be brutally or systematically assaulted she must usually enter our most sacred institution, the family. It is within marriage that a woman is most likely to be slapped and shoved about, severely assaulted, killed, or raped. Thus, it is impossible to understand violence against women without also understanding the nature of the marital relationship. (Dobash and Dobash, 1979: 75)

The links between patriarchal control and the influence of patriarchal institutions becomes evident if one accepts that heterosexual marriage benefited and benefits men. However, whilst marriage does cement women’s insubordination it also afforded women some benefits which single women did not have such as ‘protecting’ women from other men or legitimacy for her children. The legal system, religious organisations, political and economic institutions and social mores, for example, are all influenced by patriarchal ideology enforcing and perpetuating the subordination of women in the family. Hence; male violence and abuse in the home has been, and still is, accepted, to a certain extent, as part of the appropriate ways of husbands keeping control over their wives (Hanmer and Saunders, 1983).

The seeds of wife beating lie in the subordination of females and in their subjection to male authority and control. This relationship between women and men has been institutionalised in the structure of the patriarchal family and is supported by the economic and political institutions and by a belief system, ... that makes such relationships seem natural, morally just, and sacred. (Dobash and Dobash, 1979: 33-4)

Whilst formally, at least, men do not now have the same ‘ownership’ over their wives, some issues ensure the subordination of women in this relationship: the ineffectual policing of domestic violence; the minimising of the effects and outcomes of domestic violence; the misunderstanding of the various forms of domestic violence; and the inappropriate sentencing of perpetrators, for example, suggests that
domestic violence is still regarded as different from other forms of violence and that cultural values still affect how domestic violence is conceptualised.

Therefore, the feminist analysis argues that marriage historically supported men's dominance in the family, which was then legally ratified and supported by various institutions, such as the church, the state and the economic order (Dobash and Dobash, 1979). Whilst it is recognised that women are no longer as powerless as they once were, and that the state no longer sanctions male violence to the same extent, it nevertheless remains that domestic violence is often not regarded as an abuse of power and that crimes of domestic violence are not treated on a parity with other crimes of violence and abuse committed between strangers or non-intimates (Bibbings, 2000; Lees, 2002).

3.3: Power and Social Control

For feminists, as argued, male violence, both actual and threatened, is primarily conceptualised as a form of social control: '[v]iolence is a means of social control of women that is at once personal and institutional, symbolic and material' (Yllo, 1993: 59). This is in direct conflict with individualised and sociological models which look for individualised or social/structural elements to explain domestic violence (Stordeur and Stille, 1989; Gelles, 1983, 1987, 1993, 1997).

Psychological explanations for domestic violence present individualistic accounts for the violence focusing on personality disorders, including intrapsychic, psychological, or biological abnormalities of the perpetrator and/or the victim (Stordeur and Stille, 1989). Whilst some feminist analyses would accept that there may be cases where individual incidents of violence may warrant this level of analysis, on a structural level this type of analysis is inadequate because it can pathologise abusive men who in every other respect of their lives are psychologically 'normal' (Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Wilson, 1983; Bograd, 1988; Stanko, 1985). Additionally, very few abusive men who are, or have been, 'treated' for their violence or abuse, have diagnoses of any kind of psychopathology and for those who do there is often very little systematic or consistent pattern to it (Bograd, 1988). If the global, or even national, figures on domestic abuse are accepted, then an individualistic analysis
would necessitate classifying a substantial percentage of the male population as having some form of psychiatric illness or problem (Wardell et al, 1983; Ptacek, 1988). Furthermore, this type of analysis does not accept the power and control explanation for domestic violence and can be deterministic by emphasising personality disorders, rather than the agency involved when men are abusive. This may also contribute to the exoneration of men for their abusive behaviours because it may be argued that it is the disorder which precipitates the violence (Bograd, 1988). Individualistic models are important for analysing why some men are violent/abusive and why many men are not, given that they are exposed to the same conditions, and many psychologists and therapists (including feminists) do use elements from these models. However, one central critique is that individualised models cannot explain why domestic violence is gendered, which is the one feature of domestic violence that is consistently reflected in national and global statistics (Bograd, 1988).

Sociological explanations often focus on explanations for the general phenomenon of violence and identifies external issues, such as class, 'race', ethnicity, religion, alcohol/substance misuse, stress, unemployment and education and how these circumstances impact on familial relationships (Gelles, 1983, 1987, 1993, 1997). According to Bograd, for sociologists, there are two strata requiring examination: '(1) social organization, or the patterns of relationships among groups, and (2) culture, or the norms and values guiding behaviour' (Bograd, 1988: 18). For sociologists it is the impact of these external pressures which lead to tension in the home that culminates in violence and abuse, and some sociologists concentrate on general social and cultural norms which validate the use of violence in the home (Gelles, 1979, 1985; Straus et al, 1980; Bograd, 1988). Whilst a feminist analysis is a sociological analysis, it differs because it centralises gender in the critique of domestic violence, and frames it within a power and control model, whereas most sociological approaches have multidimensional explanations. In the quotation below, Gelles identifies how the sociological approach differs from individualised explanations:

The core of the sociological perspective is the assumption that social structures affect people and their behaviour. The major social structural influences on social behaviour in general, and family violence in particular, are age, sex, position in the socio-economic structure, and race and ethnicity. In addition, the structure of social institutions also influences social behaviour. (Gelles, 1993: 31)
Different sociological approaches emphasise these issues identified above by Gelles and consequently there are numerous approaches which also have considerable overlap. For illustrative purposes, this section will examine the Family Violence approach which incorporates much of the theoretical underpinnings of other sociological models and is arguably the most influential analysis of domestic violence in the USA (Gelles, 1983, 1987, 1993, 1997). As the name suggests, the 'family violence' or 'spouse abuse' approach conceptualises the general 'culture of violence' and in this approach, it is the family itself which is the central unit of analysis (Kurz, 1993). Sociologists who adopt this perspective often regard family violence or 'spouse abuse' as something which happens in families as a result of external pressures such as unemployment, stress, alcohol or drug misuse and some also accept the influence of sociocultural norms such as 'patriarchal sexism' for example (Gelles, 1983, 1987, 1993, 1997). Family violence analysts thus argue that the core of the problem is related to the family unit and with familial relationships, which implicates all members of the family. Feminists, however, argue that 'families' are not violent, it is people who are violent, and with respect to domestic violence, it is predominantly men who are violent (Hester, 1992; Kurz, 1993b; Hearn, 1998a):

> [t]he danger in conceptualising the field as 'family violence' is that it implies that it is 'the family' that does the violence. 'The family' does not do violence: violence is done by people, usually men, albeit within violating relationships, including those of families. (Hearn, 1998a: 29)

In addition to the external pressures and socio-cultural norms and values having an influential effect on domestic violence, the Family Violence approach understands that, 'the structure of the modern family as a social institution has a strong overarching influence on the occurrence of family violence' (Gelles, 1993: 31). Whilst feminists also problematise the 'family' (see above) feminists and Family Violence theorists have different analyses and whilst Family Violence theorists accept that sexism affects the levels of violence in the family, they reject the primariness of a gendered analysis because, according to Gelles, '[w]hat I reject is the ideological fervour used to advance the argument that sexism causes abuse, rather than the claim that gender inequality is part of a causal model' (Gelles, 1983: 157). Whilst accepting gender as a factor, for these theorists what is equally, if not more,
significant is socio-economic status or economic class (Gelles, 1993). By not focussing on gender, Family Violence theorists underestimate the power differentials which are implicit in many heterosexual patriarchal households and Kurz argues that the Family Violence approach is thus ‘based on false assumptions about the nature of marriage and of equality between men and women’ (Kurz, 1993b: 89).

This view of the exercise of power as gender-neutral misrepresents the nature of marriage as a partnership of equals. ... power is not gender-neutral; it is structured into the institution of marriage in such a way that women are disadvantaged. (Kurz, 1993b: 98)

By focussing on the family as the central unit of analysis, and underestimating the power differentials between women and men, this approach has a tendency to minimise the impact of male domination which, according to feminists, is the central contributory factor for all male violence against women (Radford and Stanko, 1996). As such, this model serves to ‘divert emphasis from male domination as the cause of wife-beating’ (Wardell et al, 1983: 78). In the feminist analysis, men’s violence is socially and culturally sanctioned and other interpretations or explanatory models do not acknowledge the impact of patriarchal norms and values, indeed feminists interpret the ‘family structure’ as reflecting patriarchal norms and values (Kurz, 1993a; Lees, 2002).

Feminists argue that, whilst psychological problems may or may not be a causation of some individual men’s violence, it cannot account for the pervasiveness of the violence which men do to women (Bograd, 1988). Additionally, unlike Family Violence theorists, feminists assert that gender power is central to any analysis of domestic violence and thus the approach (and terminology) should not degender this violence in the way that terms such as ‘family violence’ do. Instead the perpetrators should be named and male violence should be referred to as such. Indeed Stanko asked ‘[w]hy is it still a political statement to refer to male violence against women’ and it seems that this question still resonates eighteen years later (Stanko, 1985: 161, emphasis in original).

Indeed, feminists conceptualised domestic violence as a public issue and it was seen as one form of male domination with links made to other manifestations of male
violation and male power and control (see Section 2.3, Chapter 2; Edwards, S. 1987; Bart and Moran, 1993d).

The major feminist contributions have been to define and to evidence male violence as fundamental to the social control of women, to identify coercive male domination and abuses of women in the home as problems of importance, and to place this violence on the world-wide agenda of social change. (Hanmer and Itzin, 2000:1)

This conceptualisation challenges sociological approaches which argue that where there is a conflict over power and power resources, this is gender neutral. Instead the feminist analysis argues that the construction of power is directly related to patriarchal, or male dominance, ideology and thus invests men with more power, and more access to power (Kurz, 1993b; Pence and McDonnell, 2000). In relation to this, instead of the Family Violence understanding of violence as a `mutual combat' or a 'conflict tactic', the feminist analysis conceptualises domestic violence as coercive control (Yllo, 1993; Stark, forthcoming):

The coercive control model of domestic violence is an important theoretical alternative to the conflict tactics model. It identifies violence as a tactic of entitlement and power that is deeply gendered, rather than as a conflict tactic that is personal and gender neutral. (Yllo, 1993: 57)

This analysis of the coercive control model is developed by Stark who argues that women's increasing 'liberation' and associated economic independence, political and legal equality and increased cultural status has destabilised the institutional subordination of women, and concurrently this has 'weakened the effectiveness of violence in securing domination' (Stark, forthcoming; Stark also references Okun 1976; Stark and Flitcraft, 1978 and Lischick, 2002 for use of the coercive control model). In this analysis, the violence, in addition to the other tactics involved, ensure that women are subjugated through violence, other controlling strategies and fear, whereby 'intimidation relies heavily on what the victim believes her partner will do' (Stark, forthcoming, emphasis added). Therefore, Stark defines the coercive control model as:

... a gender strategy that encompasses a range of tactics men use to establish mastery by subjugating their partners. Coercion, the use of force to directly compel or dispel a particular response, includes acts of physical or sexual assault and threats or other acts of intimidation that induce pain, injury and/or fear. In addition to injury and death, these acts can cause chronic pain or significant behavioural or psychological problems. (Stark, forthcoming)
This analysis facilitates an understanding of why domestic abuse can be differentiated from violence between men or strangers for instance, because it is the controlling elements of this violence which are integral to it. Furthermore, feminists argue that patriarchal societies in which power differentials between the sexes (in addition to other demarcations such as class and ethnicity for example) are naturalised and supported (to varying degrees) in families and households are fundamental to domestic violence.

As feminists we argue that sexual violence is used by men as a way of securing and maintaining the relations of male dominance and female subordination, which are central to the patriarchal social order. We recognize that patriarchy is crossed through and in interaction with other power structures, namely those of race, class, age and status regarding disability. (Radford and Stanko, 1996: 65)

Therefore, the feminist analysis of domestic violence clearly states that it is inextricably linked to gender constructions and gendered power differentials. The individualised approaches which link domestic violence to psychological problems, and the sociological analyses which focus on the family unit, are inadequate precisely because, even though they incorporate both internal and external contributory factors, they fail to accept the centrality of gender and power relations.

For feminists, domestic violence is not a phenomenon that should be conceptualised as psychological, individualistic, class, 'race' or ethnicity related for example, but that should be contextualised as an institutionalised form of male supremacy which is supported by patriarchal ideology although affected or modified by many other social, cultural and individual factors (Yllo, 1983; Hanmer and Maynard, 1987; Dobash and Dobash, 1992).

3.4: Gender Asymmetry
Perhaps the most influential and controversial aspect of Family Violence research is in relation to the methodology used to obtain their data and in the related findings. In an attempt to quantify the levels of domestic violence, Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz (1979) developed the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS) which is a scale that measures
the amount and type of violence used in interpersonal relationships. The numerous criticisms of the CTS led to a modification, and Straus and colleagues developed the CTS2, in which they added questions relating to sexualised violence and differentiations in violence, particularly in relation to injuries sustained through the violence (Straus et al., 1996, cited in Johnson, 1998).

Results from the initial CTS survey were unexpected as they revealed that husbands and wives were equally responsible for committing violence of all types which led to the conclusion that there was symmetry in the use of violence, and that domestic violence could therefore be understood as 'mutual combat' (see Straus, 1980, cited in Johnson, 1998: 27). This finding was accepted by many as a refutation of the claim, based on most other evidence from police incident data, hospital records, injury data, national probability sample surveys and help-seeking statistics, for example, which argues that the pattern of domestic violence is asymmetrical with men the primary perpetrators (Saunders, 1988; Dobash and Dobash, 1992, 2000; Dobash et al., 1993; Kurz, 1993a; Nazroo, 1999).

In addition to the critiques above, the results of the CTS/CTS2 have been extensively critiqued for various other reasons (Saunders, 1988; Dobash and Dobash, 1992; Dobash et al., 1992; Johnson, 1998; Nazroo, 1999). A central feminist criticism of the CTS/CTS2 is that in referring to their own violence, men often underestimate the extent of it and women overestimate, which would therefore skew the results (see Dobash and Dobash, 1992; Dobash et al., 1992; Johnson, 1998). Another significant criticism is because the CTS/CTS2 scale does not pay significant attention to the motives, intentions and consequences of the violence because it treats all violent acts as a single category so that a beating leading to hospitalisation is in the same category as a push, for example (Johnson, 1998).

In response to this, Straus conceded that men may, in fact, inflict more damage because of their physicality but not because they are more likely to use violence, and

31 The CTS monitored how many times a person in a relationship had been violent towards their partner in the previous twelve months and how often the partner had been violent towards them in the same time period. Only one half of the couple was asked to fill in the scale and the total sample was split equally between female and male. The measurements on the scale ranged from 'verbal reasoning,' 'verbal aggression' to 'physical aggression' (Johnson, 1998: 27).
relatedly, that women were less likely to initiate violence but often acted in retaliation or self-defence (Straus et al, 1979; Dobash et al, 1993). In contradiction to this, in 1990, Stets and Straus argued that the levels of violence reported by the CTS2 meant that women’s violence could not be explained simply as self-defence or retaliation, and that women were equally as likely to be the initiators of the violence after all (Stets and Straus, 1990, cited in Dobash et al, 1993: 73). Indeed, the BCS CASI (1998) research reports that women were twice as likely to have been injured and more likely to have experienced repeated violence (Mirrlees-Black, 1999).

Estimates are that only 10% of [domestic violence cases] involves an isolated event and that the other ninety per cent involves systematic beatings, often with escalating violence, over the duration of the couple's married life. (Hanmer and Stanko, 1985: 366, cited in Morley and Mullender, 1994: 5)

Feminist theorists have consistently found that women's violence is often in self-defence or in retaliation and rarely do women instigate the violence (Saunders, 1988; Dobash and Dobash, 1992, 2000; Dobash et al, 1992; Kurz, 1993a). Furthermore, feminists argue that it is not just physical violence which is problematic but other forms of abuse such as sexual, emotional, financial control and so on, all contribute towards a form of systematic controlling abuse and violence by men towards their female ex/partners which characterises and constitutes domestic abuse (Saunders, 1988; Dobash and Dobash, 1992, 2000; Dobash et al, 1992; Yllo, 1993).

3.5: Male Gender Behaviour
Wilson argues that the individualised and sociological critiques of domestic violence are fundamentally flawed because they are looking for a ‘causation’ of male violence which does not exist (Wilson, 1983). Instead, according to a feminist analysis, the prerequisite is a patriarchal culture which endorses a man’s right to power, control and dominance at the expense of women and children, and the struggle for dominance over other men. This therefore raises questions about what is regarded as acceptable male behaviour when it is linked to asserting male dominance. As will be examined in more detail in the following chapters (4 and 5), there is arguably a link with male violence and its acculturation into normalised heterosexual constructions of masculinity (Dobash and Dobash, 1998b). Edwards argues that, whilst the
assimilation of male violence into normative masculinity may be discreet, it is arguably the case that there is a cultural expectation and acceptance of some forms of male violence.

Masculinity is frequently exonerated, even in perverse forms. From male sex offenders to male violent offenders, violent behaviour is often seen as an extension of the cult of masculinity. Through ideologies and social constructs, through the lack of civil and criminal remedies and their interpretation, which often fails to give women adequate protection, we find that male violence is frequently, if covertly, legitimated. (Edwards, S. 1987: 153)

Thus, the argument can be made that male violence is a product of normative masculinity and is accepted in our society (to varying extents) which raises questions about 'masculinity' as a gender construction (the next two chapters address this issue in detail).

... gendering sexual violence, then, requires more than simply being aware of who the victims and who the perpetrators of such violences are. It requires that we recognise the pervasive way in which presumptions concerning normal male heterosexuality underpin those violences and our understandings of them, though with the important caveat that not all men behave in this way. (Walklate, 2001: 119)

The feminist analysis of domestic violence and male violence in general, clearly implicates the (social construction) of male gender behaviour and how this is interpreted, implemented and enacted within a society which is structured according to patriarchal ideology (Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Bograd, 1988; Stordeur and Stille, 1989).

3.6: Conclusion
This chapter concludes by reiterating that there has to be fundamental challenges to structures and ideologies which sanction male violence. If not, sociological approaches will continue to look for external causations and individualised accounts will continue to pathologise violent men. Both approaches, in whatever particular form, fail to recognise that domestic violence and indeed, all sexual violence exists because a society built on a patriarchal framework endorses hierarchical relationships based on biological sex demarcations which legitimates the behaviour of the dominant group (men) to maintain their hegemony (Bart and Moran, 1993d).
Therefore, the ideology supporting male dominance has to be challenged, in order to effectively stop male violence against women and children: ‘[w]ife battering will continue until the sexist society that maintains it is challenged and changed, even if individual men cease their violence toward their partners’ (Stordeur and Stille, 1989: 31-2).

As explained, the next chapter is going to examine the social construction of masculinity and the links between normative or hegemonic masculinity and male violence.
Chapter 4
The Study of Men and ‘Masculinity’

4.0: Introduction
It has been argued in previous chapters that male violence, and domestic violence in particular, is inextricably linked to normative masculinity, and thus in order to investigate this hypothesis the literature on masculinity is critically examined. Due to limitations of space, it is impossible to provide a complete taxonomy and critique of all the writing on men and masculinity, and thus this chapter will address the literature deriving from Men’s Studies and the Critical Studies of Men32 (McMahon, 1993; Robinson, 2003). It should also be noted that this chapter does not ‘deconstruct’ masculinity or analyse the efficacy of the various theoretical positions on the meanings and formations of masculinity. Instead it reviews the literature specifically in relation to its impact on and contribution to the understanding of male violence and how masculinity as the gendered behaviour of men is constructed in this literature.33

Since the 1970s there has been an explosion in the number of academic and populist publications on the subject of men and masculinity, debating and critiquing such issues as hegemonic and counter hegemonic masculinities, gender roles and behaviours, and critiques of the epistemological and methodological foundations of the various masculinity theories. Since the 1990s there has been an increase in the number of academic texts on masculinity and this has come largely from the UK, the USA, Scandinavia and Australia (Hearn, 1996a, 1998a, 1998b; MacInnes, 1998; Peterson, 1998; Pease, 2000; Pringle et al, 2001c; Connell, 2002; Collier, 2002; Hearn et al, 2002a; Robinson, 2003).34

32 This body of literature is not yet canonized within the academy and often the name for this literature is Critical Men’s Studies or Critical Studies on Men. Throughout this chapter, these names will be used interchangeably.
33 It is acknowledged that there is little explicit reference to class and ethnicity in this chapter but this is a reflection of the literature, rather than an omission of the author, although many of these writers do have an implicit understanding of the interconnections of class, ‘race’ and ethnicity, for example, on men’s gender identities (see Hill Collins, 1991; Archer et al, 2001).
34 An example of this is that the Research Directorate of the European Commission, under its Framework 5 Programme has funded a three-year project (2000-2003) entitled The Social Problem and Societal Problematisation of Men and Masculinities. This is conducting comparative work with
The literature on men and masculinities, however, is not homogenous and encompasses writings from theorists with disparate ideological positions. One such distinction is between those authors who write within the body of literature which has become known as Men's Studies (Brod, 1987a; 1987b; 1987c) and those who situate themselves within Critical Men's Studies (Hearn, 1987, 1998a, 1998b, Morgan, 1987, 1992; Hearn and Morgan, 1990a, 1990b; McMahon, 1993; Hearn and Collinson, 1994; Pringle 1995). The point of divergence between these two bodies of work lies in their identification with, or rejection of, feminist ideology and politics (Hearn, 1996a; Skelton, 1998; Archer et al, 2001). Pringle and colleagues argue that the difference between these two approaches is that the Critical Studies on Men 'are part of the broader project of Women's Studies and Gender Research, rather than competitive with them' (Pringle et al, 2001c: 3). One central problem identified with the Men's Studies literature is that either it does not engage with the feminist literature on men and masculinities or is anti-feminist (Hanmer, 1990; Robinson, 2003).

This chapter will therefore discuss the concepts of 'masculinity' and 'masculinites' and critically review the literature which focuses on masculinity and male violence and the relationship between them. It is argued that a feminist analysis is essential if this work is to be critical of men and masculinity rather than complicit in justifying or excusing male dominance and in relation, male violence against women. Furthermore, a central argument of this chapter is that many of the authors of the masculinity literature conceptually disemboby masculinity and problematise 'masculinity' to the exclusion of a critical focus on men and the behaviours of men (see Section 4.5).

4.1: Masculinity as a New Object of Social Research?
Historically, studies of 'masculinity' were posited mainly within the parameters of psychotherapy, socialpsychology and sociological developments (Connell, 1993, 1995). Predominantly in the USA, there was evidence of activist movements which Clatterbaugh charts as incorporating the following perspectives: the Conservative
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ten countries developing 'empirical, theoretical and policy outcomes on the gendering of men and masculinities' (Hearn et al, 2002a: 381).
Perspective; the Pro-feminist Perspective; the Men’s Rights Perspective; the Mythopoetic Perspective; the Socialist Perspective; Gay Male Perspective; African American Men’s Perspective; and the Evangelical Christian Men’s Movement (Clatterbaugh, 1997: 9). In the UK academic context, the movements which have had the most influence are the Pro-feminist, the Men’s Rights, the Socialist, and the Gay Perspectives (although politically the Men’s Rights lobby has had a very significant impact). Arguably the pro-feminist perspective has had the most influence regarding academic endeavours in the UK and, it is this literature which will be addressed in this chapter.

It is not strictly a ‘new’ endeavour for academic research to examine men and masculinity. Indeed feminists, amongst others, have argued that unless social research was specifically on women, as mothers for instance, it has always been implicitly centred on men and thus social research is, and has been, the study of men and masculinity (Kimmell, 1987; Hanmer, 1990; Mac an Ghaill, 1996; Archer et al, 2001; Hearn et al, 2002a). In response to this, Men’s Studies and Critical Studies on Men argue that they are examining men and masculinities explicitly and critically instead of assuming the ‘male as universal subject’ as previous social research has done (Brod, 1987a, 1987b, 1987c). Furthermore, Hearn and colleagues argue that the Critical Studies on Men have a critical focus which was previously absent:

> [f]or a long time, men, masculinity and men’s powers and practices were generally taken for granted. Gender was largely seen as a matter of and for women; men were generally seen as ungendered, natural, or naturalized. (Hearn et al, 2002a: 383)

Critics, both within and outside the parameters of Men’s Studies and the Critical Studies on Men, are cognisant that this research could be perceived as yet more work focusing on men, to the exclusion of research on women (Hearn et al, 2002a). Hearn (1999, 2001) is sceptical of the rationale for men researching men and argues that within the context of the unequal distribution of power it is not in men’s best interests to focus critically on themselves. Seidler warns that this research may be far from critical and may become yet another example of the ‘oppressors organising themselves’ (Seidler, 1991: 23).
If men have been involved in the construction of a world that is simultaneously a world of and for men and a world which allows men to disappear into an undifferentiated humanity, how can these self-same men subject this world to critical inquiry? And if they do engage in this kind of enquiry is there not the danger that this will become another construction, part of the continuous outpouring of men into a man-made world? (Morgan, 1992: 2)

Morgan argues, therefore, that it is essential to remain critical of the literature on men and masculinities, including the literature that professes to be pro/feminist (Morgan, 1992). However, Morgan also argues that it is possible for men to produce critical work on gender, men and masculinity and argues that it is indeed necessary for men to do so because it recognises ‘one’s own complicity in systems of sexual oppression’ (Morgan, 1992: 22).

If male violence is to be examined then this clearly involves an analysis of men, or masculinity, because as Dobash and Dobash comment, ‘it is not possible to effectively address men’s violence if we know nothing about it’ (Dobash and Dobash, 1998b: 142). Thus, Hearn and Collinson argue that it is legitimate and necessary to make men and masculinity the explicit objects of social research but with the qualification that there has to be a recognition of the power invested with men and the power relations between men and women (Hearn and Collinson, 1994). Hearn (1987) is cognisant of the potential for complicity in producing non-critical work which may justify or excuse men’s violence based on analyses and discussion of ‘male gender behaviour’. He thus suggests that before men write or study men and masculinity, they should acknowledge and adhere to a set of ‘ground-rules’ which conform to a pro-feminist theoretical perspective in order to limit the potential of anti-woman and pro-patriarchal research which will perpetuate, rather than challenge, the power relationships between men and women (Hearn, 1987). The first of the five ‘ground-rules’ argues that Men’s Studies scholars must not appropriate feminism, feminist theory or Women’s Studies; secondly that Men’s Studies must welcome male and female scholars and further that ‘the forms, procedures, findings and theories of Men’s Studies must be open to women’s scrutiny, criticism and guidance’; thirdly, that Men’s Studies does not develop as a critique of feminism but as a critique of men’s practices; fourthly that it should be cross disciplinary; and finally that all of the authors need to ‘subject our own practice to scrutiny’ (Hearn, 1987: 181). Therefore, Hearn (1987) and Hearn and Morgan (1990b) argue that
there have to be structures in place to ensure that work produced in this field does not collude with pro-patriarchal and anti-feminist ideology and challenges the power relations between men and women (see also Canaan and Griffin, 1990).

4.2: Definitions of Masculinity

Whilst the central unit of analysis of this chapter is studies on men and masculinity, there remains a level of ambiguity over precise definitions of the terminology of ‘masculinity’ (Segal, 1990; McMahon, 1993; MacInnes, 1998; Hearn et al, 2002a; Pringle et al, 2001c). Not only is there a lack of a cohesive and concrete definition of ‘masculinity’, more significantly, there is a distinct absence of a debate and discussion over this very issue. McMahon finds it significant ‘how seldom writers on masculinity explicitly indicate what kind of concept they take masculinity to be’ (McMahon, 1993: 690).

Kimmel argues that despite the different characteristics which constitute masculinity the most significant identification is that of not being a woman (Kimmel, 1994). Therefore the definition of masculinity is often predicated upon what it is not, rather than what it is: ‘[w]hatever the variations by race, class, age, ethnicity, or sexual orientation, being a man means “not being like women”’ (Kimmel, 1994: 126; see also Chapters 7 and 9).

Therefore, just as sex categories are inherently relational (see Chapter 1), so are the constructions of masculinity and femininity, because one concept has no meaning without the other as a reference point (Brittan, 1989). Horrocks agrees that masculinity and femininity are relational but his argument suggests that it is a reciprocal relationship whereby, ‘the masculine and feminine determine each other, are in a relationship with each other’ (Horrocks, 1994: 2). This definition, however, diminishes the influence of power and obscures the fact that as the powerful dominant gender, masculinity can define, or construct, masculinity as the ‘norm’ and femininity as the ‘other’ (de Beauvoir, 1974 [1949]; Connell, 1990; Thompson, 2001).
Masculinity and femininity are not complementary characteristics, attached, rigidly or otherwise, to their respective sexes. Rather, they constitute a value hierarchy whereby the male individual has the right to his own autonomous 'human' status and the benefits which flow from that. (Thompson, 2001: 46)

Kimmel also argues that a definition of masculinity is 'not being like women' but argues that it is feminists/women who have the power to define their gender and thus masculinity is 'reactive' to definitions of femininity (Kimmel, 1987: 123). In response to this, Ferber argues that if this is the case then it is because constructions of masculinity benefit men and thus, masculinity is reactive because there is no incentive or motivation to be proactive or instrumental in change (Ferber, 2000).

McMahon argues that many 'definitions' of masculinity are actually prescriptions for what it should be and 'are really descriptions of popular ideologies about the actual or ideal characteristics of men' (McMahon, 1993: 691; Chapter 7). Segal reiterates the point that whilst definitions of masculinity may appear to be more sophisticated, they are as lacking in definitional content as ever: '[m]ost of the new books on masculinity constantly emphasise complexity and contradiction. Yet they spend little time exploring its specific nature and significance' (Segal, 1990: x).

Additionally, whilst many of the definitions provided for masculinity acknowledge that masculinity is more than the accumulation of physical characteristics they underestimate the significance of power to masculinity. Indeed, in a society with a gendered hierarchy, power is integral to how masculinity is conceptualised and expressed and has individual and institutional ramifications:

[in a world dominated by men, the world of men is, by definition, a world of power. That power is a structured part of the economies and systems of political and social organisations ... On an individual level, much of what we associate with masculinity hinges on a man's capacity to exercise power and control. (Kaufman, 1994: 142)

As a basic definition of gender constructions, Brittan argues that, 'gender will reflect the material interests of those who have power and those who do not' (Brittan, 1989: 3). Thus, any analysis of gender, and particularly those concentrating on male gender behaviour and constructions, must have a clear analysis of power central to its understandings and critique because, as Hearn argues, masculinity is enmeshed in power issues (Hearn, 1987, 1999, 2001).
4.3: Masculinities

Many of the writers on masculinity argue that it is more appropriate to refer to masculinities, in the plural rather than the singular, as a means of reflecting the 'complexity, fragmentation and differentiation which exist between the diverse lives of men, as well as the continuities which unite them' (Collier, 2002: 738; see Carrigan et al, 1987; Brittan, 1989; Segal, 1990; Morgan, 1992). Carrigan and colleagues (1987) argue that the competing and diverse manifestations of masculinities, in addition to the multiple forms and expressions of masculinity, necessitates the usage of masculinities. Morgan also advocates the use of masculinities as he argues that it safeguards against any essentialism and prevents a reification of any one monolithic masculinity (Morgan, 1992). However, whilst Hearn and Collinson advocate the usage of the plural, they express the concern that recognition of the pluralities of masculinity can lead to a 'diversified pluralism with insufficient attention to structures of power and oppression' (Hearn and Collinson, 1994: 113).

The development and usage of the plural recognises that there are multiple expressions of masculinity, which may not necessarily be complementary. Indeed many of the masculinity authors argue that there are different hierarchies of masculinity which are manifest in subordinated, marginalized and hegemonic forms, for example (Segal, 1990; Connell, 1995). Jackson argues that there have been four fundamental developments in the study of masculinity with the emphasis on the pluralities of masculine identities: '(i) masculine identities are historically and culturally situated; (ii) multiple masculinities exist; (iii) there are dominant (hegemonic) and subordinate forms of masculinities; and (iv) masculinities are actively constructed in social settings' (Jackson, 2002: 39).

The possibilities of alternative forms of masculine gender constructions are central to this thesis because this facilitates the possibilities of masculinities which are not complicit in violence. On a general level this also substantiates the argument made in Chapter 1 that gender roles must be socially constructed if they can take multiple forms.
4.4: Hegemonic Masculinity

Connell is credited with developing the concept of hegemonic masculinity, which has been widely applied in the masculinities literature (Carrigan et al, 1985; Connell, 1987, 1993, 1994, 1995). The concept of hegemony is derived from the writings of Antonio Gramsci working on class relations (Gramsci, 1971). Connell (1995: 77) defines hegemony as 'the cultural dynamic by which a group claims and sustains a leading position in social life' and as Gramsci argued, once hegemony is established it continuously has to reassert itself to maintain its status (Gramsci, 1971). Connell, like Gramsci, recognises that there has to be power behind the implementation of the hegemonic ideal in order for it to be applied and established (Connell, 1995; Archer et al, 2001). Gramsci and Connell both recognise, however, that what identifies a hegemonic status is its ability to assert and establish itself, so that it becomes a normalised, integrated facet of society: 'hegemony is likely to be established only if there is some correspondence between cultural ideal and institutional power, collective if not individual ... It is the successful claim to authority, ... that is the mark of hegemony' (Connell, 1995: 77). There is, however, almost a paradox implicit in this analysis because the state has to incorporate and propagate hegemonic masculinity whilst at the same time exercising control over it when for instance, male violence is too extreme (Connell, 1994; see Section 3.0, Chapter 3).

The significance of the use of hegemonic masculinity is that it represents a shift from a theoretical conceptualisation of men as a monolithic discrete group with shared interests and experiences and develops, 'towards a conception of men as reproducing, reworking and resisting multiple and conflicting forms of masculinity' (Gough and Peace, 2000: 386). This analysis of masculinity allows for considerations of power and how masculinity intersects, supports and competes with sexuality, 'race', class and gender, for example (Messner, 1998; Gough and Peace, 2000; Archer et al, 2001). Such an analysis aligns itself to a constructionist view of gender, as opposed to a biological analysis, and facilitates an understanding of masculinity as something that men 'do' rather than what men 'are' in an essentialist understanding of the term (Morgan, 1992).

One of the significant characteristics of hegemonic masculinity is its ability to be malleable towards what is favoured within the particular socio-economic and
political climate. This leads Connell to argue that it is therefore a ‘historically mobile relation’ (Connell, 1995: 77) and is also ‘vulnerable to displacement by other forms [of masculinity]’ (Connell, 1993: 603). In relation to this, hegemonic masculinity must be understood as a multidimensional phenomenon. Furthermore, this hegemony, within a patriarchal context, serves to perpetuate a gender order that supports the dominance of men over women (Connell, 1990, 1993).

Hegemonic masculinity can be defined as the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women. (Connell, 1995: 77)

If it is accepted that gender is socially constructed, then it follows that normative or hegemonic ‘types' of masculinity are similarly constructed. However, the constructions of normative and hegemonic masculinity are of such a reified and idealised form that many men actually fail to meet the standards:

[w]ithin the dominant culture, the masculinity that defines white, middle-class, early middle-aged, heterosexual men is the masculinity that sets the standards for other men, against which other men are measured and, more often than not, found wanting. (Kimmel, 1994: 124)

Whilst hegemonic masculinity reflects the lived reality of a minority of men, Connell argues that the significance of hegemonic masculinity is not related to the actual numbers of men who embody this type of masculinity, instead, its power lies in its ideological influence whereby ‘[h]egemony is a question of relations of cultural domination, not of head-counts’ (Connell, 1993: 610). Connell also argues that hegemonic constructions of masculinity may also be narrow and ethnocentric which results in, ‘a discourse of “masculinity” [being] constructed out of the lives of (at most) 5% of the world’s population of men, in one culture-area, at one moment in history’ (Connell, 1993: 600). In relation to this, Hearn reflects: ‘I begin to wonder to what extent masculinity is an ethnocentric or even Eurocentric notion’ (Hearn, 1996a: 209). In this analysis therefore, whilst many men do not conform to hegemonic masculinity, the power and ideological influence of the hegemonic standard ensures that many men benefit from its existence (in relation to women) in terms of the perpetuation of patriarchy, and reap the ‘patriarchal dividend’ (Connell, 1995, 1998). However, in reality, men who do not meet the proscriptions of the
white, middle class, heterosexual, male 'norm,' particularly in Western capitalist society, warrant disapproval and recrimination (Hearn, 1996a). Without denying the impact these other factors may have (in terms of men's access to power), it nevertheless remains that, men retain a level of power over women, whereby 'powerlessness in one arena does not preclude having considerable influence elsewhere' (Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994, cited in Pringle, 1995: 5). According to Kimmel and Kaufman, even those men situated within the most powerful echelons of society do not regard themselves as holding, or having access to, power:

... many middle class, white, middle-aged heterosexual men - among the most privileged groups in the history of the world - do not experience themselves as powerful. Ironically, although these men are everywhere in power, that aggregate power of that group does not translate into an individual sense of feeling empowered. In fact, this group feels quite powerless. (Kimmel and Kaufman, 1995: 18, cited in Ferber 2000: 31)

Thus, whilst hegemonic masculinity may only reflect the masculine reality of a small proportion of men, and some men may benefit more than others, it nevertheless remains that hegemonic masculinity benefits most men, to the extent that it penalizes most women. Indeed, in the quotation below, Hearn criticises Brod for accepting that some men do not feel powerful as though this in some way negates the overall power dimension of masculinity:

Brod (1987) suggests: 'Men's Studies de-powers the masculine mystique by shedding light on its true nature revealing it to be vulnerable and mutable' (p57). This might refer to the supposed vulnerability of individual men, yet that might easily coexist with the structural powers of men. Individuals may feel vulnerable, even be mutable, may even crack up, but men's control of violence, armies, states, capital, the police and so on, does not require this of the entire population of men, as long as the majority do not feel especially vulnerable for most of the time. (Hearn, 1989: 675)

Discussions of hegemonic masculinity should at least contain a recognition of the effects that it has on women's lives, as much as it does on men's. Morgan further argues that 'the point about the construction of hegemonic masculinity is, ultimately, in relation to the control and domination of women' (Morgan, 1992: 202) and, it could be added, that it also structures power relations amongst men.

35 It is beyond the parameters of this thesis to critique or analyse how non-hegemonic forms of masculinity are incorporated into the analysis of masculinity, although Chapter 5 discusses this issue more fully.
However, the key point is that if power is the central defining feature of hegemonic masculinity then in the context of this research it is the ability to exert that power through violence if it is required, or wanted, which is significant. Indeed, the literature in the following chapter on young people and the data from the young people in the empirical research identifies that the concept of hegemonic masculinity is centrally important. Furthermore it is implicitly understood by both the young men and young women in the literature and the empirical research that violence and aggression is constitutive of hegemonic masculinity. Thus, power is symbolised and exerted through access to, or enacted, violence.

4.5: The Theoretical Separation of Masculinity from Men

A central problem identified with much of the masculinity literature is the tendency for ‘masculinity’ to be reified as some kind of autonomous ‘thing-in-itself’. This disembodying and hypostatisation is highly significant because it partly explains the confusion surrounding definitions and applications of masculinity, and it is also particularly problematic in relation to analyses of male violence.

McMahon argues that the result of this hypostatisation is that the focus is drawn away from the material reality of men’s behaviour and interactions and instead the focus is relocated onto a constructed theoretical concept of ‘masculinity’ (McMahon, 1993). In a similar critique, Hearn (1996a) also argues for the need to refocus attention back from ‘masculinity’ and onto ‘men’. Hearn also argues that it is men’s practices that are problematic and thus, instead of attributing some kind of causal power onto ‘masculinity’, ‘men’ should be the focus of analysis and men’s ‘material discursive practices’ should be problematised and analysed (Hearn, 1996a: 214). This ‘theoretical separation’ of masculinity from men has profound implications and it is argued that this is a fundamental limitation in Men’s Studies (and, at times, the

36 In this quotation, McMahon is critiquing the writings of Michael Kimmel (1986).
Critical Studies on Men). The crucial problem is not with the phenomenon of 'masculinity' as a disembodied construction, but with men's 'material discursive practices' especially when manifest as violence against women. Thus, a critique of the behaviour of men is needed, rather than, or at least in conjunction with, a critique of the theory of 'masculinity': 'to say that the problem with gender relations is the way in which masculinity is constructed, with the solution a "reconstruction of masculinity" is to displace theoretical attention from men's political practices' (McMahon 1993:692).

4.6: Male Violence

The discussion of the hypostatisation of masculinity is of utmost importance in the debate about sexual violence. Within the masculinity literature, there is a lack of a sustained acknowledgment of male violence in general, and male violence against women in particular (there are, however, a few notable exceptions, see Hearn, 1987, 1996b, 1996c, 1996d, 1998a, 1998b; Morgan, 1992; Messerschmidt, 1993; Godenzi, 1994; see also Stanko, 1994).

Hearn is one author who engages with male violence in his analyses of masculinity and is unequivocal in his anti-male violence position (Hearn, 1987, 1996b, 1996c, 1996d, 1998a). Hearn argues that violence is an integral constituent of normative masculinity and thus deserves more critical focus than many masculinity theorists presently afford it: 'much of men's violence needs to be understood as ... forms or examples of particular masculinities' (Hearn, 1999: 160) and relatedly that '[a] lot of what men do needs to be re-labelled as violence' (Hearn, 2001: 17).

Hearn is critical of those masculinity writers who do not incorporate an account of violence in their analyses, because, as argued, violence is overwhelmingly a male activity and 'to omit violence from the theorizing of men is to leave aside one of the fundamental elements in the dominant formations of men' (Hearn, 1998b: 785). Kaufman also recognises the centrality of male violence to masculinity, and argues that instead of 'male violence' it should be conceptualised as 'men's violences' because the term 'male violence' potentially essentialises all men as violent (Kaufman, 1994: 161). It is also argued that 'men's violences' is a more appropriate
term because it explicitly states that individual men are the perpetrators of this violence and that violence can take multiple forms. Hearn also argues that male violence should be named and conceptualised as 'men's violences' or the 'violences of men' because these terms recognise violence as done by men and not by 'masculinity' (Hearn, 1998a). Hearn provides four reasons for this naming strategy: firstly that 'it attributes the violence to men'; secondly that 'it removes any assumption of biological inevitability'; thirdly that 'it removes any ambiguity that there is a special form of violence that is "male"' and finally that 'it acknowledges the plurality of men's violences' (Hearn, 1998a: 4).

Thus, central to many of these arguments is that male sexual violence should not be approached as though it were an unusual and dissentient act. Instead, it should be regarded as constitutive of hegemonic masculinity whereby acts of violence are in themselves compliant with normative masculinity: 'violence is not a deviant act; it is a conforming one' (Toomey 1992 cited in Hatty, 2000: 1). However, it should be reiterated that this is not suggesting that male violence is an essentialist characteristic which is biologically determined, instead it is being argued that violence against women is an elected expression of masculinity. Pringle (1995) argues that violence is 'behaviour chosen by men, and is the product of choice within a structural context of hierarchical power arrangements' (cited in Hearn, 1998a: 35, emphasis in original). Similarly, for Hearn it is 'a social choice, a clear intention to do harm, for which men are individually responsible' (Hearn, 1998a: 210). Thus, male violence is deliberate and purposive and is acculturated into definitions of normative masculinity (even though this violence may be rejected by other men and may not be recognised as a choice by those who use it):

the experience of violence is socially routine and routinised for men, such that the reference to violence (men's violence) is that which forms and informs the category of men of which men, individual men, are a part. The category of 'men' is a social one and not a natural or biologically determined one. (Hearn, 1998a: 209, emphasis in original)

It is precisely this routinisation and acculturation of male violence as an expression of masculinity that makes it so problematic. Indeed, in relation to this point, Hearn argues that 'violence is a reference point for the production of boys and men' (Hearn,
1998a: 7). Indeed, it is the very regularity and normalcy of this violence which suggests that it is not deviant behaviour:

That sexual violence is so pervasive supports the view that the locus of violence rests squarely in the middle of what our culture defines as "normal" interaction between men and women. (Johnson, 1988: 146, cited in Kelly and Radford, 1998: 63)

Paradoxically, the more prevalent, common and normalised male violence becomes the more it escapes criticism. Hearn (1998a) argues that this is what facilitated the lack of critical focus on male sexual violence including both domestic violence and other manifestations of male violence against women (see Chapters 2 and 3):

as men do more violence, they are able to diminish previous violences, in terms of both their impact and their recognition as violence. Doing more violence may both diminish consciousness of violence and lead to increasing ways of accounting for violence. As men do more violence, ... it becomes more taken-for-granted as part of their ordinary life rather than something exceptional. (Hearn, 1998a: 202)

Thus, the contradiction is that as feminists are demanding more critical enquiry into male violence due to the prevalence and incidence of it (see Chapter 2) it is also because of this very prevalence that men's sexual violence almost becomes de-problematised. For instance, it could be argued that domestic violence was trivialised by the police as a 'domestic' incident because of the prevalence, every-day occurrence and normalisation of such violence and abuse of women by their husbands/partners. In other words, men being abusive/violent towards their female spouse was just what men did and hence was not a concern for the police.

Godenzi argues that male violence 'is an elementary structural and cultural element of a patriarchal society' (Godenzi, 1994: 135). Radford and Stanko also emphasise the normalcy and assimilation of male violence into the culture of patriarchy, and argue that it is 'one of the defining characteristics of patriarchal societies' and is 'central to the patriarchal social order' (Radford and Stanko, 1996: 65-77). Therefore, whilst the violence of individual men is of immediate importance, not least of all for the victims of it, it is the collective male access to violence and abuse as a resource and as a characteristic of normative masculinity which is of concern: 'in a male dominated society, abusive behaviour can be rewarding to men as it
maintains their position of dominance and in some contexts enhances their social status' (Lees, 1996: 210).

Whilst there has been an explosion of publications about 'masculinity' it nevertheless remains that male violence, and particularly male violence towards women, has been largely neglected in this literature (with the exceptions of the authors mentioned above). Hearn argues that the relative paucity of critical writing on men's violences by masculinity authors may be deliberate because the levels of male violence are so prevalent that to challenge such a customary aspect of masculinity could potentially problematise many other aspects of normative/hegemonic masculinity:

... to focus on men and men's violence to women, unsettles, makes problematic, the way men are, not just in the doing of particular actions of violence but also more generally. It raises question marks against men's behaviour in general. (Hearn, 1998a: 6)

4.7: Conclusion

Whilst the discussion and debates on men and masculinity, and their relationship to gender constructions and power, are much needed, the concern is that these studies are not consistently critical and may in fact contribute to patriarchal literature supporting, excusing or naturalising male dominance. It is also argued that there is a lack of critical attention directed towards understanding and recognising male violence against women. However these studies, which do exist, are a valuable beginning in the development of an understanding and critique of male violence.

In relation to this study, one of the most concerning aspects is the disembodying of masculinity from men, particularly in relation to male violence, both for men as perpetrators and women as 'embodied' victims. This disembodiment facilitates a situation whereby men are absolved of blame, responsibility or accountability for their violence (or any other undesirable behaviour) and it is masculinity which is problematised. With respect to male violence this is of particular concern as it removes culpability from men, and if men are not held accountable then it becomes feasible to relocate the blame onto other people or to external factors (see Chapters 2,

37 There is much more literature on men's violence towards other men.
3, 8 and 9). As Hearn as argued, we should be examining men's 'material discursive practices' and not 'masculinities' as though 'it' could act of its own accord (Hearn 1996a: 214). It is argued that strictly focusing on 'masculinity' is a political strategy which absolves men of their responsibility for their violence, and critics of masculinity who 'disembody' masculinities are complicit in this exoneration (McMahon, 1993). It is therefore of utmost importance that causal power is not attributed to masculinity because it is men's behaviour and practices, particularly when manifest as sexual violence, which are problematic (Hearn, 1996a

The next chapter will examine the literature written specifically on young people and masculinity and will have as its central focus of analysis male violence against women.
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Young People and the Construction of 'Masculinity'

5.0: Introduction
The focus of this chapter is on young people’s conceptualisations of masculinity and the relationship between masculinity and male violence. The first sections of this chapter focus on gender role acquisition and how the various hegemonic, pseudo-hegemonic and subordinate masculinities impact on each other. In this part of the chapter there is a greater emphasis on sexuality, which was only briefly discussed in Chapter 4, and as before, 'race', ethnicity and class, are understood as profoundly influential factors in people’s lives, but constrictions of space prohibit discussion of these issues (Willis, 1977; Mac an Ghaill, 1994, 1996; Canaan, 1996; Frosh et al, 2002). The latter sections concentrate more on male violence and refer to the literature in order to analyse how young people regard male violence, how it impacts on their lives as young men/women and how they see it influencing their lives as adults. Throughout this chapter, the focus remains on how masculinity and male violence are interconnected and how young people perceive this connection.

The previous chapter argued that there has been an increase in the numbers of studies focusing on men and masculinity and this literature was reviewed and critiqued within the context of male violence. This is also done in this chapter but the literature on young people and masculinity has less of a focus on male violence than that found in the masculinities literature.

Much of the literature on young people and masculinities has an educational and schooling emphasis, which is pertinent with respect to the empirical research of this thesis which was conducted with pupils in secondary schools in Glasgow (see Chapters 6, 7 and 8). However, this literature is not strictly relevant because the process of schooling, and educational programmes are not the object of analysis in this research project. Schools are important because this is where young people often solidify, or explore, their gender roles and, '[s]chooling has come to be viewed both as an important site for the reproduction of gender relations and as a site for
intervention and change' (Aveling, 2002: 267). Schools, however, are not neutral sites, but are enmeshed with deep ideological beliefs about gender and gender roles. Pringle and Raynor argue that 'schools themselves are central locations for the generation of patriarchal discourses and practices' (Pringle and Raynor, 2001: 9; see also Epstein, 1997; Equal Opportunities Commission, 1998, 2001; Skelton and Hall, 2001).

The literature reviewed in this chapter is used to investigate how young men develop their masculine identities and the ways in which their masculinity impacts on their perceptions of male violence. Much of the literature, therefore, concentrates on young men/boys but there are some studies which are inclusive of girls (and the empirical research undertaken for this thesis involved both young men/boys and young women/girls, see Chapters 6, 7 and 8).

It should also be acknowledged that it is beyond the remit of this chapter to analyse the process of youth and bio/psycho/sociological maturation and development. This chapter will use the definition of 'youth' provided by O'Donnell and Sharpe: '[y]outh is both a biological and a social category, it is a period of physical and mental maturation and of learning about society and about what society expects of its individual members' (O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000: 3-4). Furthermore, the terms 'boys' and 'young men' will be used interchangeably which reflects 'a considerable amount of ambiguity in the literature' (Frosh et al, 2002: 1). Developing Frosh and colleagues' emphasis, and in line with O'Donnell and Sharpe's analysis, the conceptualisation of this stage in life reflects 'a period mainly in the teenage years in which boys are becoming acculturated, or acculturating themselves, into increasingly salient masculine identities' (Frosh et al, 2002: 1).

5.1: The Context of the Literature on Young People and Masculinity

In the late 1980s and 1990s a dominant, and populist, rhetoric was that boys were in 'crisis'. This was typified by the Home Secretary, Jack Straw, pronouncing that 'the main social issue of our time pertain[s] to the behaviour and role of young men' (Straw, 1999, cited in O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000: 1). O'Donnell and Sharpe
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(2000) catalogue the list of concerns about boys in this period (1980s and 1990s) ranging from: boys’ ‘underachievement’ in school, which was indicated through girls gaining better school grades;\textsuperscript{38} the consequential ‘under-qualified’ boys’ struggle for employment; the crime levels of boys (three times higher than the level for girls); and the increase in the suicide rates for young men which has doubled since 1976 and which is much higher than the levels for young women (O’Donnell and Sharpe, 2000; Jackson, 2002).

Whilst these issues were evident, and debated, in the media there was also an increase in academic research on young men/boys, and indeed much of the media coverage of these issues stemmed from academic research (see Skelton, 1998). In many respects, for the first time, young men and masculinity were problematised on a much broader level, contrary to the previous research which had critiqued masculinity in relation to young working class or young black men, for instance (Willis, 1977; Mac an Ghaill, 1994, 1996b; Canaan, 1996; Frosh \textit{et al}, 2002). The problematisation of masculinity is not the same as a critique of masculinity, but often these interconnected endeavours become interchangeable with each other, and are almost regarded as synonymous. There is also a tendency in this literature towards a separation between theoretical debates about gender constructions, and between what

\textsuperscript{38} Skelton has a summary of the media reporting of the development of the claim of boys’ underachievement:

"With regard to schooling, media interest has focused on boys’ ‘underachievement’ in terms of academic qualifications, with particular attention being given to the attitudes and behaviours of working-class boys. Since 1995 the Times Educational Supplement (TES) has carried, almost on a weekly basis, some report or article which refers to boys’ poor motivations towards schoolwork. The arguments put forward to explain boys’ underachievement have derived from research studies, individual school initiatives, Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) and School Curriculum and Assessment Authority (SCAA) reports, as well as personal viewpoints. These different sources offer a variety of explanations but two overriding themes are evident; those arguments located within wider social change and those which look to the curriculum, pedagogy and practices of the school. For example, changes in employment patterns, the economy and the family are all said to have impacted upon traditional forms of (working-class) masculinity (TES, 12 January 1996, 12 March 1996, 10 January 1997)." (Skelton, 1998: 217).

The Equal Opportunities Commission conducted research in this area and found that: ‘[b]oth boys and girls have improved their performance at GCSE and Standard Grade, but girls’ performance has increased more rapidly than boys’. Boys are performing less well than girls in most subjects’ (Equal Opportunities Commission, 1998: 1). A recent report in the Guardian (August, 14\textsuperscript{th} 2003) states that the 2003 ‘A’ and ‘AS’ level results show that girls are still performing better than boys and that they are ‘increasing their lead over their male rivals’. The general secretary of the National Union of Teachers, Doug McAvoy, is quoted as saying: ‘Girls continue to out-perform boys, and more enter for these examinations. It is essential that these differences are investigated by the Education Department. It is not sufficient just to put it down to laddish behaviour and leave it at that’ (Smithers, 2003). It could also be suggested that there is a lack of previous comparable data and that perhaps girls have always outperformed boys.
it actually means for young men to be masculine and how they construct, apply and make sense of, their masculinity (Frosh et al, 2002).

A problem with the earlier literature on young people is related to the neglect of gender difference. Much of this research was conducted in schools and the resultant data with male school pupils tended to be universalised and presented as data relevant for all school pupils both male and female, although this gender blindness is much less evident in the more contemporary research in this area.

By the late 1970s feminist educationists were pointing to the inappropriateness of studies of schooling which drew conclusions about ‘school pupils’ but were actually studies of boys’ subcultures (McRobbie, 1978; Llewellyn, 1980; Fuller, 1980; Acker, 1981). For example, anti- and pro-school values and orientations were the subject of Hargreaves’s (1967) research, which was set in an English boys’ secondary modern, and Lacey’s (1970) study of an English boys’ grammar school. Similarly, explorations of ‘counter-school’ culture demonstrated a male bias, as Willis’s (1977) study was located in a boys’ secondary modern school in England and Corrigan’s (1979) research was conducted solely on a group of boys in a comprehensive school in the north-east of England. (Skelton, 1998: 218)

In relation to this thesis it is significant that, in the academic research on young men and masculinity, there is insufficient attention paid to male violence which is problematic considering the levels of sexual violence, as well as other forms of violence, committed by boys and young men (see Kelly et al, 1991; Kenway and Fitzclarence, 1997; Burton and Kitzinger, 1998; Holland et al, 1998; Dublin Women’s Aid, 1999; Mullender et al, 2002; see this chapter and Chapters 8 and 9).

5.2: Gender Role Acquisition
Recent research commissioned by the Equal Opportunities Commission on Young People and Sex Stereotyping (2001) found that young people still have very traditional attitudes towards women’s and men’s roles framed within a male dominance model (see Chapter 7). In this analysis, women are still regarded as the main care givers with primary responsibility for domestic chores (see Skelton and Hall, 2001). Sharpe (1994) argues that schools are complicit in this sex role stereotyping, through sexist attitudes and curriculum orientation, whereby girls tend to be ‘schooled’ for a domestic role which is often, in addition to an occupational role (see also Griffin, 1985):
[girls’] upbringing in the family prepares them for ‘femininity’, their education reinforces the sex divisions through school organization, and the curriculum teaches them ‘skills’ suitable for ‘women’s work’ in which they encounter some measure of discrimination throughout all parts of the occupational structure. Popular ideas and beliefs still see all but the most talented (and usually middle class) women as primarily wives and mothers, while at the same time acknowledging that today a large proportion of women are regularly employed. (Sharpe, 1994: xi)

Nayak and Kehily (1996) similarly argue that schools do not just ‘reflect’ the gender constructions displayed in society but are active agents in perpetuating gender role (and power) dichotomies whereby, ‘schools can be seen as sites for the production of gendered/sexualised identities, not simply agencies that passively reflect dominant power relations’ (Nayak and Kehily, 1996: 212, emphasis in original).

In the research with young people cited in this chapter, the authors concur that the boys tend to hold much more traditional attitudes towards the roles of men and women, than the girls (Griffin, 1985; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Sharpe, 1994; O’Donnell and Sharpe, 2000). O’Donnell and Sharpe (2000) refer to a ‘cultural lag’ in the different attitudes between boys and girls towards the roles of women and men, with the girls holding much more egalitarian opinions and the boys being much more traditional.

The boys’ often conservative attitudes and assumptions about marriage and the domestic division of labour highlighted this sense of a ‘time warp’ between them and the girls, within which they had not quite come to terms with the changing realities of gender relations and power structures. (O’Donnell and Sharpe, 2000: 7)

The traditional attitudes of the boys have consequences for how they regard themselves in relation to girls, in relation to other boys, and also how they see themselves in future adult relationships. O’Donnell and Sharpe found that the boys had more progressive attitudes towards women’s status in the workplace but had much more traditional views with respect to women’s domestic roles: ‘[t]hey [the boys] seemed to find it easy to acknowledge women’s right to have good jobs but harder to accept them having equal status in the family’ (O’Donnell and Sharpe, 2000: 8). One of the research questions which O’Donnell and Sharpe asked their respondents and which demonstrated the differential attitudes towards familial roles, was with respect to the statement ‘The father is the most important person in the home’. They found that ‘a quarter of each of the white and the African-Caribbean boys, together with nearly half the Asian boys, still thought this was true’ whereas
almost all of the girls in their study strongly disagreed with the statement (O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000: 111). Connell (1995) argues that men benefit from traditional heterosexual relationships and reap the 'patriarchal dividend' and thus, it could be argued that boys are more traditional in their views because they are aware of the benefits to them of heterosexual interpersonal relationships (see Section 1.1, Chapter 1 and Chapter 3). This contrasts with the research findings on girls in O'Donnell and Sharpe's study, which found that the girls had 'lowered their expectations and respect for marriage' (O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000: 91). The girls' circumspect attitudes towards marriage may be related to an awareness of the expectations of their roles and the concomitant duties of domesticity (although arguably, many girls and women still aspire to marriage). The young people in Mac an Ghaill's research reported that they thought that women were still expected to be the primary homemakers and the attitude was that if men, or boys, performed any domestic tasks it was seen as them 'helping out' (Mac an Ghaill, 1994). The following excerpt from one of the interviews conducted by Mac an Ghaill typifies the young women's views on this (M.M is Mac an Ghaill):

Dawn: That's one of the main things you learn as a girl, you have to look after other people. Like at home my older sister brought me up and now I'm the one looking after my gran.

M.M: Why do you think that is?

Julie: Girls have to look after men all their lives. My dad and brothers can do nothing for themselves. We have bad rows about it. My mom says there's not much you can do about it but me and my sisters argue with them and my brothers are changing a bit.

Sam: I think a lot of the new men types, like my mom's partner, they talk about sharing domestic responsibilities. But you know that it's not true. In fact like all these things what's different about middle-class fellas compared to other men is that they are more dishonest.

M.M: And would that be true for all middle-class men?

Sam: It's probably changing with boys our age. I think that it's different with my brother because my mum and me have different expectations about what men should do. He does a lot more of the housework. But you have to keep at him to do it. It's also because he's younger than me. It will be interesting to see if he changes when he's in his own place with a girlfriend. (Mac an Ghaill, 1994: 115)

Concurrent with the ideology of women as primary homemakers is the perception of men as the primary 'breadwinner' and this male breadwinner model contributes to a continued construction of women as dependent (Head, 1999; Visser, 2002). The research literature finds that young boys tend to embrace traditional notions of the
relational roles of men and women more strongly than the girls, and that these roles are enmeshed in this male dominance model (see above and Chapter 7).

Associated with the male breadwinner model is the perspective that women and men occupy different spheres in the public and private arenas (see Section 3.1, Chapter 3). According to Griffin, the young people in her sample accepted, and naturalised, the differences between women and men and the occupation of separate spheres. These attitudes were based on reflecting their own experiences of school and their understandings and perceptions of adult relationships (Griffin, 1985). Whilst it could be argued that ideologies and beliefs have progressed since Griffin's study, the data in Chapter 7, and Frosh and colleagues 2002 study, found that the young people in their sample also believed that men and women should, and do, occupy separate spheres, and have different roles (Griffin, 1985; Frosh et al, 2002). Frosh's study found that not only were women comprehended as 'different' from men, but they were also seen as unequal (Frosh et al, 2002).

Mandel and Shakeshaft (2000) similarly argue that their research (with high school students in the USA) found a strong demarcation between men and women and that these differentiations were clearly enmeshed with notions of male dominance and heterosexuality. They argue that these conceptualisations of masculinity and femininity, and the subsequent 'appropriate' roles which young people/adults adopt, are 'harmful' for young people in four ways:

1. Boys learn that masculinity means to reject feminine behaviors and attributes, contributing to misogyny and homophobia.
2. Girls continue to face pressures to be beautiful, attractive, and sexy ... and thus grow into young adulthood believing appearance is their primary (or only) attribute.
3. Large numbers of girls literally struggle to identify positive aspects of being female; few boys struggle to identify positive aspects of being male.
4. Adolescents must contend with being "straight" [heterosexual] in junior high school, the assumption [is] that one is presumed to be heterosexual unless demonstrated otherwise.

(Mandel and Shakeshaft, 2000: 77-78)

This section has argued that traditional ideologies about women’s and men’s roles are still evident in young people’s analyses and that the schooling system, in relation to prevalent heterosexual patriarchal ideology, perpetuates the male breadwinner model with the identification of women as the primary homemakers (Griffin, 1985;
Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Sharpe, 1994; Skelton, 1998; Mandel and Shakeshaft, 2000; O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000; Frosh et al, 2002; Visser, 2002). It is also suggested that the traditional model of women's and men's roles impacts on constructions of gender for young people. This chapter will therefore proceed to analyse young people's views of masculinity and how young men/boys construct their masculinity, considering that the prevailing framework of gender role construction is based on the male dominance model.

5.3: Masculine Gender Construction as Oppositional to Femininity: or the Differences Between Boys' and Girls' Behaviour

The young people in the literature discussed above have clear delineations between women's and men's roles and behaviours, and whilst much of this is based on their perceptions of adult interaction, it is also based on their own experiences, primarily in school. One such distinction that is made by the young people in this literature is the behavioural differences between the girls and the boys in the classroom (see Section 7.1.7, Chapter 7). Indeed the Equal Opportunities Commission research (1998: 1) found that 'more than four times as many boys than girls were excluded from schools in England in 1996' (it is unclear what the reasons for the exclusions were, one possible reason is disruptive classroom behaviour):

There is a great deal of evidence that boys are more disruptive in school classrooms than are girls; this has been widely reported by educational researchers (e.g. Francis, 2000; Warrington et al., 2000), teachers (see Younger et al., 1999) and pupils themselves (e.g. Whitelaw et al., 2000). (Jackson, 2002: 46)

O'Donnell and Sharpe's respondents suggest that boys often misbehave more than the girls, as the following quote illustrates:

**Interviewer:** Do boys and girls muck around the same?

**Darren:** No, girls do their work and stuff. The boys muck around. There are some girls who muck around but not this level.

**Interviewer:** Why do you think that is?

**Darren:** To impress everyone. To be macho.

(O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000: 22)

Linked to this misbehaviour in the classroom by the boys is a 'rejection' of schoolwork, or at least the appearance of rejection for these boys. This vilification of
study and appropriate behaviour can be explained though links to constructs of appropriate masculinity. One rationale is the perception that academic work is seen as 'soft' and therefore does not reflect a 'tough' (hegemonic) masculinity and secondly, that school work is seen as feminine and again something which boys should reject (Frosh et al, 2002, 2003):

Epstein (1998) argues that one of the dominant notions of masculinity in many schools in the late 1980s and early 1990s involved the avoidance of academic work, or the avoidance of the appearance of engaging in academic work. She goes on to say that achievement in itself was not always considered to be a problem, but that being seen to be working to achieve definitely was a problem (see also Martino, 1999). (Jackson, 2002: 45-6)

Jackson consolidates this and argues that, 'not working hard at school can be seen as a defensive strategy by some boys to distance themselves from an academic world that is perceived as “weak”' (Jackson, 1998: 89). Indeed, most of the research with young men/boys in schools supports the argument that school work is perceived as not masculine – as associated with ‘weak’ boys and femininity - and Mac an Ghaill’s data (from boys in schools) reflect this: “[t]he work you do here is girls’ work. It’s not real work. It’s just for kids” (Mac an Ghaill, 1994: 59). The central point from this is the association of ‘girls’ work’ with work which is not ‘real’ or that it is seen as children’s work. Indeed, Reay encapsulates the link between masculine identity formation, femininity and school work:

[i]f part of ‘normal’ male development involves the expulsion of the feminine, which then becomes a target for contempt, learning, and in particular literacy-based subjects, which are encoded as feminine, will continue to be denigrated. (Reay, 2002: 232)

This association of school work with girls or femininity is a key issue because, in order to construct their masculinity, the boys have to reject, or have to be seen to be rejecting, femininity or things associated with girls and the feminine (Frosh et al, 2002; see Chapters 7 and 9). This issue is also discussed in the previous chapter in relation to how men construct their masculinity and how masculinity is often constructed as that which is ‘not like women’ (see Chapter 4 and especially Section 4.2; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Frosh et al, 2002, 2003).
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5.4: Constructing and Applying ‘Masculinity’

One of the central difficulties in writing and researching in this area is that young men have not yet solidified their personal masculinity and it is thus a period in which they themselves are trying to ascertain ‘who they are’ and ‘where they fit in’ (O’Donnell and Sharpe, 2000). In relation to this, in their research with young men, O’Donnell and Sharpe (2000) argue that they do not use or apply Connell’s (1995) ‘hegemonic masculinity’ framework (see Section 4.2, Chapter 4) because, ‘the subjects of our research are not yet securely positioned within the hierarchy of patriarchal power’ although they then qualify this by arguing that ‘to a greater or lesser extent, all the boys anticipate and prepare for a position within patriarchy, and charting this process is an important part of our research’ (O’Donnell and Sharpe, 2000: 10). However, these researchers recognise that the development, construction and application of masculinity is a relational endeavour, with boys judging themselves against each other: ‘[t]o a large extent it is within the male peer group that boys construct their masculinities – imitating each other and evaluating themselves against each other’ (O’Donnell and Sharpe, 2000: 38).

Arguably, it is pertinent to use Connell’s analysis of masculinity, because often young men/boys judge themselves against, and model themselves on, a perceived notion of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1995; see Section 4.4, Chapter 4). Therefore, the hegemonic framework has relevance for boys/young men, with respect to how they construct their own masculinities, and how they perceive other young men/boys (Carrigan et al, 1987; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Canaan, 1996; Edley and Wetherell, 1996; Frosh et al, 2002). Indeed Frosh and colleagues argue that Connell’s analysis is relevant for the ways in which young men use hegemonic masculinity as the standard against which to place themselves and it is often regarded as ‘the ways in which “approved” modes of being male are produced, supported, contested and resisted’ (Frosh et al, 2002: 3).

For the sample of boys in Frosh’s study, hegemonic masculinity was understood in a sophisticated manner as the ‘ideal’ to which boys aspired, but which many accepted they would fail to meet (Frosh et al, 2002). Additionally, in this study, as long as the boys attained some of the attributes of hegemonic, or at least normative, masculinity,
to identify themselves as 'not feminine', then this was an endorsement of their status as males.

Hegemony is clearly a socially produced set of practices and boys are to a considerable degree aware of this. ... Strikingly, most boys discussed hegemonic masculinity as if it was a possession that few boys could hope to obtain: it was rare for boys to consider that they possessed the attributes associated with it. However, the power and pervasiveness of this notion made it difficult for boys to escape without having their gendered repertoires limited by it. Many boys who did not see themselves as possessing the attributes associated with the hegemonic ideal nevertheless negotiated places for themselves as non-hegemonic, yet clearly 'masculine'. (Frosh et al, 2002: 98)

Frosh and colleagues argue that the function of hegemonic masculinity is a framework for boys to model themselves on, and thus construct their own masculinities and it is also used as a 'method of social regulation' (Frosh et al, 2002: 11).

This discussion has focused on how young men construct their masculinity in relation to other young men, within their male peer group, but arguably, the contradictions involved in developing various masculinities (in relation to the hegemonic standard) are all based on a physical and ideological separation from femininity and girls' gender development.

5.5: Heterosexism, Homophobia and 'Macho' Boys
A salient issue in much of the literature on young people is the emphasis on 'prescribed' heterosexuality and the homophobia which often accompanies this ideology, particularly in relation to (boys') practices and opinions. It is argued that so prevalent is the assumption of heterosexuality, that it is often more appropriate to use the term 'heterosexism', as defined by Redman as the 'presumption that heterosexuality is normal, natural and universal' (Redman, 1996: 178). This suggests that homosexuality is regarded as abnormal, unnatural and particular:

[a]nother term is heterosexism, and this term is useful because it emphasises the following: that people who are heterosexual receive privileges and benefits and recognitions while those who are non-heterosexual do not. In other words, that there is a system of injustice and oppression organised around sexuality. (Flood, 1997:1)
Mandel and Shakeshaft’s research found that the young people’s assumption of heterosexuality was a fundamental prerequisite, and ideological premise, of what it means to be male and female (Mandel and Shakeshaft, 2000). They argue, like Flood and Redman, that the ideology, translation and application of normative heterosexuality encompasses misogynist and homophobic assumptions, which, for them, means that it is more appropriate to refer to it as ‘heterosexism’ rather than heterosexuality (Redman, 1996; Flood, 1997; Mandel and Shakeshaft, 2000). This construction of heterosexuality dictates that boys and girls engage in female/male relationships in which male demands are primary. Therefore not only is heterosexuality deemed obligatory, it is also constructed as a power relationship that services the requirements of the male (Mandel and Shakeshaft, 2000). Mac an Ghaill also argues that in his cohort of school students, their understanding of normative heterosexuality combined misogynist and homophobic beliefs and whilst it was also accompanied by contradictions, this did not undermine the extent to which heterosexual assumptions were the basis upon which young men predicated their masculinity (Mac an Ghaill, 1994).

Mac an Ghaill was particularly interested in the views of gay male students and conducted focus groups with these students (outside the school environment). The following excerpt is taken from one of the focus groups with gay male students which identifies the intersection of heterosexuality with misogyny and homophobia.

Adrian: It’s strange really because heterosexual men are supposed to be attracted to women, so you would think that they would respect them. But the worst thing that they think they can call a gay man is a girl.

Joseph: They see themselves as powerful and superior and then the rest, women and us, are lumped together as inferior but at the same time they are sexually attracted to women!

Rajinder: When straight men discriminate against women and gays, I don’t think it’s really about sex at one level. It’s mainly about power ... Power is used in different ways against people.

M.M.: Could you expand on that?

Rajinder: I used to think that a lot of discrimination against blacks, gays or women was more at the level of individuals. I mean I always knew about institutional racism and sexism but I have learnt a lot with us talking together about wider structures. ... The people who make the policies, make the rules — who are mainly men — are middle-class and they are the real threat ... But if you are really interested in understanding gender and sexual relations, you have to look at the wider power bases don’t you? Otherwise you end up divided against each other and not fighting the real enemy. It’s like with gays, some of them can’t see how badly this society
treats women. We have a lot in common. (Mac an Ghaill, 1994: 164-65)

These students have a sophisticated assessment of the intersections of heterosexuality, homophobia, misogyny and power dimensions, all of which are evident in patriarchal (hegemonic) masculine identity in our society (Connell, 1995). In another extract from Mac an Ghaill, a student explains how he challenged homophobic assumptions by a teacher, through using examples of male 'heterosexist' misogyny.

Matthew: The RE [religious education] teacher said one day in class that teenage boys go through a homosexual phase just like earlier on they go through an 'anti-girls phase'. All totally sexist of course, no mention about the girls' sexuality. I told him, I didn't think boys did go through phases. I said that if boys go through an 'anti-girls phase', it was a long phase because men were always abusing women all of their lives. I meant straight men, but I didn't want to upset him too much. Then lots of the girls started talking about how horrible men were and why did they act like that. The teacher was mad. It was gays that were supposed to be the problem and I turned it round to show the way it really is. Straight men are dangerous to us all, women and gays. (Mac an Ghaill, 1994: 168)

Through their experiences of homosexuality, and consequent rejection of hegemonic masculinity, the young men cited above have shown that they have alliances with women due to the discrimination faced by gay men and women, by traditional normative heterosexist masculinity (there seems to be an assumption that the gay people being referred to are men, because the women are referred to separately).

Flood (1997) argues that men are more homophobic, in general, than women, and that this is due to the association of homosexuality being constructed as oppositional to the hegemonic standard which thus must be rejected in order to conform.

Homophobia is a deeply gendered phenomenon; constructions of gender and sexuality are interrelated and mutually constitutive, such that dominant masculinities, femininities and heterosexualities are interdependent. Hegemonic masculinity, the dominant model of how to be male, in particular is structured by homophobia. This relationship between homophobia and masculinity is evident in the first place in boys' and men's relatively stronger allegiance to homophobic attitudes and emotions than women's. Males are more homophobic in their emotional reactions to homosexuality, and homophobia is also correlated with traditional views of gender and family roles. (Flood, 1997:2)
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For many of the young men/boys in the research cited above, the worst verbal insults that they can be called is ‘gay’ or ‘a girl’ and these terms are frequently used interchangeably to mean the same thing: that the boy is not ‘masculine’ enough to be a ‘straight’ masculine boy, whereby: ‘[f]requently, the homophobia expressed towards non-macho boys was in terms of the assertion of their similarity to girls’ (Epstein, 1997: 109, see also Epstein, 1998; Epstein et al, 1998, 2001). Epstein (1997) argues that not only are homophobia and misogyny deeply enmeshed but ‘are so closely intertwined as to be inseparable: misogyny is homophobic and homophobia is misogynist’ (Epstein, 1997: 113). Thus, homophobia and misogyny, according to Epstein (1997), are not arbitrary constructs, but actually define normative heterosexual masculinities, and this position is reiterated by Flood:

[m]asculinity is defined as essentially heterosexual and defined against or in opposition to homosexuality, as well as femininity. “Real” men are heterosexual men, and the dominant model of masculinity is of a heterosexual masculinity. (Flood, 1997: 3)

Such were the levels of homophobia and anxiety of being labelled gay (by the boys), that a third of the boys in Frosh’s study voluntarily raised it in the interviews (Frosh et al, 2002). For these boys, Frosh and colleagues report that the ‘boys labelled as gay were seen as possessing the same characteristics that were denigrated in girls’ and thus provided further evidence to support the argument that homophobia and misogyny are deeply interconnected (Frosh et al, 2002: 176). In the majority of cases, the actual sexuality (or sexual behaviour) of the boys was not necessarily the reason for the boy to be labelled as gay (and hence not masculine) but it was a perception of them not being masculine enough, or overly feminine, which engendered this type of labelling. Nayak and Kehily argue that sexual behaviour is almost irrelevant when it comes to homophobic invective, whereby: ‘homophobic insults are frequently more about gendered behaviour than actual sexual practice’ (Nayak and Kehily, 1996: 215).

In relation to this, the clear assumption is that for boys being gay and/or being feminine is not a desirable status (although there is a lack of reference to how homosexuality affects or impacts upon girls’ experiences). Therefore, sexuality was central for many of the boys’ construction of masculinity and a rigid hyper-
heterosexuality was deemed the norm (Nayak and Kehily, 1996). Not only was heterosexuality regarded as the ‘norm’ but this normalisation was almost naturalised, which allowed for a conceptualisation of non-heterosexual sexuality to be construed as ‘deviant’ or ‘abnormal’ (Nayak and Kehily, 1996; Mandel and Shakeshaft, 2000; Frosh et al, 2002).

Many of the young people in the literature above used the terminology of ‘macho’ to refer to male ‘heterosexist’ behaviour and identification and it was also used to infer a particular male physicality, of being well built or muscular (see Section 7.2.4, Chapter 7). This denoted hegemonic masculinity and enmeshed to this notion of ‘macho’ was a sense of aggressiveness (Epstein, 1997; see Section 7.2.5, Chapter 7). One of the boys in O’Donnell and Sharpe’s research identifies the link between being ‘macho’ and ‘hard’ and how this is an integral facet of masculinity: “Boys are meant to have a ‘macho’ image and be hard. If you don’t fit into this, people think you’re stupid” (O’Donnell and Sharpe, 2000: 118).

Furthermore, it is not only in schools that this heterosexism, misogyny, homophobia and ‘macho-ness’ are displayed and evident (even though many schools actively challenge this ideology through anti-sexism policies, for example), but it is apparent in the broader cultural arena which also promotes hegemonic masculinity as the ideal type: ‘[i]n the wider society, aggressive and violent macho images and behaviour and offensive sexual references underpin the more oppressive forms of patriarchal domination’ (O’Donnell and Sharpe, 2000: 187). It can therefore be suggested that misogyny, sexism, heterosexism and homophobia are theoretically linked through the framework of a vilification of things that are related to women and girls.

The connections between hegemonic masculinities and homophobia can be seen when we consider that many of the characteristics ascribed to gay men are applied to women. In this sense homophobia and misogyny can overlap, where one is ‘spoken’ through the other. ... Homophobia is then a means of consolidating sexuality and gender through the traducing of femininity, and its association with homosexuality. (Nayak and Kehily, 1996: 214)

Epstein argues that sexism in schools can never be properly challenged until it is ‘understood through the lens of heterosexism’ (Epstein, 1997: 106). The ‘insult’ of being gay is, as argued above, less connected to sexual behaviour than being a way
of challenging masculinity and implying that the boy is feminine and in this context, association with the feminine is to be rejected. Therefore, the basis of homophonic insults are premised on a vilification of women. This is why the connection must be made between homophobia, heterosexism and misogyny.

5.6: The Relationship Between Male Violence and Young People

As was identified, schools are key sites (in relation to the actual environment and the age of pupils) for the development, formulation and production of gender roles and behaviour, and some authors argue that there are similar implications for the role of schools in relation to male violence (Kenway and Fitzclarence, 1997; Parker, 1996).

There are several bodies of research literature which support the following contentions: that violence is widespread in schools, that most often such violence is perpetrated by males and can thus be understood as a violent expression of certain types of masculinity, that schools are implicated in the making of masculinities and that consequently they can be involved in the unmaking of the types of masculinity which are implicated in violence. It is increasingly accepted that schools have an important role to play in the prevention of violence. (Kenway and Fitzclarence, 1997: 118)

Parker (1996) further argues that schools are not just locations where male violence is displayed but are themselves complicit in the production of violence:

we must not assume that violence is a cultural currency which pupils alone bring to the school. Additionally, the institution itself must be seen as an active agent in the violence debate and, indeed, within the formation of masculine identities and ideals. (Parker, 1996: 148)

With respect to this thesis, it is important to critique young men’s/boys’ understandings of masculinity in relation to how they view male violence and whether, like adult hegemonic masculinity, male violence is seen as a constituent factor of this. Messerschmidt (2000) argues that there has to be an examination of young men’s/boys’ and young women’s/girls conceptualisations of masculinity because previous research has neglected ‘how masculinity, sexuality, and sexual violence are related’ (Messerschmidt, 2000: 287).

However, it should be clarified that what is being problematised, in this context, is male violence against women, rather than violence in general. Kenway and
Fitzclarence (1997) make the connection between male adult violence against women and the violence perpetrated by young men/boys in schools against young women/girls.

Violence by males against females most commonly takes the form of rape and sexual assault, domestic violence and verbal and physical harassment. Most violence against women and girls occurs within relationships of one sort or another. Intimate relations and settings are more likely to result in violence than are stranger relations and public spaces, although clearly violence erupts there too. Even so there is overwhelming evidence to show that verbal and physical harassment, teasing and taunting relating to sexuality or gender against girls and women is rife in schools. Most boys either engage in this or comply with it. (Kenway and Fitzclarence, 1997: 123)

Statistical evidence suggests that young men/boys are often involved in sexual violence and general violence: ‘[i]t is young men who are most likely to be violent and to be victims of violence’ (Kenway and Fitzclarence, 1997: 123, emphasis in original; Hinsliff, 2003). Furthermore, Messerschmidt identifies that young men are deeply implicated in sexual violence:

[a] significant proportion of all male sexual offences are committed by persons younger than the age of 18 years. Approximately 25 percent of all rapes and 50 percent of all known cases of child sexual abuse can be attributed to adolescent-male sex offenders (Davis and Leitenberg, 1987; Fehrenbachetal, 1986; Ryan, 1997). (Messerschmidt, 2000: 286)

It is therefore pertinent to address young men’s/boys’ attitudes towards male violence against women because of their involvement in this violence and because they may be implicated in this violence against women as adult men. Indeed, as has been argued throughout this thesis, male violence and masculinity are deeply interconnected, and thus there has to be an analysis of how young men formulate their masculinity with respect to male violence:

[violence] forms a crucial component within the lives of many adolescent boys - so much so, that in becoming implicitly encoded within their behaviour, it often proceeds to shape the contours of adult masculinity (Seidler, 1980; Eardley, 1985; Askew and Ross, 1988; Beynon, 1989). (Parker, 1996: 145)

A central argument of this chapter is that traditional conceptualisations of hegemonic masculinity, and the related misogynist and homophobic ideologies held by the young men (in the studies discussed above), impact on young men and women’s experiences and conceptualisations of male violence. The links with hegemonic
masculinity and male violence are identified by Lesko who argues that ‘[p]art of the explanation is the elision of a sense of patterned, normative masculinity. These patterns of discursive visibility and invisibility suggest a broad and deep familiarity with and acceptance of the norm of righteous male anger and violence’ (Lesko, 2000: xii).

5.7: Young People’s Understandings and Experiences of Male Violence

Results from the first piece of UK research conducted with children (8-12 years) and young people (12-16 years) asking them about their ‘understandings and perceptions’ of domestic violence, showed that there was ‘considerable confusion’ over what the respondents understood domestic violence to be, whereby ‘only 5 per cent of the whole sample referred to the definition of domestic violence now commonly used by service providers and in legislation’ (Mullender et al, 2002: 45). This finding was similar to the Dublin Women’s Aid (1999: 9) research which found that ‘young people demonstrated a lack of clarity about definitions of rape, assault and harassment’. More positively, in Mullender and colleagues study, when asked, ‘[t]hreats to hurt were defined as equally violent as physical acts of aggression by the majority of secondary school children (73 per cent) and by just over half of primary school children (57 per cent)’ which suggests that these respondents have an awareness of the wider definitions of domestic violence (rather than just strictly physical violence) (Mullender et al, 2002: 47). The Dublin Women’s Aid research also found that ‘young people have both high levels of contact with and high levels of tolerance of harassment, abuse and violence’ (Dublin Women’s Aid, 1999: 29). This tolerance of male violence was also reflected in Mullender and colleagues’ research which found that a third of all the boys and one in five of the girls agreed with the statement that ‘[s]ome women deserve to be hit’ (Mullender et al, 2002: 70). Furthermore, Mullender and colleagues’ research revealed that as boys got older they were more likely to agree with this statement but as girls got older they were slightly less in agreement (a decrease from one in five to one in six) (Mullender et al, 2002: 70). There was some consensus between the opinions of the boys and the girls whereby three out of four boys and nine out of ten girls (rising to 97 per cent of 14-16 year old girls) agreed that a possible justification for male violence was if the female partner had been unfaithful (Mullender et al, 2002: 73).
Mullender and colleagues argue that the boys tended to hold traditional attitudes about heterosexual interpersonal relationships and that the girls had ‘low expectations of heterosexual relationships and of how they will have to behave within them’ which reflects the findings of the literature cited above, in relation to gender roles (Mullender et al, 2002: 90). Indeed, even with some of the young men in O'Donnell and Sharpe's study who supported a less ‘macho’ masculinity and an emphasis on men being able to be emotional (which was regarded as feminine rather than masculine), there was still the assumption of male violence as ‘natural’. The following interview, by O'Donnell and Sharpe, is in relation to ‘naturalising’ violence.

Adam: I think that a man should be strong, but on the other hand he should show his emotions. Some people say that if a man cries he's a sissy, but why do you have tears -- they're meant to come out at some time or another. A man should be able to look after his children, look after his wife. And the wife should be able to look after the husband and children.

Interviewer: So you could cry if you wanted?
Adam: Yes.
Interviewer: Do you think men are more violent?
Adam: Most men, yes.
Interviewer: Is it nature or do you think they've learnt to be that way?
Adam: I think it's nature.

(O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000: 54)

A further example from an interview in O'Donnell and Sharpe's research identifies the way in which masculinity, and what is seen to be appropriate macho masculinity, is intrinsically linked to violence.

Everybody's been in a fight ... If you're a good fighter everyone respects you. If you're like a wimp, no one respects you. Be macho to be respected by boys. If there's a big man you respect him, if there's a little one you say 'Shut up, get out of the way' and hit him. (Bruce). (O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000: 114)

Whilst this quote refers to male violence between males the rest of this section concentrates on girls' experiences of male violence. The research from Griffin (1985) shows the almost universal level of male violence which the girls in the interviews had experienced. The following extract shows how all of the girls had experienced some form of sexual violence and one of the girls, El, starts by minimising her experience by saying that 'he didn't do anything' (which reflects the ways in which women tend to minimise their experiences of male violence, see
Chapters 2 and 3). The extract also indicates the ways in which women are often blamed for male violence.

\begin{quote}
El: Like that man that dresses up in women’s clothes round here. You shouted at him: Well I wouldn’t as long as he didn’t do anything.
Sally: But he might. I’d shout at him. He did do something to me – he nearly killed me with fright.
Cathy: I mean all of us have been followed home from school in day-light or flashed at by the same man.
El: Well that bloke got out of a car and ran after me - I was only 14. Luckily I was near my gran’s so I ran in there.
Cathy: They’re terrible, they just get away with it, how can they have the nerve? Why do they need to do it? You can’t go on your own anywhere. I saw that bloke the other day. Only I can’t tell my mum. She wouldn’t let me out and my dad’d belt me.
Sally: A man did that to me and Pat in the park. We always walked through together. He came up to us and got his wotsit out. I just ran like mad. I was scared – terrified. She stood there and said: ‘Is that all you’ve got?’
Cathy: That’s what you should do - they expect you to run away.
(Tildesley, white fifth formers). (Griffin, 1985: 66-67, emphasis in original)
\end{quote}

In a different interview with the form teacher of the school pupils quoted above, Griffin found that the young women in her interviews were correct to assume that their experiences of male violence/abuse, would either be disbelieved, minimised or that they would be blamed for them (CG is Griffin.).

\begin{quote}
Mr Yates: Some of the girls have been saying they’ve been attacked coming from school.
CG: Yes some of them did mention that to me.
Mr Yates: Yes, well you don’t believe them do you when they say that?
GC: But if they’re worried about it....
Mr Yates: Yes but some of them wouldn’t know what it means. They’re just having you on. These attacks are just nothing. They’re not serious you know (laugh).
(Griffin, 1985: 67)
\end{quote}

Additionally, some of the young women in Griffin’s interviews appeared to internalise beliefs about women’s responsibility for male violence/abuse. This is illustrated below, with the statement from Cathy who says that: “I think that girls who go out in slit skirts, and minis like, they deserve it. They’re asking for it.” (Griffin, 1985: 67; see Chapter 8). Whilst Griffin’s study is almost twenty years old now, the research findings for this study (see Chapters 8 and 9) and the Dublin Women’s Aid research with young people, conducted in 1999, found the same women blaming attitudes:
my friend's fella, he's not a bad person, he just gets a little angry when he has a drink on him and if she treats him bad in any way, if she does the dirt on him, he loves her. He doesn't hit her hard, anyway, everyone goes through it. Questionnaire 063. (Dublin Women's Aid, 1999: 15)

Research conducted in America found that the patterns of abuse for teenagers are similar to those in adult relationships and that differentiated gender behaviour and male violence is evident in adolescent heterosexual relationships (Makepeace, 1981, cited in Wolfe et al, 1997: 24). Wolfe and colleagues cite the fact that teenage wives are the group at greatest risk of being killed by their husbands, which suggest that prevention strategies are imperative (Wolfe et al, 1997: 21). Indeed Katz catalogues the violence/abuse that young American women experience to argue for prevention and intervention strategies.

Considering the fact that some studies show that as many as a third of high school [14-18 years] and college-age [over 18 years] youth experience violence in an intimate or dating relationship during their dating years (Levy, 1992, p. 4), why isn't teen dating violence talked about in every high school in America? Why, when more than half of all rape victims are assaulted by the age of 18, and 29% are assaulted by the age of 11 (National Victim Center, 1992), is there such a meagre amount of antirape programming in high schools and middle schools [11-14 years] - if not elementary schools [5-11 years]? (Katz, 2000: 283-4)

Other research conducted with American youth found attitudes that reflect the findings of the Zero Tolerance Trust research (1998) which found that one in two boys and one in three girls thought that forced sex (by men against women) was acceptable in some circumstances and that in some circumstances it was acceptable for men to hit women. (Wolfe et al, 1997).

The following extract from a group interview conducted with fifth form females in an English school shows how male violence is a common occurrence and how it is almost normalised in the young women's experiences (Griffin, 1985). Furthermore the excerpt identifies how young women blame themselves for the violence (CG is Griffin).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deb:</th>
<th>Did you see that film about battered women on the tele the other night?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El:</td>
<td>Yeh, it's terrible. She could have fought back like my mam does. She hits him back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny:</td>
<td>Don't you think she might get beat up worse then? When my dad hits my mum and we think he shouldn't, we have a go at him and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stop him. But sometimes when she goes on and on at him we
don’t ’cos she deserves it.

CG: You mean she deserves to get beaten up for just talking to him?

Sue: Yeh, well not really I suppose.

Sally: Well my mum left him and took us too. She had to.

Cathy: I’d just leave if I was being treated like that. I’d even leave the
kids.

CG: Would you?

Sally: I bet when it came to it you wouldn’t. You’d be frightened that
he’d batter them.

El: What about if you have a daughter and she looks like you? If you
go and leave her he’ll take it out on her ’cos she reminds him of
you.

Sue: If he beats you up does it mean he loves yer?

Deb: When I first went with blokes I thought that getting beat up
happens all the time. I thought I had to put up with it ’cos that
was what women was supposed to expect. Then I realised that it
was wrong to have to put up with it.

(Griffin, 1985: 48-49)

Perhaps it is of some consolation that the final comment by Deb states that women
do not have to “put up with” male violence. However, the research quoted in this
section suggests that young people do have an expectation of male violence, and that
violence is an expression of normative masculinity.

5.8: Links Between Normative Masculinity and Male Violence

The research literature has established clear links between constructions of normative
masculinity and male violence against women. This chapter has demonstrated that
young people, and particularly young men/boys, still tend to hold very traditional
attitudes towards men and women’s roles which are framed within a male dominance
model. O’Donnell and Sharpe argue that the male dominance model contributes to
sexist ideologies about women’s and men’s roles and conclude that “[f]ar too many
of them [boys] carry more than a residue of patriarchal and sexist attitudes and
behaviour’ (O’Donnell and Sharpe, 2000: 192). As part of their research, O’Donnell
and Sharpe asked the young people about the perceived advantages and
disadvantages of being boys and girls. The following quotation shows the
differences in the responses.

Those [girls] who emphasised the disadvantages of being a girl quoted sexual
harassment and rape; getting pregnant and giving birth; having periods; and being
subject to name-calling (reputation), as features of girls’ lives to be avoided. The
other main disadvantage they saw for girls was in terms of sex discrimination in
jobs and other opportunities, and sexism in general. Boys, on the other hand, had it
better. They, like the girls, thought boys have an easier life: more fun; more
freedom (...); parents worry less about boys than girls; boys are better at sports; they are the dominant sex (being the 'man of the house', etc.); and have better opportunities. (O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000: 116-117)

Thus, for girls the structural inequalities that women face are real 'disadvantages' for these young women and, similarly, the everyday normative male sexual violence faced by them also impinge on their lives. This is contrasted with the boys having, in many ways, 'an easier life' through being the dominant sex, which further illustrates how hegemonic masculinity benefits both boys and men. However, this also distinguishes the power integral to constructions of masculinity whereby boys appreciate that men and boys have more power than women or girls and thus malign the feminine and associate themselves with the masculine in order to accrue this power (Dworkin, 1981). Therefore, it is difficult to envisage how hegemonic masculinity could be dismantled with all the benefits (real and perceived) attached to it, because any challenge to masculinity 'means a threat to its power and privilege' (O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000: 121). This could mean that 'some boys may feel the need to define and assert their masculine identities even more strongly' rather than reconstitute their masculinity in such a way that multiple masculinities come to be accepted and that violence against women and girls is explicitly rejected (O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000):

... the issue that needs to be addressed is the investment that many boys, men and schools have in promoting a particular version of masculinity which is to their detriment in the sense that it limits them from developing a wider repertoire of behaviours and ways of relating. Until a commitment is made, particularly by men and boys themselves, to addressing the role that sexuality, homophobia and misogyny continue to play in how many of them define and negotiate their masculinities, we believe that very little will change. (Martino and Meyenn, 2001: xii)

Therefore, schools have roles to play in the construction of new masculinities and young people have to be allowed to explore multiple ways of being men and women that are positive and mutually supporting.

5.9: Conclusion

It has been argued in this chapter that schools are key sites where young people develop their gender identities. However, the potential problem is that schools have their own ideologies, which often reflect patriarchal values and assumptions. The
male dominance model is perpetuated in schools and this is the framework within which many young people define their gender identities. The male breadwinner model is pervasive and there is still an expectation of the sexual division of labour in the home.

The young men appear to have rigid notions of what is acceptably masculine, and related to this is the rejection of the feminine. However, not only is the feminine rejected it is also vilified. This links in to the heterosexism and homophobia, which almost defines hegemonic masculinity. The dependence on the homophobic and misogynist male dominance model has profound implications for male violence. The prevalence of male violence suggests that these young people almost regard it as constitutive of what men do and many of the young women seemed resigned to the high levels of violence which impact on their lives. This is explicit in the research cited in Section 5.7, which identifies the extremely high tolerance by males and females of male violence.

The next chapter turns to the empirical research carried out in this study, describing the methodology that informed the empirical research. Chapters 7 and 8 present the findings of the empirical research. As will be evident, many of the issues discussed above are raised in the empirical research, which suggests that work with young people on these issues should be a central concern.
Chapter 6
Methodology: Research Ethics and Methods

6.0: Introduction
The previous chapters have concentrated on the theoretical literature and the next two chapters discuss the empirical findings of the research project. Therefore, this chapter is concerned with the methodological issues involved in this research project and is divided into three parts. Part One addresses the methodological and epistemological issues that inform a feminist research agenda, the approach adopted by this research project. Part Two addresses issues concerned with involving young people in social research in relation to ethical considerations, power issues and consent. The use of focus groups is also discussed here. Part Three looks at the actual methods involved in conducting the empirical research for this study and explains why the research was conducted in Glasgow.

Part 1: Feminist Methodology

6.1.1: Introduction
This section argues that a feminist methodological approach is distinctive from traditional positivist methodology primarily because of the epistemological values that underpin it and the inherent political commitment of feminist research (Bograd, 1988). It is argued that whilst most social research methods, including feminist methods, are products of traditional social research, it is often their application which methodologically and epistemologically distinguishes them, and which thus differentiates them as feminist (Stanley and Wise, 1983a, 1990b, 1993; Harding, 1987a, 1987b; Kelly, 1988a; Cook and Fonow, 1990; Kelly et al, 1994)

6.1.2: Differentiating Feminist Research from ‘Traditional’ Social Research
There is no discrete model that constitutes a feminist methodology but for feminist researchers it is impossible to disassociate from their understandings of women’s
subordinate social status. For feminist researchers, this awareness of gender inequality is always present in the research process. It can be understood as a reaffirmation of the second wave feminist slogan that 'the personal is political' because, as Stanley and Wise express it: "[w]e believe that feminist social science must begin with the recognition that "the personal", lived experience, underlies all behaviours and actions" (Stanley and Wise, 1983a: 205; see also Kelly et al, 1994). Feminist researchers are centrally aware of the pervasiveness of power and how power differentials permeate the research process, in relation to themselves as researchers and in relation to women as respondents (Stanley and Wise, 1983a).

Similarly, Cook and Fonow (1990) argue that feminist research has a fundamental political goal of challenging patriarchy and thus it should yield data that can contribute to the emancipatory project of feminism. This approach identifies a central debate within feminist research, over whether feminist research should be research conducted exclusively with women, for women and by women, a methodological conception which emerged in the 1970s when feminists were first developing critiques of androcentric research. This view has been challenged and now feminist research is often defined more by the methods employed, the methodology which structures it, and the epistemology which informs it, rather than being defined as research exclusively on and with women, although, arguably, it should still be for women (Harding, 1987a, 1987b, 1991). Kelly (1988a) argues that it is not just the methods that make research feminist but 'the questions we have asked, the way we locate ourselves within our questions, and the purpose of our work' (Kelly, 1988a: 6). Feminist methodology evolved from mainstream (sometimes characterised by feminists as 'malestream') social research, which suggests that there is nothing intrinsically 'feminist' about it and, instead, it is the application that differentiates it (Harding, 1987a; Cook and Fonow, 1990; Kelly et al, 1994).

Some feminist researchers have developed 'guidelines' in relation to constituting feminist research and Mies (1983: 122-128) suggests some guiding principles for feminist research:
1. 'conscious partiality' rather than "objectivity".
2. inverting the traditional relationship between researcher and researched to reduce power imbalances.
3. declaring the emancipatory role of research.
4. developing 'conscientization'.
5. recognising the relevance of women's individual and collective experiences and histories.

Similarly, Acker and colleagues (1983) have three principles for feminist research: the commitment to women's liberation; using non-oppressive methods; and the continuing feminist critique of traditional approaches in addition to being reflectively critical of its own practices (Acker et al, 1983; see also Shields and Dervin, 1993 and Cook and Fonow, 1990, for a discussion of 'guidelines' for feminist research).

Whilst these guidelines offer various suggestions as to what should constitute feminist methodology, the one consistent factor is in the feminist commitment to women's emancipation from patriarchal power relations (Ramazanoglu, 1992). Some feminist researchers reject the idea that feminist research has to be conducted on women because, for radical feminists and other feminists working in the area of male violence, the research subjects may be men. For these researchers, it is imperative that research is conducted with the perpetrators of this violence (men) and Kelly and colleagues (1994) argue that this does not make their research any less feminist:

"Much of our research has not been exclusively 'on' or 'with' women, since it has involved men and focused on institutions. The issues we have researched, however, are 'feminist issues' - primarily domestic violence and child sexual abuse. We have throughout attempted to 'do' our research as feminists and to ask feminist questions. (Kelly et al, 1994: 32)"

This point has particular relevance for this research project because, whilst men and masculinity, in relation to male violence, are the central areas of investigation, the purpose of this research is to challenge male violence and is thus a feminist endeavour.

6.1.3: Value Free Social Research?
Most feminist social researchers reject positivist methodology for its adherence to the conviction that there are objective social facts that researchers can dispassionately
gather in the name of social research. Feminists argue that because the personal and political worlds are inherently enmeshed they cannot be discretely separated: thus researchers’ own subjectivity is inevitably part of the research process (Bograd, 1988). Most feminists argue that the positivist endeavour of value-neutrality is a ‘myth’ because ‘the descriptions, interpretations and explanatory phenomena in science inevitably involve social values’ (Assiter, 2000: 330; see also Bograd, 1988; Gordon, 1987; Alcoff and Potter, 1993; Harden et al, 2000).

Arguably, the feminist approach of declaring subjective knowledge and objective ‘bias’ is a more theoretically rigorous way of conducting research because it informs the reader as to the aims, objectives and rationale of the research. Du Bois (1983) and Gelsthorpe (1992) both argue that recognition of the impossibility of total objectivity does not equate to poor quality research:

[a] rejection of the notion of ‘objectivity’ and a focus on experience in method does not mean a rejection of the need to be critical, rigorous and accurate (Du Bois 1983); rather, it can mean making explicit interpretative schemes in the concern to produce good quality knowledge. (Gelsthorpe, 1992: 214)

The response to the feminist objective of recognising possible ‘bias’ is often critiqued by suggesting that the standard of feminist research is less rigorous than other methodological approaches whereby: ‘[b]y being openly politically committed, feminists are charged with failing the test of producing generally valid and authoritative knowledge’ (Ramazanoglu and Holland, 2002: 3). One of the more public critiques of feminist research methods came from Martyn Hammersley. This involved a five year debate between him and feminist social researchers in the journal Sociology (Hammersley, 1992, 1994; Ramazanoglu, 1992; Gelsthorpe, 1992; Williams, 1993), which was continued in the online journal, Sociological Research Online (Hammersley, 1997; Hammersley and Gomm, 1997a, 1997b; Romm, 1997; Harrison and Hood-Williams, 1998; Humphries, 1998; Letherby, 2002).

In the debates cited above, Hammersley questioned the validity of personal experience as proposed by feminist researchers because ‘[s]ince all experience is a construction, it always carries the capacity for error as well as for truth’ (Hammersley, 1992: 193). Hammersley challenged the feminist endeavour of
breaking down hierarchical power relations and argued that this oversimplifies the complex reality of social research (Hammersley, 1992).

Hammersley received substantial criticism in relation to his critique of feminist methodology (see above). Ramazanoglu argued that whilst Hammersley critiqued the feminist principle of subjectivity and experiential knowledge, he did not reflexively examine, or problematise, his own position in the research process (Ramazanoglu, 1992). Perhaps it is more pertinent to frame Hammersley's position, and the feminist responses to it, as a challenge to the standpoint that some feminist researchers adopt when conducting social research, which is discussed below.

6.1.4: The 'Standpoint' in Social Research

Some social researchers, including but not only feminists, adopt a 'standpoint' position when conducting social research.39 This standpoint means that the researchers have an identification with the research respondents and consider them to have the expert knowledge on the phenomenon being studied (Hartsock, 1983; Harding, 1987a, 1987b, 1991, 1993; Smith, 1987; MacKinnon, 1993; Thompson, 2001). The empirical research for this study was conducted from a standpoint position that constructed the participants (the young people) as the experts in the area in which they were being interviewed (see Parts 2 and 3 of this chapter).

Hartsock (1983) explains that, for her the feminist standpoint is developed from a Marxist analysis, which identifies the conflicting dichotomy of capitalist and proletariat.

---

In this view, the ideological premise of standpoint feminism developed from, and reflected, Marxist analysis in that it was a grounded theory utilising the knowledge of the oppressed group (Hawkesworth, 1999). In a feminist research context, the standpoint position uses women’s oppression as a knowledge base and turns it into a resource to be utilised for social research purposes (Smith, 1987). This relates back to the imperative of bringing subjectivity into the research process (see above) and recognising women’s experiences as valid sites of knowledge (Harding, 1991).

Perhaps the key feature of standpoint feminism, as a methodological tool, is that not only do women have a unique and valuable perception of their oppression but they also have awareness of their oppressors, namely men because ‘[a]s objects of oppression (women) are forced out of self-preservation to know the motives of their oppressors’ (Mies, 1983: 121). This conceptualisation cannot be inverted because, even though men have knowledge of themselves and of women, they cannot experience women’s oppression and the resultant sexist discrimination endured by women, precisely because of their role as the oppressor group (Hartsock, 1983; Assiter, 2000).

A feminist standpoint is possible, in Hartsock’s view, if women generally experience life differently from men because they live in different social relationships to men’s exercise of power, and if they experience material differences in gendered conditions of life. (Ramazanoglu and Holland, 2002: 68, emphasis in original)

Hartsock links the grounded experiences of men and women as opposing sex classes and the standpoint position locates women’s knowledge of this power relationship as the most informed position from which to extrapolate knowledge on this phenomenon, for emancipatory purposes (Hartsock, 1983; see also Harding 1987a, 1987b; Smith 1987; MacKinnon, 1993; Thompson, 2001). This position does not assume an uncritical or unproblematic universalism, but acknowledges that there are disparities and conflicts between, and amongst, women’s experiences (see Section 1.4, Chapter 1 for a discussion of essentialism). Indeed, one of the main criticisms of feminist standpoint theory is that it assumes a universalism between all women, which is unfounded when class, race, sexuality and disability discrimination, for example, are brought into women’s individual experiences (McRobbie, 1982; Scheyvens and Leslie, 2000). In response to this critique of essentialism, feminist
standpoint proponents argue that they recognise the multiple oppressions women endure and do not falsely homogenise the experiences of all women (Hartsock, 1983; Harding, 1986, 1993; Hawkesworth, 1999). Hawkesworth argues that there is not a feminist standpoint but multiple standpoints that reflect the diversity and heterogeneity of women (Hawkesworth, 1999). Furthermore Harding (1993) argues that these multiple standpoints may be occupied by different women at different times, reflecting the way women's lives change and the different socio-cultural-economic-political positions that women may find themselves in.

The standpoint position is therefore overtly political, and rejects the claims to 'objective' social research and declares the interests of the researcher and the researched (Hartsock, 1983; Hawkesworth, 1999). Furthermore, the standpoint position is centrally concerned with theory and knowledge, because it is a political endeavour whereby 'standpoint theory was to provide a bridge from knowledge to politics as cogent critiques would give rise to transformative praxis' (Hawkesworth, 1999: 135).

6.1.5: Summary of Feminist Methodology

As has been argued, an exact definition of feminist methodology remains elusive, but ultimately a commitment to the goal of women's liberation is fundamental (Acker et al, 1983; Gatenby and Humphries, 2000; Ramazanoglu and Holland, 2002). The particularities remain contested but it appears that as long as the methods are applied with feminist principles then any research methods are potentially acceptable (Clegg, 1985). Not all feminist researchers utilise the standpoint approach but this was the methodological approach used in this research. Therefore, given this general theoretical and epistemological orientation, the next section addresses the adequacy of the proposed methods in relation to the empirical study with the young people.
Part 2: Research with Children / Young People: Theoretical and Methodological Challenges

6.2.1: Introduction
This section discusses the role of children and young people in the research process for two reasons. Firstly, the empirical research for this thesis was conducted with Scottish school pupils aged between 15 and 18 years; and secondly, because there are implications for feminist research and its empowering and emancipatory goals, as outlined in the first part of this chapter.

6.2.2: Historical Background to Research with Children
The last ten to fifteen years have witnessed a paradigmatical shift in how children and young people are conceptualised in their roles as research participants and citizens generally (in the West) (Qvortrup, 1995). This shift, however, has not been universally accepted or universally applied, and it is fraught with internal complexities and external resistance (Goodenough et al, 2001; Williamson et al, 2003). There has been a move toward consultation with children and young people in both a research capacity and with a policy focus, which is partly linked to the UK ‘rights’ and ‘citizenships’ discourses which argue that as citizens as current children, and as future citizens as adults, children have a right to be consulted. On an international level, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), and particularly Article 12, was ratified and assured the ‘right’ for children’s opinions to be given and their voices to be heard (Williamson et al, 2003).

UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, Article 12 (p. 12):
States parties shall assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those views freely in all matters affecting the child, the views of the child being given due weight in accordance with the age and maturity of the child.

The extent to which this is applied, however, is disparate. In England and Wales the Children Act 1989 formalised a move away from parental duties towards one of parental responsibilities and incorporated a recognition and representation of the wishes and views of the child through children’s guardians. In Scotland, the
Children (Scotland) Act 1995 stated that the views of children must be taken into account, impacting on parental figures, the Courts, Children's Hearings and Local Authorities, but it is discretionary and is differentially applied. More recently, the Standards in Scottish Schools Act 2000 reiterated that children should be consulted, but similarly this has been disparate in application. It is problematic to account for how effective it has been, although Borland and colleagues argue that the Scottish Parliament has been highly influential in this reconceptualisation of children and prioritising children's voices (Borland et al, 2001). This is exemplified in the Child Strategy Statement issued by the Scottish Executive (2000) which argues, in relation to policy, that:

"Children form one fifth of Scotland's population, but may have only limited opportunity to consider or comment on policies which impact on them. Whereas most adults are silent by choice, many children are not in a position to have an influence on matters which greatly affect them. In the vast majority of instances, adults in the wider community act effectively in the interests of children. However it remains the case that children have decisions made about, for and against their interests without their views being taken or needs properly considered. (Borland et al, 2001: 6)"

It is evident that on a theoretical level, at least, there have been moves to be more inclusive of children and to acknowledge their views and opinions. This chapter has so far referred to children as though this were an uncontested homogenous group. However, it should be acknowledged that 'children' is a socially constructed category and loosely speaking refers to all those under the age of eighteen (Morrow and Richards, 1996). In the context of this research, children are conceptualised as (age appropriate) competent individuals, adept in a range of ways and thus deserve trust, respect, decision-making responsibilities and autonomy in the same way as adults (Alderson, 1995, 2000, 2001). However, as children, they do have distinct additional needs and characteristics which are based around issues of vulnerability, whereby some children are perceived as more vulnerable than adults, particularly when specific age groups of children are referred to (Williamson et al, 2003). This conceptualisation of children as responsible and competent (according to age) informed the theoretical framework of the research which, in turn, impacted on the methodological approach that this study adopted (see Part 3, this Chapter).
6.2.3: Development of the Role of Children in Research

Historically, the majority of non-clinical research conducted with children was in developmental psychology. Traditionally the approach was one of research conducted on children as the research objects rather than with children as the research subjects or indeed as co-researchers, although this position has been challenged in recent years (Oakley, 1994; Hill et al, 1996; Hood et al, 1996; Alderson, 2001). Much of the new sociological research in Childhood Studies has embraced this paradigmatical change in which children are involved in research by virtue of what they are now – children – as opposed to what they will become – adults (Qvortrup, 1994). This links into the theoretical approach which regards children as active citizens with concordant decision making, and taking, abilities:

...it is possible that the previous lack of children's views in this area reflects society's continued perceptions of children as passive "human becomings" (Qvortrup, 1994: 4) and as such are not accorded the status of "citizens" (Roche, 1999) with rights to knowledge and the decision making process. (Goodenough et al, 2001: 4-5)

Concurrently, there have been similar re-evaluations of traditional research methods precisely because of the recognition of children's needs as children, and because of the interest in researching children and the desire to have appropriate methods with which to conduct this research. Or, more simply, there has to be a methodology to support the theory: "[a]ttempts to place children more centrally within the remit of social science do not rest on a theoretical framework alone, but demand a methodology to underpin such a framework" (Pole et al, 1999: 40).

According children a voice does not imply that all decisions affecting them are given to them but that they are involved in the decision making process. This applies not only to social research but to other forms of research and policy making, for example: '[i]n research, as in the rest of life, this does not mean that children should determine what happens and how, but that they should have opportunities to exercise influence in discussions which concern them' (Hood et al, 1996: 130).
6.2.4: Ethical Considerations for Research with Children

Whilst all researchers should adhere to relevant ethical guidelines, the issue of ethics in relation to research with children becomes a much more salient issue complicated by the fact that there is not a single formal ethical procedure in place for conducting social research with children. There are, however, various guidelines and codes of conduct, primarily: the Medical Research Council (MRC) *The Ethical Conduct of Research on Children* (medical research); the British Psychological Society (BPS) *Code of Conduct Ethical Principles and Guidelines* (1991); the British Sociological Association (BSA) *Statement of Ethical Practice*; and the *National Children's Bureau Guidelines for Research*, which all address children's participation in social research, albeit to different extents. Almost all of these guidelines for non-clinical research address the issues of consent, confidentiality and methodology (Goodenough *et al.*, 2001).

Since there is no formal social research ethical code, social researchers have often used the biomedical ethical model which emphasises that no harm should come to a research participant whilst being involved in research (Goodenough *et al.*, 2001). It is arguable that, particularly with reference to social research, it is often the case that whilst there may be no harm, there is also no direct benefit from participating in research. Often in social research the potential gains, in the form of new practice or policy, will be in the long term and may not affect change for a considerable period of time, and the 'benefits' from research may not personally affect the research respondent. In effect, taking part in social research is often an entirely altruistic endeavour with no tangible gains to the participants (although admittedly sometimes a participant may receive payment). King and Churchill (2000) argue that, as with all research, particularly research with children, there must be a 'strong emphasis on nonmaleficence' because:

> children are in a position of compromised autonomy, both because of a lack of decisional capacity and because of their susceptibility to coercive influences. ... for children as well as for all other subjects of research, the direct personal benefits from participation in the research are at best a positive side effect of the research enterprise, never its primary aim. Stated another way: in research (as contrasted with treatment), beneficence - the duty to do good - typically has a future-directed and society-oriented meaning rather than a present-directed and individually oriented meaning. ... Research is done to change future practices and policies for the better, not primarily to benefit the subjects enrolled. (King and Churchill, 2000: 714)
Mahon and colleagues (1996) argue that research participants must be aware that they may not gain directly from the research and so any positive or 'therapeutic' benefits cannot be used in any way for validating social research: '[i]t is crucial to mark the boundary between research and therapy very clearly. Any therapeutic effects of participating in research cannot be used as a justification for conducting the research' (Mahon et al, 1996: 151).

6.2.5: Power

As with all social research, and particularly research with marginalised groups, there is the issue of the power imbalance. Many social researchers argue that being sensitive to the research respondent and 'matching'40, for example, may minimise the power differentials involved in all research situations. However, with respect to young people, if the research is being conducted on behalf of an institution then it is unlikely that the researcher will 'match' the respondent in terms of age.41 Additionally children and young people are all too aware of their relatively powerless socio/political/economic/cultural status as exemplified by their (historical) exclusion from decision making bodies (see above). Thus, researchers who work with children from a children's rights perspective are cognisant of the various measures that have to be taken in order not to further disempower children in the research situation. Whilst there are measures that can be applied to minimise the power differentials it would be impossible for researchers to argue that they had entirely removed them for, as Mayall (2000) argues, children are aware that 'a central characteristic of adults is that they have power over children' (Mayall, 2000: 121, cited in Borland et al, 2001: 23). The effect of the power differential should be acknowledged because it is precisely the existence of this that may 'encourage' children to give what they perceive to be the 'right' answers in a research scenario rather than give the researcher their honest answer (Hood et al, 1996).

40 'Matching' is where, for instance, if the research participants are from minoritised ethnic communities, the researcher is from the same ethnic community.
41 For examples of research conducted by young people see Alderson (2000).
6.2.6: Consent

One of the key elements in conducting most social research is the affirmation that the research participants have given informed consent to their participation and have given this based on information relating to the research project in question (Goodenough et al, 2001; Williamson et al, 2003). However, gaining informed consent from children is additionally problematic due to their status as 'non-adults' (Qvortrup, 1995). As argued, the empirical research for this study was conducted with the theoretical conception of young people as responsible for their own decision making and with responsibility for giving an informed decision whether to participate, or not, in the research. However, due to children and young people’s unique status with respect to age, it is often the case that adults give consent on their behalf and this can be a complicated process if it involves parental and/or institutional gatekeepers (Hood et al, 1996).

There is an ambiguity with respect to conceptualising young people as capable of giving their consent whilst at the same time appreciating that risk, safety and harm issues are pertinent and must be central. Children’s safety and well-being are absolutely paramount and should never be compromised for the sake of a research project: if they are, then the research itself is unethical and should not be being carried out. There should be structures in place to scrutinize researchers who conduct research with young people, and these structures should identify ethical research from unethical. Furthermore, the credibility of the researchers themselves should be established, which should involve background and police checks, for instance. This is not a role that the child, or proxy consent giver, should be expected to undertake and is thus the responsibility of the adult. This, however, introduces gatekeepers, which removes the child one step (at least) away from the research and gatekeepers often assume responsibility for consent before the child has been informed of the project (Hood et al, 1996; Mullender et al, 2002).

The issue of consent is inextricably linked to power relations whereby, in many societies, children are expected to do what adults ask or tell them to do, where even

---

42 This is debated in relation to ethnographic research which may be covert and which may preclude consent. Additionally, there is the issue of seeking consent from powerful groups, who, if fully aware of the implications of the research may withhold consent. However, these debates are beyond the remit of this thesis. For further reading see O'Connell Davidson and Layder (1994), for example.
requests are often polite orders. This makes it extremely problematic for a child to refuse consent, because they are fully aware of the possible repercussion of dissenting from an adult’s decision, particularly in an institutional setting such as school: ‘children’s consent to research participation in this context can shade into coercion, and their participation then becomes “just another form of schoolwork” (Denscombe and Aubrook, 1992; Pole et al, 1999)’ (David et al, 2001: 352).

Hood and colleagues argue that the problem of children wanting to refuse consent is further compounded if the arrangements have already been made by an adult, before the date of the research, and the child is expected to participate in the prearranged research (Hood et al, 1996). King and Churchill (2000) argue that parents should act in the best interests of their child and that the child should also be consulted and that ‘[s]ociety expects parents to have interests closely aligned with those of their children and to take account not only of their children’s needs but also of their children’s preferences where appropriate’ (King and Churchill, 2000: 719).

If it is accepted that parents always act in the best interests of their child, then this position described by King and Churchill is salient. However, within the context of researching domestic violence, for example, where there is the very real circumstance that the violence/abuse could be happening in the child’s home, the parent could in fact act in self interest and not allow the child to participate, even though it may be in the best interest of the child to be involved. Additionally, the parent could decide that they do not want their child to participate, for reasons other than those mentioned above, even if the child expressly wishes to do so, which emphasises the contradiction between parental responsibility and children’s rights (Hood et al, 1996).

However, if, for instance, the research project has been examined by an internal ethics committee and the researchers individually scrutinized, then the onus could be placed with the child to give informed consent without a gatekeeper taking this decision. Hood and colleagues (1996) argue that children should be fully informed of the research project and then be given the opportunity to participate, or not, with full informed consent. However, they also suggest that the levels of gatekeeping that exist, particularly with respect to children in schools, are often sizeable and may
preclude children giving consent on their own behalf. Even where researchers prioritise the right of children to make their own decisions about participation, there is still the obstacle of other adults who may feel that their consent is adequate and give or refuse consent on the child's behalf, regardless of the child's opinions. This may be done with the best intentions of the adult who may assume that the child is incapable of making this decision, which is an issue Alderson (2000) examines. One such way to militate against an assumption of compliance of a child is to conceptualise consent as an 'ongoing process' and not a singular response as David and colleagues argue:

> consent has usually been seen as given as part of a 'one-off' event at the outset, on the basis of the presentation of adequate information that provides sufficiently for the participants to 'know' and 'understand' what they are 'getting themselves into'. However, this idea has latterly been challenged by notions of consent as an ongoing process, especially in relation to children (but also with adults). (David et al, 2001: 348)

Thus, children should be asked before, during and at the end of the interview if they are still consenting and their decision to withdraw, at any stage, should be fully and unconditionally accepted (Hood et al, 1996; David et al, 2001).43

6.2.7: Focus Groups as an Appropriate Research Method for Interviewing Children

The use of focus groups in social research is a relatively recent phenomenon; indeed they were traditionally used in market research but have now become more popular in social research (Morgan and Krueger, 1993; Krueger, 1994; Kitzinger, 1995). A central rationale for the application of focus groups in market research was the ability to engage groups of people, at the same time, to discuss an issue presented to them, which was meant to mitigate time, logistical and financial constraints of research (Krueger, 1994). However, in the social research context, the 'interaction' of the group and the purported effects of reducing hierarchical power dynamics between researcher and research participants is often why such groups are favoured (see Section 6.2.5.). Even with these recommendations focus groups have been little used with children and where they have been, there are few reflective accounts to assess

---

43 Although there is a qualification to this, for example, if the researcher suspects that withdrawal is due to parental or institutional pressure.
the applicability and efficacy of this method. Scott (2000) argues that not only are there few reflexive accounts but there is little 'guidance' about how to use focus groups when the participants are children (Krueger, 1994; Kitzinger, 1995; Hood et al, 1996; Wilkinson, 1998; Kitzinger and Barbour, 1999; Borland et al, 2001). Hood and colleagues offer guidance based on the experiences of other researchers:

Greenbaum (1987) suggested some guidelines for focus group discussions with children based on experience in market research. He suggested that the optimum groups size is five to six and that the age range should be kept small. This advice fits with the experience of the authors (Hill, 1992; Triseliotis and others, 1995). More controversially, he advocated single-sex groups, as he believed that boys and girls are often hostile to each other and have marked differences in interests. (Hood et al, 1996: 134)

Researchers who use focus groups with young people argue that the group setting can be conducive to reducing hierarchies, militating against power dynamics, and can be supportive for children (see above). Contradictorily, however, it is an oversimplification of the construction of power and hierarchy, if it is argued that a group of children can negate the complex effects of these phenomena, and additionally the power dynamics inherent in groups of children are left unacknowledged and unexamined.

Although it is argued that groups can mitigate the power balance between researcher or consultant and children (because children outnumber adults), this has been disputed as an assumption which ignores the relationships of power and control inherent in them (Baker and Hinton, 1999). Furthermore, even if problems of adult influence are diminished, those of peer influence are increased. (Borland et al, 2001: 33)

Conversely, the argument that the group arrangement can augment confidence is one which is often cited in the (limited) literature on focus groups with young people (Krueger, 1994; Wilkinson, 1998; Kitzinger and Barbour, 1999). However, it is also argued that the group situation may inhibit shyer participants and may be influenced by the gender composition of the group, for example (see above). Borland and colleagues (2001) advocate the usage of focus groups in research with young people, but are nevertheless cognisant that there are potential limitations including the suppression of the ‘minority perspective’ (Borland et al, 2001: 33).

---

44 The issue of single sex groups is discussed further in Part 3, this chapter.
A potential drawback is that the respondents can get ‘side-tracked’ into discussing an issue which is not strictly on the topic that the researcher is examining (Hood et al, 1996). Whilst this is a salient point, it is not solely relevant to focus groups with young people and can be an issue in focus groups with adults (Krueger, 1994; Catterall and MacLaran, 1997). It is arguable that focus groups can mitigate the power exerted by an interviewer over an interviewee in a one-to-one interview situation, and as argued, it is central to a feminist methodology that efforts are made to minimise power differentials (see Part One). Additionally, the focus group participant can opt out of contributing in a less conspicuous manner than would be possible in a one-to-one interview. Researchers who use this method, and who are conscious of the power dynamic involved in any research with children, often use methods such as handing over the control of the tape recorder to the group so that they can choose when to record and when not to. This method was used in this research and research of Mahon who argued that this technique also developed rapport with the respondents (Mahon et al, 1996).

It should be made explicit that the information young people give, in a focus group, and in any other research setting, can never be given an assurance of complete confidentiality because of the possibility of disclosure of abuse (Mahon et al, 1996; Hamilton, 2001; The National Children’s Bureau, 2003; Williamson et al, 2003). Social researchers have a (moral) duty to pass on information regarding disclosure of harm or abuse but the researcher can fully inform the participants, before the study, that this will happen should they choose to disclose this information, and that the researcher will inform the participants before they pass on any information. If the researcher does this, then they can still adhere to ethical guidelines without undermining or betraying a child’s confidence, which would be both unethical and disempowering.

6.2.8: Summary of Research with Young People
To conclude, there have been formidable changes in how children and young people are conceptualised both in society at large and within the academic community. However there may also be an incongruence between the children’s rights rhetoric
and the actual steps which are taken to ensure their ethical consent, participation and appropriate position in research.

The empirical research in this study with young Glaswegian school pupils aimed to incorporate a children's rights paradigm and the next part of this chapter will describe and explain the process involved in including young people in the empirical research.

**Part 3: The Empirical Research**

**6.3.1: Introduction**

Having discussed the literature on research methodologies and having established the theoretical framework for this research, this part of Chapter 6 will discuss how the theoretical framework informed the methodological approach and how this in turn was actualised in the realities of conducting the empirical research for this study. This section will describe the actual process of gaining access to the research participants and the empirical study itself.

As with many research projects there was a considerable amount of time invested in making arrangements to conduct the research. This research had additional constraints because it was conducted in schools, where there were many levels of gatekeepers who had to give permission for the research before the young people could themselves be contacted (some of the gatekeepers put limitations on the discussion topics and also demanded that certain issues, such as 'sex', were not discussed, see Section 7.1.5, Chapter 7). As stated previously, the theoretical framework for this study is located within a child's rights perspectives which believes that children are capable of making informed decisions about their participation. However, this position is complicated by the fact that contacting children in schools necessarily involves getting through the gatekeepers before contact can be made. Thus, in respect to this research, there is a certain disjuncture between the theoretical framework which aims to prioritise children's rights to give consent and the acceptance that children have to be safe. In order to comply with
this, the researcher was voluntarily police checked and the information was offered to all the gatekeepers concerned. However, at no point during the fieldwork did anyone query the suitability of the researcher or whether a police check had been conducted.

6.3.2: Fieldwork Site

As previously discussed, the fieldwork was conducted in Glasgow which is the largest of Scotland’s cities, with 25 per cent of the 609,370 population aged nineteen or under (Glasgow City Council, 2003). Since the inception of the Scottish Parliament in 1999, Glasgow City Council has introduced measures to tackle domestic abuse, which the Parliament and the Council regard as a significant social problem, and has been given priority status (see Section 2.3.1.1, Chapter 2).

Scotland and Glasgow have been instrumental in setting up and implementing various strategies on domestic abuse and Glasgow has had considerable emphasis on young people and their attitudes towards domestic abuse. The approach has integrated citizenship, culture and education with domestic abuse issues, framed within the parameters of respect, power and relationships. Thus, Glasgow was chosen as the area for the empirical research to be conducted because of the (potential) awareness of the young people of the issues of male violence, and domestic abuse in particular (see Section 2.3.1.1, Chapter 2).

However, in addition to these aforementioned reasons, Glasgow was chosen because the researcher is a Glaswegian who has a substantial knowledge of the city. This is both in terms of the geography and socio-economic divisions of the city and also the personal experience of being a young person growing up in Glasgow and attending school there. This familiarity with the culture and language was also conducive to working with young people who regarded the researcher as being ‘like them’. 45

---

45 See Appendix V for list of Colloquialisms used in the interview extracts.
6.3.3: Contacting Participants

In February 2002 letters were sent explaining the research and seeking permission to approach schools in Glasgow, to the four Local Authorities in Glasgow (Glasgow Education Department, East Dunbartonshire City Council, South Lanark Education Department and East Renfrewshire Council), and permission was granted by all four departments. Procedurally, the heads of schools are the first point of contact and thus the heads of 34 state schools and 8 private schools were written to, asking them if they would participate in the research project. Resultant from this, all of the private schools refused, and ten state schools agreed to participate.

In total, there were thirteen focus groups involving 77 young people in the participating ten schools (three schools had two groups). A pilot focus group was conducted prior to the schools' groups with three white male sixteen year olds just beginning post GCSE courses. This group agreed that the focus group was an appropriate method to interview young people and found it an enjoyable experience. From the pilot study, the interview schedule was re-drafted, the groundrules were developed and the decision to include a flip-chart exercise was made (see Section 6.3.5). Of the actual groups, four were single sex (two male and two female) and the other nine were mixed sex (see Section 6.2.7). The gender ratio was slightly more female (43) than males (34). The age of the young people ranged from fifteen years to eighteen and their ethnicity was white-Scottish (37 female, 30 male), nine Asian-Scottish (6 female, 3 male) and one Chinese-Scottish (male) (see Appendix I). Due to the relatively small number of participants it is unclear whether the gender ratio had an effect on the responses that were given in the interviews, however, it was definitely the case that in each mixed and all male groups there was a dominant male who took the lead. In chapters 7 and 8, which discuss the empirical data in detail, it becomes apparent who the dominant male was in each group and this young male was able to either present an opposite view to the group which was then adopted by the group or their opposing view was often left unchallenged. The claim can thus be made that in all the groups with male participants, there would be a male who would dominate the group, even when they were the lone male and the other participants

46 There is considerably debate regarding what qualifies as a focus group as opposed to a group discussion. The definition of focus group which is used here is in the wider sense of a group of people who are brought together to discuss a specific issue presented to them and the terms focus group and group discussions are used interchangeably (see Section 6.2.7).
female. Whilst the interviews were deliberately and conscientiously constructed to be as non-hierarchical as possible, and the young people were encouraged to explain and defend their views, it was often the dominant male who defended their position the most rigorously on the occasion where they were challenged on it (see Chapters 7 and 8). It is also unclear how much the sex ratio affected the responses of the group with respect to how much the girls in single sex groups would have modified their answers if there were boys in their group and vice versa. From the sample the only fact that can be made with certainty was that if there were any males in the group one of them would dominate even if they were the only male amongst females. This male also tended to be a popular character who was confident and outspoken and, critically, was seen to be 'cool' by the other members of the group. This male was also heterosexual, by their own admission, and was popular with other boys and girls.

Whilst all the schools were state schools, there was a split with five catholic and five non-denominational schools. It would be entirely subjective to retrospectively assign a class status to the respondents as the young people were not asked to define themselves in economic-class terms. In order to contextualise the schools, the scores and rank on the Scottish Indices of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD)\(^47\) 2003 for each ward where the school is situated are given. In total there are 1222 wards in Scotland and those schools who rank closest to 1 are the most deprived and those ranked closer to 1222 are the least deprived. In addition, the percentage of secondary school pupils, in each school, who are entitled to free school meals is also given (for 2002-03).\(^48\) The table below thus gives a rough socio-economic classification for the schools in the study.

---

\(^47\) The domains in the SIMD are Income Deprivation, Employment Deprivation, Health Deprivation and Disability, Education, Skills and Training Deprivation, and Geographical Access to Services (www.scotland.gov.uk/library5/social/siod-06.asp).

\(^48\) All of the names of the schools have been removed to protect the anonymity of the participants, and they are referred to by number (see Appendix I for details of each school).
Table 1: Scottish Indices of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) 2003 and Pupil Entitlement to Free School Meals, 2002.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank (out of 1222)</th>
<th>% of Secondary School Pupils Entitled to Free School Meals, 2002-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>67.73</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>65.04</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>52.42</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>54.31</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.4: Pupil Participation.

Pupils aged between 15 and 18 years were involved in the research. The upper year groups were selected because it was thought that this would limit the propensity of schools refusing to participate. Pupils aged 15 were involved because young people can leave school from the age of sixteen and thus this age group was involved in order to get a more diversified sample (rather than solely pupils who choose to remain at school) and pupils cannot remain in school beyond the age of 18.

All the parents/guardians and pupils\(^49\) were sent out an *Information Sheet*\(^50\) about the research containing literature on the research, the research aims and objectives, and contact details of the researcher. There were, however, two different consent forms distributed: the parents/guardians received an ‘opt out’ form whereby they had to return the form stating that they did not want their child to participate, otherwise the assumption was made that they were in agreement; and the pupil was sent an ‘opt in’

\(^{49}\) Whilst the teachers were asked to randomly select pupils to participate, in many of the groups the teachers had selected whom they thought to be the most appropriate pupils such as the more ‘well behaved’ or academically orientated pupils. Some teachers, however, did randomly select from class registers.

\(^{50}\) See Appendix II
consent form which expressly stated that it had to be signed and dated prior to the focus group otherwise they would not be able to participate (see Hood et al, 1996).  

The Information Sheet was attached, to the consent form, so that the pupils could read about the research; have time to reflect about what the group would entail; get an idea of the types of questions they would be asked; and give them time to formulate any questions they wanted to ask. Signed and dated consent forms were received, on the day of the interview, from all the participants and it was reiterated that even if they had signed the form and consented, the young people could still withdraw from the study (at any stage) without any consequences.

6.3.5: The Focus Groups

The focus groups were conducted with groups ranging in size from three participants to seven. The interviews were semi-structured and only a topic guide, rather than a preset interview schedule, was referred to. All of the chairs in the room had a leaflet put on them with the names and contact details of local and national support services for children who may be experiencing, witnessing or concerned about abuse (see Appendix IV). The leaflets were placed on the chairs so that no one had to ask for them or felt stigmatised by being given one, and the leaflets also contained contact details for the researcher.

Whilst all the groups followed the same format there was an exception in Group 2, which was a school for children with special educational and emotional needs, and it was decided not to ask this group about domestic violence. This was decided because whilst all of the participants were fully informed about the research prior to the interviews, on arrival at this school the head teacher explained that the majority of the pupils in the group were living in households where abuse was occurring. During the focus group when the interview moved on to the issue of aggression, domination and violence, the respondents became very quiet, withdrawn and

51 See Appendix III
52 One of the schools was given a presentation about the research and the forms were left with the teachers and pupils. When the group was conducted the following week extra pupils had to included because so many wanted to participate. This school also expressed that they wanted to be involved in any further research.
appeared uncomfortable and the decision was taken not to pursue this line of discussion any further. Whilst this position can be criticised for failing to include these young people in a discussion about domestic violence, it was felt that the interviewer was not experienced or skilled enough in working with young people with special needs to ensure that the young people were not upset by the discussion. This was not done to patronise the young people or to exclude them, but was an ethical decision done with the intention of not making them discuss issues which they were clearly uncomfortable with.

All the participants in all the groups were also informed that at the end of the interview they would be asked to be ‘consultants’ to the research project to discuss what they thought of the focus group as a research method for working with young people. If the young people did not want to participate in this consultation exercise then they were informed that they could leave because the ‘official’ interview was over and this exercise was not being recorded or monitored. All of the participants remained and I asked them for their views of the interview itself, how it was organised, if they thought it was an appropriate methodological approach to use with young people and if they had suggestions to improve it for the next time. There was a unanimous agreement that the young people appreciated being involved in the research and being asked questions, in a non-patronising manner, about their views and opinions on such a ‘serious’ issue. They said they felt that it was less intimidating being interviewed in the group setting but now that they had done it they would be more willing to participate in a one-to-one interview, if I wanted them to. One of the groups volunteered to give up their lunch break to continue the consultation because they were enjoying the process so much.

6.3.5.1: ‘Groundrules’

Before the start of the interview, ‘groundrules’ were put on the wall (and left there throughout the interview) and were talked through to ensure that everyone was aware of them, understood them and appreciated that they had to abide by them. The ‘groundrules’ emphasised some of the points in the Information Sheet and contained additional information about the conduct of the focus groups. The first ‘groundrule’ emphasised that the interview was confidential and that the participants should not
tell other people what was discussed (although it was understood that some of the participants may have wanted to tell their friends and family about their experience and thus was qualified by adding that they should not disclose specific examples of what was said). It was also explained that someone else would have to be informed if any disclosures of abuse were made, although, this would not be done without first discussing it with them. The second rule emphasised that the interview was anonymous so that they could choose, or be assigned, a pseudonym so that their real names would never be used in the report of the research. As the interview was being audio-tape recorded it was explained that it would only be the researcher who would hear the tape and once the interviews were transcribed (by the researcher) only the pseudonyms would be used. In relation to this it was made explicit that if anyone was not comfortable with the tape recorder then it did not have to be used and that anyone, at any point during the interview, had the right to turn it off, without any repercussions for so doing. Respect was the next 'groundrule' whereby they were asked to respect other people's opinions even if they differed from their own. This also included not talking over each other and allowing the person to finish what they were saying first. Additionally it was emphasised that sexist, racist, disabilist or any other offensive language would not be tolerated. They were informed that they had the right to say 'no' and they could 'pass' on any of the discussion topics if they wished. It was also emphasised that they did not have to talk about their own personal experiences, but if they did want to, then they could do so (with the above issue of disclosure emphasised). Finally it was explained that the written notes were only to aid the identification of who was talking on the tape when it was transcribed.53

6.3.5.2: Payment
No mention of payment was made at any point before or during the interview but at the end of the interview all the participants were offered refreshments in the form of crisps and fizzy drinks as a small compensation for the time they had given towards the interview (see Mahon et al, 1996).

53 At each group a colleague was present to take notes in case the participants did not want the tape-recorder on.
6.3.5.3: Interview Schedules

The central topic of the focus groups was on the young people's perceptions of gender constructions and their views on male violence against women, specifically domestic abuse, and in investigating whether they perceived any connection between masculinity and male violence. Therefore, there were four main research questions being investigated:

1. How is masculinity constructed?
2. What are young peoples' understandings of male violence?
3. Do young men and women accept male violence as part of male gender identity?
4. What is the relationship between masculinity and violence and how is this translated in interpersonal relationships?

It was recognised that the terminology and theoretical concepts embedded in the research questions are perhaps familiar only to academics and it was essential to frame these questions in such ways that the respondents would understand them. Thus, the first half of the focus group involved the young people being split into two groups with one group writing down on flip chart paper all the words they could think associated with 'men' and the other group all the words associated with 'women' (except group three, because there were only three of them and group two because the participants had special educational needs and it was less appropriate for them to write things down). It was explained that they could write words relating to work, clothing, hairstyle, and music for example, but in order to avoid charges of prompting the 'men' group to write about male violence, there was a conscious decision not to mention anything to do with behaviour or emotions. After the words were written, the participants had written down their words, they were asked to explain them, and a group discussion ensued. The participants were asked to give examples of role models who they thought would be appropriate for boys and girls in order to make the discussion more tangible and to establish the characteristics that boys and girls admired in adult women and men. In the second part of the focus group, the issue of domestic abuse was raised and the young people were asked to give definitions of what this meant. This engendered lengthy discussions and they were asked why they thought it occurred (see Chapters 7 and 8).
In the pilot interview, there was a more formalised structured topic guide; however, in practice, the flip-chart exercise was a more appropriate introduction to the discussion and put the young people at ease. The discussions of their words lasted for different lengths of time but ensured that a discussion did take place. The participants reflected very carefully about their responses, which were made with some deliberation and thought. The topic guide was therefore not strictly necessary but was a good reference point if the group were struggling to verbalise or answer any of the questions put to them and helped ensure that the discussion stayed on the relevant issues and did not get 'side-tracked' on other matters.

During the interviews, the participants were, at times, asked to elaborate their responses. This was done because the study was investigating attitudes found by other research which identified that some young people have a high tolerance of male violence (see Section 1.0, Chapter 1 and Chapter 5) and it was deemed appropriate to challenge their views and get them to explain why they responded in particular ways. In the feedback the young people said they appreciated the opportunity to present and defend their points of view. The ethos of the interview was reciprocal whereby the participants could ask questions which were honestly answered, although some were answered at the end of the interview where it was deemed more appropriate.

6.3.5.4: Analysis of Data

A thematic analysis of the interview transcripts was conducted, using the qualitative computer package NUD*IST, and from this analysis, key themes emerged and these are represented in Chapters 7 and 8. A substantial amount of the content of these findings chapters is the text of the young people which was transcribed verbatim. The direct quotations are used in these two chapters, in order to give the young people their voice and to limit the amount of reinterpretation of their speech as much as possible.

It is inappropriate to quantify the responses of the young people because a formal interview schedule was not adhered to in each group. Where quantitative measures can be made, they have been included but it is important to emphasise that this research is not a representative sample and is meant to be illustrative of what some
young people think about these issues. All the names included in these chapters are pseudonyms that were chosen for them or that the young people chose for themselves. Also, each participant has a code beside their name which represents: their sex (f = female / m = male); group number; age and is represented as follows: [f;g12;17] (see Appendix I). In each quotation, M represents the researcher. Also if there are no spaces between the quotations it represents a discussion in the same group, if there is a space it signifies that the extracts are from different interviews.

6.3.6: Summary of Methods
It has been explained that Glasgow has invested in, and developed, educational programmes to challenge young people's views of male violence, which is why this area was selected for the research sample. The process of conducting the research, and the various problems connected with it, have also been discussed. Some of the issues discussed above remain unresolved, such as to how to enable young people to consent to research without this decision being taken for them. The issue of having single or mixed sex groups is also an issue which remains unanswered but that future research, on a larger scale, may clarify.

6.4: Conclusion
This chapter has discussed the epistemological and methodological ideology of this research project and how it relates to the methods employed in this study. It has been argued that a feminist methodological approach is a more reflexive process that acknowledges subjectivity and recognises the part that it plays in feminist research. Considerable length was spent discussing methodological and epistemological implications of researching with children when trying to integrate a children's rights perspective which also reflects feminist ideology. The last section described the research process itself and raised issues which were pertinent to this research.

The next two chapters will present the data on young people's views of gender construction, and their views about domestic abuse and male violence, and Chapter 9 will discuss the implications of this data.
Chapter 7
Findings 1: Gender Constructions

7.0: Introduction
Before the findings are presented it is important to reiterate the research questions that were being explored through the group interviews:

1. How is masculinity constructed?
2. What are young peoples' understandings of male violence?
3. Do young men and women accept male violence as part of male gender identity?
4. What is the relationship between masculinity and violence and how is this translated in interpersonal relationships?

The findings of the focus groups have been split into two chapters: this chapter will explore the young people's responses to the gender differences between women and men. Chapter 8 will examine the discussions on male violence against women and domestic abuse, in relation to their conceptualisations of gender constructions.

This chapter is divided into two parts: the first part describes the data on the young people's conceptualisations of perceived gender differences and behaviour; the second part concentrates on their views about gender constructions. Within both of these parts there are subdivisions: the first part on gender differences and behaviour is split into sections on emotions, communication, caring, employment, sexuality, body image, acceptance, sport and role models. These demarcations are resultant from the words which the young people wrote during the flip-chart exercise in relation to identifying differences between women and men, with the exception of the concept of role models which was introduced by the interviewer. As such, these schemas are resultant from the words the young people wrote rather than being categories predefined by the interviewer.
Chapter 7

The second part on gender constructions is subdivided into sections on the male breadwinner and female dependent model; the equalising of roles and positions; alternative masculinities; 'macho' masculinity; and aggression. Similarly, these categories were defined as a result of the process of analysis but due to the dialogical nature of group interviews the categories are not strictly discrete and there is an element of overlap in these sections.

As argued in the Methods section (Part 3, Chapter 6), it is problematic to quantify small-scale qualitative data but where there was unanimous agreement, either by all of the participants in the group, or by all of the groups, this is indicated.

Part 1: Gender Differences and Behaviour

7.1: Introduction to Gender Differences and Behaviour

This section presents the discussions the young people had in response to the flip-chart exercise where they were asked to write down words about women and men (see Section 6.3.5.3, Chapter 6). As with all data analysis, there is an element of interpretation involved, and in this chapter the author has selected material that represents issues that were raised by the different groups and which reflects the points the participants were making. All of the sub-headings below, in the first part of this chapter (excluding the role model section), are resultant from the words the young people wrote, during the flip-chart exercise, on the differences between women and men.

7.1.1: Emotional

One of the first issues to be discussed by all of the groups was in relation to women being more 'emotional' than men, which all of the groups were in agreement with. Indeed, the list of words relating to women in this category ranged from "emotional", "affectionate", "compassionate", "considerate", and "loving", which is contrasted to emotional words for men, which were "angry", "caring (sometimes)", and "weak
emotionally". The first extract from Zahid, identifies that he does not regard being emotional as a positive attribute, and believes that women are “too emotional”.

Zahid [m;g12;17]: I think women are too emotional. ... I wouldn't say they are strong emotionally, I would say they are a bit more confident with their emotions and showing it whereas men are just more guarded. They don't really let on that they care.

Also in relation to men being emotional Michael (Group 7) agrees that in general women are more emotional than men and that this is the case unless the emotion is anger (in relation to this point, all the groups wrote either “dominant” or “aggressive” or both in relation to men, and this is discussed further in Section 7.2.5):

M: So you think men are less emotional?
Michael [m;g7;15]: Apart from if it's anger.

In one of the all boy groups (Group 12), William explains that he thinks that there is a disjuncture between how men feel and how they act, whereby men act in a certain way which is not necessarily reflective of how they are actually feeling (Frosh et al, 2002).

William [m;g12;16]: I think it's just that, in men it is just like, things can be different on the exterior than what they are actually inside. Although men like to put on the facade that they are strong and that but they are quite often not.

This is reiterated by Emma [f;g1;15] who claims that men “hide their feelings more”. It is unclear whether, as a whole, the young people regard being ‘emotional’ as a positive or negative quality but this issue was usually regarded in reference to women and surfaced throughout the interviews at various points.
7.1.2: Communication

In relation to women being regarded as more emotional than men, some of the young people associated communication skills and styles with this and argued that women were better communicators than men. In the first extract below, Mia introduces the concept of 'trust' to communication and she appears to broaden out the discussion on communication by connecting it to issues of friendships and trust.

_Mia [f; g3; 17]:_ Yes, and we share things and communicate better. And there is a different level of trust between girls than there is between boys.

_Edward [m; g3; 18]:_ Lassies will sit and talk to each other about things that have happened, things in their life that have affected them and that, but boys won't. Boys will just sit there and talk about something that was on the telly or sport or something. They don't actually talk about stuff that actually happens in their life and things that affect them.

Both Mia and Edward are in agreement that girls talk more to each other about personal issues than boys do. Similarly, in a different group (Group 5), both Megan and Gareth also agree that women and girls are more communicative than boys and men.

_Megan [f; g5; 16]:_ Women find it easier to talk about their problems, if you know what I mean, with other people they will go and say to one another. But guys will just leave it and try and bury it under the surface and won't ever mention it. Even if they have got a problem with their friends then I think they are less likely to go and talk to their friends about it. Whereas if a girl had a problem with her friends she would go and talk to them about it.

_M: _So if they had a problem with somebody, not their friends, but with a teacher or their parents or their sister or something.

_Megan [f; g5; 16]:_ I don't think they are likely to talk about it. I don't know, that is just what I
think. I don't they would talk about it as openly as girls would do.

Gareth [m; g5; 16]: Guys would probably bottle it up.

The discussion of communication appear to reflect wider issues about friendship, trust and expressing feelings, as well as the difference in communication styles between females and males (Holland et al, 1998).

7.1.3: Caring

In conjunction with the discussion about women being more emotional and communicative than men/boys many of the young people argued that women were more caring. Some of the reasons for this were predicated in women’s childbearing role and some of the words, in relation to women, used by the groups included women being “caregivers”, “maternal”, “carers”, “caring” and “loving”. There were no ‘care words’ used for men. However, one of the discussions by Group 8 identifies that boys and men are caring but “hide it” more than women/girls who are more explicit about their caring side.

Ryan [m; g8; 15]: Boys are caring as well. Boys do care as well.
Bethany [f; g8; 15]: But girls are maternal.
Amanda [f; g8; 15]: Girls don’t try to hide it under big layers of manliness.
Bethany [f; g8; 15]: They [boys] try and be all masculine and try not to show their feelings whereas we just don’t care.

This extract identifies that the young people have clear views about masculinity and femininity and associated traits and behaviours. This is illustrated by Amanda, above, who refers to men hiding their caring side under “big layers of manliness”, which is implicitly critical of normative masculinity (Connell, 1995). Bethany also emphasises that women/girls do not have to hide their “feelings” which is presumably because it is a characteristic of femininity for women to be regarded as more caring or maternal, for example (see O’Donnell and Sharpe, 2000).
The above dialogue is taken from a mixed group in which there were three boys and three girls and in this group Ryan was clearly the most outspoken and assertive member. As will become evident from further extracts from Ryan, he had quite a 'macho' or masculine persona and made jokes about girls and from early on asserted his heterosexuality. Thus, it is perhaps the case that Ryan was able to suggest that men were also 'caring' because for Ryan to say this would not undermine his heterosexuality or masculine identity (see Epstein, 1997, 1998 for a discussion of heterosexuality and homophobia).

7.1.4: Employment/Work

One of the other areas in which all the young people had unambiguous, and shared, opinions was in relation to the demarcations between the different jobs assigned to, and undertaken by, women and men. From the lists, the words relating to employment for women included: "cleaners", "jobs with less risks", "low pay", "less pay", "nurse" and "office work". Most of these words referred to pay and types of jobs and only a number of job titles, such as nurse or cleaner, were referred to. This is in contrast to the words for men which, in addition to discussions about pay and status, "better paid", "earn more money", "boss", "high profile jobs", included numerous example of specific jobs such as, "trades", "builders", "manual workers", "industrial jobs", "engineering/engineers", "risky jobs - fireman, police", "lawyers", and "more in high power - US Presidency".

There was acknowledgment that, whilst men did not only do manual work to the exclusion of other types of work, it was agreed that strictly men, and not women, performed this type of work. There was also recognition by all of the groups about the disparities in pay between women and men. In some of the groups the analysis of this was complex and sophisticated, involving discussions of the "glass ceiling" and the male gender hierarchy in many workplaces (Equal Opportunities Commission, 1998, 2001). Most of the groups spoke of the gendered nature of some jobs and nursing (as women's work) was mentioned in all of the groups. The groups tried to rationalise their answers and argued that women's status as caregivers and nurturers contributed to the understanding of nursing as a woman's profession. The members of group 4 (in a school in an affluent area that was at the bottom end of the Scottish
Indices of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) ranked at 1207 out of 1222 and with only 5.4% of the pupils entitled to free school meals) argued that a man’s heterosexuality, whether assumed or presumed, would be questioned if he were a nurse and an assumption of homosexuality would be made (Mac an Ghaill, 1994). All the young people’s responses were placed within a heterosexual framework, and an identification with homosexuality, according to these young people, is something to be avoided (Redman, 1996).

*Leigh [f;g4;17]:* Men maybe wouldn’t want to do a nurse’s job ‘cos it’s a stereotype that they might think oh that’s a female’s job.

*Rubina [f;g4;17]:* Yeh, they might not want to go into a pub and say “oh yeh, I’m a nurse”.

*Leigh [f;g4;17]:* People might think they are gay or something.

This point is discussed in Chapter 5, where some young people argued that male homosexuality was predicated on the perception of the boys’ behaviour and not their sexuality or sexual practice (Nayak and Kehily, 1996). This is the rationale used by Leigh in the quotation above and is the findings discussed by Nayak and Kehily (1996). Furthermore, the identification of ‘women’s work’ and ‘men’s work’ seems to be related to sexuality and specifically heterosexuality and it could be argued that this position is informed by an understanding of masculinity and femininity which reflects traditional ideologies (Equal Opportunities Commission, 2001).

### 7.1.5: Sexuality

Some of the schools stipulated that sexuality or sex could not be discussed and thus this issue was not introduced in any of the groups (which is a problem with gatekeepers in social research, see Part 2 and 3, Chapter 6). However, through the discussions it was evident that there was an implicit understanding that heterosexuality was the norm. This normative assumption, or assertion, of

---

54 Because the issue of homosexuality is only briefly explicitly discussed in this section, this is in no way meant to imply that further discussion is not needed on this issue and instead is a result of the schools prohibition of a discussion of this issue. Indeed, as has been argued throughout, sexuality and how men interact with other men and women is fundamental to the analysis of male violence, which is regarded as an expression of normative male gender behaviour.
heterosexuality was a finding in much of the other research conducted with young people on gender constructions as discussed in Chapter 5 (see Nayak and Kehily, 1996; Mandel and Shakeshaft, 2000; Frosh et al, 2002). In addition to the comment by Leigh above (and Mia, see Section 7.2.4 in relation to ‘macho’ masculinity) only one of the boys out of all groups explicitly referred to male homosexuality in relation to people they know and this was done in a very negative way:

*John [m; g1]; 16*: If there was a boy in our school and we thought he was gay then we would outcast him straight away.

As shown, and as reflected in the literature on young men and masculinity contained in Chapter 5, one of the key issues for the boys was about peer group acceptance (Frosh et al, 2002). For the boys in the literature, and the boys in the focus groups, any deviation from the norm of heterosexuality would not have been acceptable. Furthermore, John’s group was an all male group which perhaps censored the groups ability to suggest anything other than strict conformity to heterosexuality because as was argued by Flood (1997) and discussed in Section 5.5, Chapter 5, it is boys who are most concerned with rejecting homosexuality and are, in relation, more outwardly homophobic. This issue of heterosexuality is linked to the notion of peer group acceptance because any deviation from the ‘norm’ of heterosexuality would be a possible reason for the boys to be excluded from his peer group and thus this issue of heterosexuality was crucial (Frosh et al, 2002).

### 7.1.6: Body Image

Another characteristic discussed by the participants was in relation to women’s alleged preoccupation with their appearance. Most of the discussion about image was in relation to women, and it was often regarded in negative ways. The body image of girls/women was also linked to behavioural characteristics of girls/women who are portrayed as “bitchy”, “flirty” and “vain”. In contrast, the words for men in relation to body image were much more positive (or neutral) such as men being “physically stronger”. As was argued in Chapter 1 it is not simply that men and women are ‘different but equal’ but in the radical feminist analysis, due to the power imbalance, men and associated qualities are regarded much more highly than women.
and their respective qualities (Rowland and Klein, 1990). On this topic of body image, this appears to be the analysis the young people have with negative descriptions for women concerned with body image and either neutral or positive associations for men, which the following extracts illustrate.

Diane[f; g1; 15]: Girls are all really pretty.
Claire[f; g1; 15]: Boys are all rolling in the mud. I don’t know about anybody else here but I think that girls that act all feminine irritate me. All giggles and flicking back hair and all that.

Rubina[f; g4; 17]: We can be a bitch. No it is just, ’em, you have to act. Being a women you have to act certain ways at certain times.
Leigh[f; g4; 17]: I suppose as well women tend to be a lot more two-faced than men. I’m a bit of a docu-soap addict and I kind of know. ... when I watch it you don’t see the men bitching but the women bitch all the time especially about the other women. And they are a lot more paranoid about each other and in competition for being the most dominant one or the most beautiful one. They can be quite bitchy sometimes.

Tracey[f; g7; 15]: Women are more interested in their appearance.
Veronica[f; g7; 15]: They are more vain than guys.
Tracey[f; g7; 15]: Women are more vain than men.
Michael[m; g7; 15]: Women are more flirty as well.
M: What do you mean by that?
Michael[m; g7; 15]: They flirt too much.
Tracey[f; g7; 15]: No we don’t.
Robert[m; g7; 16]: Attention.
Michael[m; g7; 15]: Aye, they are attention seeking.
Robert[m; g7; 16]: You don’t even realise this, it’s just in your nature.

In the first excerpt Claire defines girls as displaying behaviours that she finds irritating (which presumably do not apply to her), although none of the other group members agree with her statement. In the second extract, Rubina claims that “we can be a bitch” but then argues that it is actually that women have “to act” in a
certain way, which perhaps suggests that she means that women are expected to act in certain ways that do not necessarily reflect how women/girls really are. This is similar to William’s comment made in the first section on emotions (Section 7.1.1) which explains that how men feel and how they act may be in conflict. Leigh, however, develops this point and argues that women are competitive amongst themselves, and that this is in relation to dominance and beauty. She bases this understanding on her viewing of ‘docu-soaps’ and distances herself from this analysis by referring to “they” instead of “we” as Rubina does. The participants in the third extract refer to women’s concern with “appearance” and their “vanity”. Michael adds that women are “too flirty”, which is based on his understanding of women’s desire for “attention” that Robert essentialises to be constitutive of women’s characteristics.

7.1.7: Acceptance

Generally, when asked if they could give evidence based reasons (their own experiences are classified as evidence based for this purpose) the participants often did not know how to verbalise the differences that they were claiming between women and men. Due to this, they were asked to draw upon their own personal experiences in the classroom. In response to this, there was unanimous agreement, by all of the groups, that boys were much more noisy and disruptive in the classroom than girls.

*Ewan [m;g11;16]:* Aye it is always the boys that are mucking about. You don’t see the lassies doing it.

*Edward [m;g3;18]:* There are four boys for every lassie gets into trouble in this school.

These statements reflect the literature discussed in Chapter 5, where it was argued that it was generally the boys, rather than the girls, who were disruptive in the classroom (Equal Opportunities Commission, 1998; Jackson, 2002). When asked about this ‘bad’ behaviour all of the boys in the groups, including the self-professed badly behaved ones, conceded that it was “stupid” and “pointless” but they did it because it was “a laugh”. When probed on this point, Edward explained that it was
more than just about having a laugh but it was a crucial way for boys to be accepted by their group. Indeed, in this respect, peer pressure seemed to be a much more salient issue for the boys than it was for the girls (O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000).

Edward [m; g3; 18]: 'Cos, like boys, if you are seen to be studying all the time and you don't go out much you are not accepted, kind of. So if you are smart, you are not accepted, basically.

Edward’s response may be connected to the fact that his school is located in an area which ranked 36 out of 1222 on the SIMD scale. Therefore, it may be the case that being studious and academic is not an aspirational goal due to the high levels of deprivation, which may be why school work is rejected in favour of behaviour that ingratiates the boys to the ‘cooler’ sets of boys in the school. However, in general the young people explained that it was not “cool” for boys to be seen to be hard working and thus all the coolest boys consciously did not do school work or homework, or conveyed the image that they did not do any. These views of the participants are confirmed in other pieces of research with young people which found that many of the young men either did not do school work, or projected the image that they did not (Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Reay, 2002). There was also an element of competition amongst the boys to see who could be the most disruptive, with the accolade of ‘coolest’ being synonymous with the title of class ‘clown’.

Edward [m; g3; 18]: I don’t think that lassies are as competitive as boys are, as far as stuff like that goes on. ... Just going into class to see who can get chucked out first and stupid things like that. It’s just stupid.

Contrary to this, Owen, who had explained that he was not like the other boys and was very much an outsider, did state that not all of the boys complied with this ‘bad’ behaviour, himself included even though Owen’s school is in a similar socio-economic area as Edward above and rates 77 on the SIMD scale:

Owen [m; g8; 15]: You do get some boys that want to work, instead of being total idiots.
From these discussions it appeared that peer group acceptance was a different issue for the boys than the girls. The boys were aware of the inherent contradictions in their disruptive classroom behaviour, but argued that it was, at times, rational, deliberate behaviour in order to be accepted by their (male) peers even though it could have deleterious effects on their school work. It could be argued, however, that acceptance was extremely important to both the boys and the girls but they differed in their methods for gaining this. The girls appeared to be more individualistic in their methods by focusing on appearance to get attention and acceptance and the boys opted for more collective methods such as those discussed above.

7.1.8: Sport
Another key theme which emerged from the flip-chart exercise was the significance of sport in differentiating women from men, and girls from boys. It was evident that in all of the schools sports were highly gender segregated with the boys playing football and rugby, and the girls playing netball and hockey. All of the girls, in all of the schools, expressed discontent with this arrangement and some of them explained that since their first year at secondary school they had unsuccessfully lobbied their sports department to redress this. When asked to describe the difference in boys' and girls' sport the responses included:

*Emma [f;g1;15]*: If they're [boys/men] into sports it's like more dangerous things. Well not more dangerous but like rugby and wrestling. Rather than like ballet dancing and stuff.

*Andrew [m;s1;15]*: [male sports are] more hands on.

*Natalie [f;g13;16]*: [female sports are] Non-contact. Less active almost.

*Shazia [f;g13;17]*: And netball is just pure [very] polite.

There was a sense of ownership from all of the boys in relation to their conceptualisation and descriptions of football. Whilst the boys and girls agreed that it was mostly a 'boys' sport', the girls were clear that they felt unfairly excluded
from playing it in their schools but the boys were satisfied with this situation. The extract below is from discussion with Sara and Hannah about football.

*Sara [f; g10; 15]:* Men are more into football than women are.

*Hannah [f; g10; 15]:* Football is a rougher game.

*Sara [f; g10; 15]:* I think it's more violent. ... The rougher the better, they [boys/men] think they look harder then.

Whilst football was regarded, by the boys and the girls, as quite a rough game, this roughness, according to the pupils, was not intrinsic to the game itself but was introduced by the male players who deliberately played “rough”.

*John [m; g11; 16]:* It's the guys that make it rough.

*Grant [m; g11; 16]:* If we play against women we make it a lot less harder.

Whilst the boys and the girls agreed with this analysis, one boy was adamant that boys and girls should not play football together because it is essentially a man’s sport. When challenged by the young women in the group about this he conceded that females could play it, as long as they did not play it with boys/men.

*M:*

*It shouldn't be allowed [girls playing football], why do you think that?*

*Cameron [m; g2; 17]:* They should play with lassies but they shouldn't play with the boys. 'Cos for boys it's a men's game.

*Fiona [f; g2; 16]:* Aye but some lassies like football.

*Brian [m; g2; 18]:* Aye lassies end up greeting [crying] and everything.

*Cameron [m; g2; 17]:* Say you hit a powerful shot and it hits a lassie, you know what I mean, she couldn't take it. ... 'Cos lassies play their own games and boys play their own games together. Let boys play together and let lassies play their own games together.

This suggests that some of these young people are working within a very gender segregated model of masculinity and femininity even to the point of sports
participation which is perhaps unsurprising when considered in the context of their schools’ sports sex segregation policies. This would support the argument that the ideology of schools and the way in which schools perpetuate particular ideologies of gender is centrally important (Epstein, 1997; Aveling, 2002).

Not only did the different sports represent the differences between girls and boys in schools but the reasons for playing sports were also seen as fundamentally different. Wendy initially states that boys play sports for fun and girls so they can keep their figures “in shape” which also relates back to women’s alleged preoccupation with their body image (see Section 7.1.6). After this initial statement, Wendy proceeded to give a more socio-cultural account and explain that sports are regarded as closely associated with men which adds pressure on the boys to participate in sport in order to conform to acceptable masculine behaviour.

Wendy (f; g8; 15]: *I think boys do it out of a hobby but lassies feel the need to do it. They feel they need to be in shape but boys they just do it naturally. ... I think boys feel more pressured into taking PE than lassies 'cos it's a sporty thing and you associate that with guys I think.*

However, there are contradictions in Wendy’s account because she comments that girls’ “*feel they need to be in shape*” but gives no explanation as to why they feel like this and then argues that boys “*feel more pressured*”. It could be argued that girls’ are also pressured but in Wendy’s language this pressure on girls appears to be less that that which is imposed on the boys.

John also linked ideologies about appropriate gender behaviour with sport by arguing that there are women’s and men’s sports and if the boundary is crossed there are ramifications. John [m; g11; 16], however, illustrated this point with an example of a woman playing a ‘man’s sport’ whereby, he states: “*Women rugby players are all big men. They are not feminine*”. This also suggests that John has fixed ideas about what behaviour and bodily image is appropriately masculine and feminine (O’Donnell and Sharpe, 2000).
Arguably there are connections between the participants’ analysis of sports and the associated gender demarcations and the discussions about appropriate masculine and feminine behaviour and image and these are discussed further in Part 2 of this chapter.

7.1.9: Role Models
In order to investigate what the young people were basing their conceptualisations and understandings of gender on, they were asked about role models and to name who they thought would be ‘suitable’ role models for girls and boys. Footballers were the top choice for role models for boys. (Worryingly, when asked, the boys all favoured Vinnie Jones over David Beckham as a role model for boys because Jones was seen as a “hard-nut” (Joseph [m;g6;16]) and thus ‘cooler’, and Beckham was rejected by the boys as a role model because he was regarded as not being as “tough” (read: masculine). Significantly, all the girls favoured Beckham as a role model for the boys. For those unfamiliar with these footballers: Jones was sent off the field for being violent during football games and has since made a career playing a gangster and thug in various movies. Beckham is known for being fashion conscious and family orientated and won a ‘Father of the Year Award’ and explains that, for him, a non-violent, loving family environment is conducive to his top class footballer status.) Cameron, who was very much against girls/women playing football, is the only boy who suggested specific characteristics of a role model and who choose a role model for boys who was not a footballer, although was a sports person. Cameron [m;g2;17] explained that Alex Higgins, the snooker player, would be a good role model for boys because he is a “nice guy”.55 Parents were also regarded as role models but along strictly gender demarcated lines.

\[\text{Diane [f;g1;15]: Daughters tend to look up to their mums and sons will look up to their fathers rather than vice versa.}\]

In contradiction, David, who attends a school which has 49% of its attendees eligible for free school meals and which is ranked 36th highest on the SIMD scale, and hence

55 Paradoxically, this image of Higgins is in contrast to the reports of his violence, alcoholism and antisocial behaviour as reported in the press (Borrows, 2003).
is in an area with significant deprivation, comments on the potential problems of having parents as role models.

*David [m;g3;17]:* I think it's like the role models. 'Cos for a lot of people, their parents are unemployed and then they see their parents. They are not intelligent and they do not have a job and they seem to be doing all right so why should they work hard just now if they can get on with life just like that?

David reasons that if parents did not continue with their education, or are unemployed, then this could be a disincentive for young people and thus they may not necessarily be good role models. In addition to parents, Rubina argues that for women, a role model is someone whom women aspire to look like.

*Rubina [f;g4;17]:* See with women, I think lots of women would have the role model of a famous actress who is really pretty and has the figure. ... You want to look like them.

This exemplifies the earlier differences set out by the young people that women were more concerned with their appearance than men (see Section, 7.1.6). Whilst Rubina explains that she is speaking on behalf of lots of women, this cannot be taken to be the case and it may be that Rubina is looking to justify her choice of role model, through projecting a role model based on looks, as an aspiration of other women. This issue of whether the young people are describing their own views or the views of other people, or are disguising their own views as those of others, is complex. At times, the young people explain that they are merely describing the views and opinions of others but it is impossible to differentiate between what is their view and what is not. Due to the flow of the conversation in the groups, the decision was taken to interrupt the conversation as little as possible. Thus, often it is left unclear as to whether the young people are presenting their own opinion or describing, what they consider to be, the opinion of 'others'.
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7.1.10: Summary of Gender Differences and Behaviour

In response to the flip-chart exercise the participants wrote words which have been classified as relating to emotional behaviour, communication skills, caring abilities, employment, body image, behaviour and sports, and role models. In addition to the physical differences, which were only cursorily referred to, the distinctions which the young people focused on were behavioural. Cultural stereotypes of traditional masculinity and femininity were relied upon quite heavily with women described as more "caring" and "emotional" and men more "sporty" and "confident" for example, and boys were presented as being more concerned with outward projections of their masculinity.

The next section presents, and analyses, the findings from the discussions about the young people's perceptions of what constitutes men and women and how they perceive the differences, or indeed the similarities, between women and men.

Part 2: Gender Constructions

7.2: Introduction to Gender Constructions

This section will explore the responses given by the participants who were asked to expand and explain what they had written or described about women and men as a continuation of the flip-chart exercise. Simply, they were asked to substantiate what they had written (or described) in order for the interviewer to understand the bases of their opinions. It should also be reiterated that, at this stage, the topic of domestic violence had not been introduced so the young people were not prompted by the interviewer to raise issues about male violence. The following excerpts from the interviews identify that many of the young people adhered to a traditional male breadwinner and female dependent model and issues of male dominance were evident in all of the focus groups.
7.2.1: Male Breadwinner and Female Dependent Model

Andrew, the only male amongst six other females, and whose school was ranked 1097 out of the 1222 on the SIMD scale and is thus in an area with little deprivation, depicts a scenario of some young women still ascribing, and aspiring, to a dependency on a male breadwinner (O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000).

Andrew [m; gl; 15]: Some girls still look to that [traditional role] 'cos they say, well if he can look after you then I won't have to do much as he'll look after me. 'Cos he can bring in the money for me and he'll do this and he can do that and I can stay at home and look after the children. It is a bad way to think but some people still do.

Andrew was eager to stress that he did not necessarily agree with this construction but it remained that some “people” still thought like that. Throughout the focus groups many of the young people ‘degendered’ the ‘people’ whom they were referring to, by talking in gender neutral language (such as Andrew does in the above extract) even though they were explicitly, and implicitly, referring to either women or men. Furthermore, it is interesting that whilst Andrew is the only male in the group of six fifteen year olds and is effectively telling the girls what their, and their peers’, aspirations are, none of the girls challenge Andrew’s opinion on this (this issue was discussed in Section 6.3.3, Chapter 6, in relation to the role of the dominant male in the group).

In one of the all female groups two of the young women were very clear in their views that men and women have very specific roles in the household, which were demarcated along the male as breadwinner and women as child carer model (Head, 1999; Visser, 2002). As mentioned, at times it was difficult to differentiate between what were the respondents’ own opinions, and what they were describing as a stereotype held by other people. The quotation below is an example of this whereby it is problematic to discern if this is Julie and Natalie’s own views or their interpretation of the views held by ‘others’.
Julie [f;g13;16]: Guys are expected to go out to work and take care of the family, and women are brought up to raise the family and take care of the husband and the house and stuff.

Natalie [f;g13;16]: The husbands and the male looks after the material needs and the woman looks after the emotional needs.

In the same group (shown below) Shazia is explicit in her opinion that men should be the primary breadwinners. However, Shazia is asked by one of the other young women whether this a religious view, perhaps because she is Asian, and the other non-Asian young women may have assumed a religious, or cultural, perspective by Shazia because of this. Shazia’s response to the question by Natalie places her opinion within a religious framework.

Shazia [f;g13;17]: Yeh, the way I see it is like the guy is meant to be the provider of his house.

Natalie [f;g13;16]: Is that a religious thing?

Shazia [f;g13;17]: It is set down in the bible that the man is the head of the house.

In contrast to the previous extract, Shazia is clear that this is her opinion by prefacing her statement with “the way I see it” so, in this instance, she is explicit about her position. In another of the schools, a catholic school, which ranked very high on the SIMD scale (36/1222), the three respondents challenged each other over the authenticity of traditional gender roles.

Edward [m;g3;18]: Aye, ‘cos men were always seen as doing physical jobs, while women were supposed to stay in the house and look after the children and stuff like that.

Mia [f;g3;17]: But that is a bit old fashioned.

Edward [m;g3;18]: Aye, but that was something that was really true at one point, people did do that. I am not saying it is now.

David [m;g3;17]: That was the stereotype, it still is.

Mia [f;g3;17]: I don’t think it still is.

David [m;g3;17]: If you go to most boys in this school and say is the male the breadwinner of the family, they will say yes.

Mia [f;g3;17]: Aye, well that’s a typical male view.
In this discussion it is interesting that David and Edward both argue that this was the traditional position, and that it is still the dominant viewpoint, particularly held by the boys in their school (O’Donnell and Sharpe, 2000). Mia replies that that is a “typical male view” so it seems that both the boys in the group and Mia (the only female) all agree that it is the boys that still ascribe to this traditional gender stereotyping. This positioning of boys is discussed in Chapter 5 where, for instance, the Equal Opportunities Commission (2001) research on Young People and Sex Stereotyping found that boys, rather than girls, are more traditional and more disposed to subscribe, and aspire, to the male dominance model (see also Griffin, 1985; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Sharpe, 1994; O’Donnell and Sharp, 2000; Skelton and Hall, 2001). What is also significant is that this school is in an area which is ranked at 36 on the SIMD scale which suggests that there are high levels of deprivation. It may thus be the case that many of the males in this area may be unemployed and are not the ‘breadwinners’ in the sense that they bring home a ‘family wage’.

7.2.2: Equalising of Roles and Positions?
In one of the all female groups, Julie challenges the traditional gender stereotypes and argues that the position of women has changed through women entering the labour market, and by men taking more responsibility in the home:

*Julie [f;g13;16]:* I think it is changing a lot because women are like, it is not as though it is really shocking but women are going out to work. It is more equal in the house as well. Guys are doing the dishes and they cook and they clean or whatever.

Many of the young people related this gender stereotyping and the consequent restructuring or equalising of women and men’s positions as starting over the last century and specifically with World War II. This may however, be more class related because Julie, above, is from a school which is ranked 604 on the SIMD scale. Claire, from a school which is even lower on the deprivation scale at 1097 out of 1222, argues that these traditional roles predate World War II, but due to job
market restructuring, women entered the work force and transformed their traditional role.

_Claire [f;g1;15]:_ 'Cos even just a few generations back, there was a lot more like housework and with the kids. There was a lot less real employment. It was only with the Second World War, women didn't work generally, they stayed at home. And so all these old morals have just been passed on with the time.

Claire makes the link that “real employment” means paid formal employment and implicitly assumes that women were not in the paid labour force before this time. Women's perceived exclusion from the labour market, pre World War II, and the last century, is suggested as a reason for women currently not having senior jobs, in relation to men, within the labour market. This position reflects the ideology of the separate spheres of the public and private with women confined to the private domain of the home to fulfil the domestic role and men inhabiting the public sphere of work and wider society (Thompson, 2001).

_Caitlin [f;g9;16]:_ Just probably the way it has always been because women haven't really had jobs before the last century, so they have to work their way up. It's harder to get a top job if you are a woman than a man.

Whilst Caitlin makes a salient point that it is “harder” for women to progress up the career ladder than men, she also takes a very long term view of labour market progression and argues that women have got a lot of catching up to do because they (allegedly) did not have (paid) jobs before the last century. Diane and Claire both argue that things are difficult to change, and even though some surface cosmetic things have changed for women and men, the upper echelons of the labour market are still unattainable for most women. Therefore, they are making an astute comment about how changes have been made at a superficial level but at a more fundamental level things remain the same in that women are still excluded from senior positions (Equal Opportunities Commission, 1998). This reflects the feminist
analysis, which argues that whilst there may some superficial or surface changes for women, at a more fundamental level women are still in a subordinate position (Lundgren, 1995).

*Diane [f; g1; 15]:* When you think back to when how everyone used to live, it's hard to make it totally different.

*Claire [f; g1; 15]:* Some things may be changing, like the long hair and make-up and the skirts ... but not much else.

In the excerpt below, Ian is persuasive in his argument, and analysis, of how schooling directed women for a life in the home. He argues that this has changed so that women no longer assume, or desire, this homemaker role:

*Ian [m; g5; 16]:* But the way you hear things talked about from say fifty years ago, you would be sitting at school, getting ready for a career in homemaking you know. How many of you are resigned to actually doing that? Things have changed.

This argument about the influence of the formal educational system in ‘schooling’ women for a life of domesticity is reflected in Aveling’s (2002) critique which discusses the role of schools in ‘reproducing’ gender roles (see Section 5.2, Chapter 5). Contrary to Claire and Diane in the quotation above, Leigh, from the school which ranked the lowest in the SIMD scale, at 1207 out of 1222 and hence has little deprivation, argues that it is due to women’s ambition that things have changed, and that women have now reached an equal status with men.

*Leigh [f; g4; 17]:* I think when we go back a hundred years ago women had to be ambitious to get to where they are today. If they weren’t ambitious then they would still be like just in the house and not getting a proper education. So I think that we have had to be ambitious to get the equality that we have now.
This quote from Leigh, and the following quotes below from Group 1 all argue that women have equality with men. This is significant because both these schools are in areas with little deprivation (according to the SIMD rank) and thus, ‘women’s equality’ may be associated with middle class women’s abilities to have careers, if desired. However, the issue of women’s equality, where it was discussed at length in one of the groups, was not necessarily regarded as a positive step for women but as retrogressive and “unfair” for men. Thus, men were positioned as ‘victims’ of women’s perceived equality.

Claire [f;g1;15]: There seems to be more rights for women than for men, and emphasising things for women than for [interrupted]. Everyone is trying to not be sexist but by doing that they are leaving out the guys.

Diane [f;g1;15]: It used to be that men were on top of women and women were just in the background and instead of making it more equal, they have made it more for women and swapped the whole thing round.

Claire [f;g1;15]: Schools are saying oh yeh, girls are getting so much higher grades but it is because girls concentrate. They are putting more pressure on girls than they are the boys.

Diane [f;g1;15]: They should help the boys to push up their grades so they can say well they are more or less the same.

Claire [f;g1;15]: It’s because there is more women’s rights as well now. ‘Cos women are now getting the same as men.

This extract is significant because the young people draw on the alleged ‘boys in crisis’ debate which argues that boys are significantly underachieving in school (Skelton, 1998). The introduction of the ‘crisis’ discussion by the participants is indicative of how this ‘debate’ is employed by the young people to ‘explain’ why boys are performing less well. However, contradictorily, Claire explains that girls are getting better grades because girls “concentrate”, which could be understood as saying that girls achieve better grades because they apply themselves more and work harder. It is also significant that Claire thinks that “women’s rights” are responsible
for the under-performing of the boys, although, apart from stating that women are getting the same as men, she does not explain how women's rights are culpable in this current situation. In the same group, Emma argues that men are now getting less opportunities than women and that more research should be done to confirm this new secondary status of men.

Emma [f; g1; 15]: If you actually researched it you would find that women are getting a lot more chances now, and in some cases more than men are getting.

This section has identified that when it comes to women's equality, the respondents articulate it as being detrimental to the status of men. However, what is significant is that it is the girls who are most vehement in their arguments that the boys (and men) are 'losing out' whereas the boys generally did not contribute to discussing this issue. This analysis also contradicts the previous discussion about women's work where all the young people, both the girls and the boys, argued that women had lower status and lower paid jobs than men, which implies that women do not, in reality, have equality with men (Equal Opportunities Commission, 1998, 2001).

7.2.3: Alternative Masculinities

Some of the boys challenged the traditional male role, in relation to their own gender role and projected adult role, and explained that they themselves had tried to assert a different masculine identity, which did not conform to this gender 'stereotype'. These boys explained that they did this through various means, including wearing different clothes and hairstyles; listening to different music; rejecting sports; and having more female friends. The boys who participated in this conversation were clearly 'outsiders' and were not part of the same friendship set as the dominant male in the group (where there was one).

The issue of friendships was an extremely salient issue for the young people and one of the issues that was discussed was with respect to how it was almost unacceptable for boys to have girls as friends. Indeed friendships appeared to be hugely significant in how boys were regarded by their peer groups and if a boy had many
girls as friends it identified them as different from the other boys and their ‘masculinity’ was questioned (Frosh et al, 2002). Conversely, it did not seem to be the case that the girls’ gender identity was called into question through having boys as friends, indeed it did not seem to be an issue whether the girls had boys as friends or not.

Dylan [m; g9; 16]: Yeh. I am not into football or sport or anything and I get questioned into why I am not into it. I’ve got more female friends than boys.
M: Do you?
Dylan [m; g9; 16]: That’s unusual but I do.
M: So it’s unusual then to have more girls as friends?
Dylan [m; g9; 16]: I’ve been told it’s unusual.
M: So do you think there has been a lot of pressure on you to conform? Has it been quite difficult to break out of that?
Dylan [m; g9; 16]: It has not really been difficult. I’ve just lived with it. I am not actually bothered that I have more female pals than guys and I don’t see why it matters.

In a different group, Andrew, the only boy, gives an account of what it is to be a “proper” man and commences by saying that he does not endorse this view and explains how he attempts to construct himself to be different from that model (Gough and Peace, 2000). Andrew continues by explaining that he does, in fact, try to conform to a more traditional (hegemonic) masculinity, even though he is not comfortable with it, because he is “picked on” if he acts different from the hegemonic masculine construction (Connell, 1995). In Andrew’s explanation, shown below, it is unfortunate that he is interrupted before he can finish his explanation but this does not reduce the ability to discern Andrew’s opinion.

Andrew [m; g1; 15]: I try and distance myself from a definite view of a man, of a proper man that has to be dominant, has to be protect the girls, has to do this and has to do that, to be a proper man. You can’t be that all the time, you always let your guard down sometimes. But people pick up on that straight away; and you are always picked on that so you try and get away
Andrew did explain that he was somewhat of an outsider and as the only male in this group of very sympathetic female friends it was a comfortable/non-threatening environment for Andrew to describe his situation. However, had there been other boys in this group, it is unknown whether Andrew would have been as forthcoming with this description of himself which confirms his outsider status with respect to the boys but which clearly endeared him to the girls. It is also noteworthy that in this female group Andrew was the dominant character but by his own description Andrew is an outsider in relation to other boys.

Julie, in an all girl group (in a school which is rated 904 out of 1222 and is therefore in an area which has relatively little deprivation) explains that in her household the males and females do not have traditional roles and in fact it is her dad and brother who do the majority of domestic chores whilst she and her sister do much less. This may be because Julie's mother does not live with them, and so her father has had no option but to adopt this role:

*Julie [f;g13;16]:* But see in my house, I live with my dad and my wee brother and my sister. And my dad does all the cooking and cleaning, my wee brother cleans, and me and my sister do nothing.

*M:* Really?

*Julie [f;g13;16]:* And my wee brother is like young, and my older sister who is twenty in May and then my wee brother is younger, and he is the only one just now with a part time job as well, and my dad does all the cleaning and washings and stuff.

None of the other young people described their family composition in as much detail as Julie, so it is not known how many young people lived in single parent
households, or had absent fathers. Whilst the young people were not asked specifically about their family composition or about the roles in their homes and who performed what tasks, no other young person described their fathers doing more domestic work than the women in the house which leaves the impression of a ‘traditional’ division of labour in the other households (Malos, 1995).

7.2.4: ‘Macho’ Masculinity

The concept of what was appropriate or acceptable masculine behaviour for men was discussed at length in all of the groups and many of them mentioned the word ‘macho’. ‘Macho’ was almost exclusively spoken of as an expression of masculinity in relation to men and boys, but one group spoke of it in relation to women (see extract below). The definition of ‘macho’ women was explained as women who were trying to act like men, as opposed to being feminine, and thus for them the term was still located in a masculine frame of reference.

Rubina [f;g4;17]: That is like when they [women] don’t want to give in to the typical stereotype. It’s like, you know usually feminists maybe or like they can be as macho as men and they are not going to give in to that stereotype. They are going to be what men are, kind of thing.

Leigh [f;g4;17]: Well you do get women like that who compete with men. So like not show any feelings or trying to act like all, oh trying to drink twenty pints of Guinness or whatever. And then you do get the females who do cry at a lot of things or cry at films. And the macho ones maybe don’t want to show their feelings and don’t want to appear vulnerable.

The definitions of ‘macho’ for the respondents were defined in exclusively male references and ‘macho’ was referred to in a complex and often contradictory way. The first focus group had a discussion about what it meant for boys to act ‘macho’ and it was regarded with ambiguity, whereby at times the group was disdaining of boys who were ‘macho’ but then Becky explained that sometimes it was acceptable. Following this, as shown below, Emma argues that “macho” behaviour is used to
impress "people" but when challenged on this, Claire makes the link with heterosexuality and argues that "macho" behaviour is used by boys to impress girls so that they will "fancy" [be attracted to] them.

Claire [f;g1;15]: 'Cos most of the guys in this school are trying to act dead butch and stuff but we just don't like that.
[laughter]
Diane [f;g1;15]: They just seem really arrogant. Like I'm fab and how much do you love me.
Claire [f;g1;15]: They walk about with swaggers and stuff.
Becky [f;g1;15]: It's ok sometimes but then when they are just like that constant it just gets on your nerves.
Emma [f;g1;15]: See they are out to impress, they think that impresses people, but obviously it doesn't. The people they hang around with do that so they do that as well.
M.: When you say that they think that impresses people, do you mean that impresses girls or boys?
Emma [f;g1;15]: Girls and boys they hang about with so that they think that [interrupted].
Claire [f;g1;15]: If I swagger she is going to fancy me.

Whilst Emma is arguing that "macho" behaviour is meant to impress both boys and girls, Claire claims that this is definitely linked to heterosexuality with the boys trying to impress the girls (Epstein, 1997). This was a group in a school in a middle class area and had five girls and only boy who had previously discussed how he was not a traditional 'macho' boy and preferred an alternative masculinity (see Section 7.2.3). Thus, had this group had a different composition of boys and girls and had a 'macho' dominant male for example, it is possible that this conversation would have taken a different direction.

When one of the all girl groups were asked how they would define 'macho' many of them gave physical characteristics, such as "short hair" (Sara [f;g10;15]) and "muscle" (Hannah [f;g10;15]). Other descriptions were more in relation to how boys acted and presented themselves, such as "thinks he's stunning" (Sara [f;g10;15]) and "confident" (Hannah [f;g10;15]), for example. The issue of the 'swagger' was also mentioned by Sara who claimed that one way to act 'macho' was
to adopt "a heavy swagger" (Sara [f;g10;15]). The group were then asked if there was any other ways of being or acting 'macho' and they gave further examples which are shown below.

Hannah [f;g10;15]: You talk dead rough. Dead strong voice.
Sara [f;g10;15]: Harsh.
Hannah [f;g10;15]: Rough. Violent. Violent especially.
M: So would they actually be violent or would they talk violent?
Hannah [f;g10;15]: Just talk violent I think.
Sara [f;g10;15]: Just to scare you.
M: So do you think that would be done, is it a show-off thing to look macho? Is it more saying this to impress other people, do you think?
Hannah [f;g10;15]: Probably his pals.
M: To impress his pals rather than other girls?
Hannah [f;g10;15]: Sometimes it's a mix.
Sara [f;g10;15]: Aye a mix.
Hannah [f;g10;15]: Sometimes it's to impress women and sometimes it's their pals.

When Hannah was asked what she meant by 'violent' she explained that she did not actually think the men or boys would be violent but would just "talk violent" and Sara explained that this was done to "scare you". When asked who this 'macho' behaviour was meant to impress, Hannah and Sara explained that it was for the benefit of both boys and girls. However, when the all male group in the same school was asked to describe what they meant by 'macho', they had a very different response.

Grant [m;g11;16]: Acting hard. Not showing your feelings. Not showing what you are thinking.
John [m;g11;16]: Aye, not being emotional, put on a front.
Grant [m;g11;16]: A big bold front, a swagger.

These responses were more in relation to emotional behaviour which was discussed in Section 7.1.1, but similarly the issue of the 'swagger' came up again. Whilst, the all girl group suggested that acting 'macho' was a way for boys to present themselves in a masculine way in the all boy group, for them, acting 'macho' was a
way to hide their real feelings and present a more masculine image than they felt was ‘real’ in personal terms (Frosh et al, 2002).

One of the mixed groups gave a different account of ‘macho’ and Mia, in the group, related this to boys’ heterosexuality.

*Mia [f;g3;17]:* Boys try to be macho. Sometimes they try and show up their friends in order to make themselves look better.

*M:* What do you mean by that?

*Mia [f;g3;17]:* I don’t know, I think that they try and show off their masculinity, how manly they are. Sometimes they seem to do it to show the fact that maybe they are straight. I am this manly, I like this sport this much, like sometimes they do with football. Or like say boxing or something like that. I think that they are trying to express their sexuality sometimes. But that is personally what I think.

*Edward [m;g3;18]:* Well usually it’s like when you see a guy walking about with his shirt half off and thinks he looks smart and walking stupid looking [laughter]. In the dancing [nightclubs] you see, like there are these guys that walk about, that walk about the dance floor with their shirt all unbuttoned right down to the bottom.

*Mia [f;g3;17]:* Trying to show off their physical ability.

Edward adds to Mia’s explanation of ‘macho’ by adding that it is also about how men and boys act, and Edward repeatedly refers to how boys walk about. In addition to the connection with heterosexuality, Mia links ‘macho’ with a liking for sports, especially football and boxing which are male dominated sports (see Section 7.1.8). In a different group, Richard, the only male in the group, defines ‘macho’ as being related to independence and endurance whereas Rubina and Leigh, in the same group, refer to physicality and emotional behaviour.
Richard [m;g4;17]: I'd say it's like men who try and push themselves to the extreme. Saying oh nothing is going to stop me. That's how I would define it. It's like I can do all this and then do all that and other folk can't. It's just a display of how good you are at being a man. ... It's like we can do, yeh I can lift that and then go for X amount of hours without sleep and then still be fresh and still do this and that. It's like individual, you don't need to be dependent on anyone.

Rubina [f;g4;17]: Yeh, well the typical male macho would be like big muscles and can beat anyone up. I think it is more personality is the macho.

M: Do you think that it is personality then rather than appearance?

Rubina [f;g4;17]: Yeh 'cos anyone can appear macho, all you have to do is go to the gym and build up a little bit but when it comes to personality.

Leigh [f;g4;17]: Yeh 'cos a guy can have really huge muscles and a strong body but they can cry at a sad point in a romantic film or something like that.

M: So crying isn't macho?

Leigh [f;g4;17]: No, I suppose it is not.

It is interesting that Richard also defines 'macho' as a way of boys presenting their masculinity or a way to “display” their masculinity (Butler, 1990). In another of the mixed groups, physical size is mentioned again and so too is the 'swagger'. In this discussion Sean uses examples of actors whom he thinks represents a 'macho' image and one who does not. Sean also uses the word machismo, which he explains is linked to aggressive behaviour, and to how boys and men are perceived.

M: Can you put into words what you mean by macho?

Sean [m;g9;16]: I think it is the need to come out best every time.

Dawn [f;g9;16]: Full of themselves.

Sean [m;g9;16]: In films it's like Arnold Schwarzenegger is macho, Woody Allen isn't.

Caitlin [f;g9;16]: Quite big and powerful.

Scott [m;g9;16]: Swaggering about.

Sean [m;g9;16]: Machismo.
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M: What do you mean by that?
Sean [m; g9; 16]: I think it is connected to the proud and the aggressive. You don't want to be seen as a jessie in public. You have always got to stick up for yourself, your mates, whoever.

Therefore many of the groups had quite varied definitions of the word 'macho', which reflected a general understanding that the word was definitely related to men and masculine behaviour and that it encompassed a range of physical size, self presentation and a lack of emotional behaviour.

7.2.5: Aggression
As has been shown, the young people argued that there were differences between boys and girls, and men and women, and they spent considerable time discussing the issue of men being, and acting, 'macho'. In relation to this, all of the young people argued that men and boys are more dominant and aggressive than women, and the boys and girls equally shared this opinion. As mentioned, all of the groups either wrote down the words "dominant" or "aggressive" (often both) in their flip-chart exercise at the start of the interview for words relating to men. It should also be reiterated that these discussions, presented below, occurred before the issue of male violence was mentioned by the interviewer and was thus an issue that the young people introduced to the focus group themselves.

In one of the all male groups, John argues that men are more aggressive than women and they are more physically violent. Whilst John does not explain why he thinks this is the case, Grant gives a biologistic account, with the cause of male violence rooted in male hormones which perhaps reflects some of the individualised, psychological explanations of male violence (Stordeur and Stille, 1989). The second quotation shown below, from Scott in a different school, reiterates John's point about boys being more likely to be in fights than girls. The third quote, from Nassar and William, in an all male group, argue the same point that men are more likely to be in fights, but situate this in adult male behaviour, outside of the school setting.
John [m; g11; 16]: Guys are more aggressive.
M: So you think that as well, guys are more aggressive?

Grant [m; g11; 16]: Definitely. You see more boys' fights than lassies'.

I think its nature. Testosterone.

Scott [m; g9; 16]: Men are always more likely to start a fight with men than girls start a fight.

Nassar [m; g12; 17]: I would say they [men] are more aggressive.

William [m; g12; 16]: Yeh, it tends to be because like men get involved in fights outside pubs and that but you never hear of women actually.

From these sets of quotes it is unclear if there is a socio-economic class influence in their opinions because group 11 is in a school which ranked very high on the SIMD scale (66 out of 1222), whereas Scott is in a school which is very low on the scale (1147 out of 1222) and Group 12 is also low on the scale (ranked 904). Thus, from this very limited selection it appears that the levels of male violence occur in locations which cut across socio-economic boundaries (Yllo, 1983; Hamner and Maynard, 1987; Dobash and Dobash, 1992).

In a different, mixed sex group, Andrew [m; g1; 15] also gives a naturalistic account of aggression and links “aggression” with “confidence” and argues that women are less confident than men, less likely to speak out, and are less aggressive than men. Also linked to the issue of confidence, Ian (in a different group) starts by arguing that men are much more confident than women. However, he then self-reflectively challenges his own statement and turns what is usually regarded as a positive attribute, ‘confidence’, into something less positive. This issue is taken up by Bart and Megan who argue that what they are actually referring to is arrogance, which is not usually regarded as an enviable characteristic.

Ian [m; g5; 16]: Possibly too confident.
Bart [m; g5; 17]: Guys are more confident aren’t they, it’s just the way they walk and act.

Megan [f; g5; 16]: That’s not confidence, that is arrogance.
However, Claire, in the same group as Andrew (see above), challenges the biological foundation of Andrew’s argument and argues that male aggression is not instinctual, natural or hormonal but is a result of socialisation processes and this explanation also fits into the feminist analysis of male violence (Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Yllo, 1993; Kelly and Radford, 1998). Claire argues that both men and women and boys and girls have the capability to be aggressive but that boys are taught how to act like this and are given more “opportunities” to act like this. This is a radically different, and almost unique position, from most of the other respondents, who tended to naturalise this male behaviour.

\[
\text{Claire [f; g1; 15]:} \quad \begin{align*}
& \text{I think that everyone is really aggressive deep down but guys just have more opportunities to, like bump into you etcetera. It's easier to be taught when you are younger I think.} \\
& \text{Boys are taught it when they are younger.}
\end{align*}
\]

Diane, in the same group as Claire, argues that it is more culturally acceptable for men to be aggressive than it is for women. According to Diane, if women or girls are aggressive then they are not conforming to the traditional feminine model and consequently it is not culturally or socially acceptable for women to act in that manner (Griffin, 1985; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Sharpe, 1994; O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000).

\[
\text{Diane [f; g1; 15]:} \quad \begin{align*}
& \text{It's more acceptable for a guy to like, if he loses it for like a second or something, it seems more acceptable.} \\
& \text{But if it's a girl it would be like “oh”.} \\
& \text{It would need to be that a lot has happened to make a girl be aggressive.} \\
& \text{Is that because it's not feminine then?}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{M:} \\
\text{Emma [f; g1; 15]:} \quad \begin{align*}
& \text{Yes, it's not seen to be part of a woman.} \\
& \text{It's against the stereotypical.}
\end{align*}
\]

In one of the youngest mixed groups (all fifteen years old) and in a school in which the area is ranked 937 out of 1222 on the SIMD scale, they argued, similarly to the other groups, that they thought men were more aggressive than women. Michael, who was the dominant member of the group, personalised the discussion by
explaining that “we” are more aggressive than women and explained that men were quicker to lose their tempers, which the others in the group agreed with. When they were asked what they meant by being aggressive, Michael gave a graphic account of an incident which he defines as typical of male aggressive behaviour:

Michael [m; g7; 15]: It’s true, we are more aggressive.
M: Men are more aggressive?
Michael [m; g7; 15]: Aye, the smallest thing can tick us off and we go nuts.
M: So what do you mean by aggressive then?
Michael [m; g7; 15]: Like if you fight with somebody it’s not just a couple of slaps around the face. It’s a couple of punches and a foot in the face.
M: So actually being physically violent. Are there other ways of being aggressive then?
Michael [m; g7; 15]: Yeh, thinking aggressively. If you want to do something to somebody.

Michael clearly links aggression to physical violence and to “thinking” aggressively whereby you are thinking about the violence you want to do to someone. Whilst all the groups made the link between aggressive behaviour and physical violence, Michael was perhaps the most explicit in making this link and he was also the only respondent who personalised the discussion. In the quotation below Michael gives another account of a violent incident although it is unclear whether Michael is referring to men in general, or to himself, because he switches between talking about “guys” to talking about “you”.

Michael [m; g7; 15]: Have you ever noticed that when a woman takes a guy into the shop, he gets pure annoyed within the first 20 minutes, and you end up needing a seat and if you don’t get a seat, you go raging?

Although Michael’s account was prefaced as a question, “have you ever noticed” none of the other members of the group replied to this question once he had finished his portrayal of the shopping trip. In Michael’s group the gender ratio was three girls
and two boys (including Michael) and neither the girls nor the other boy agreed with, or challenged, Michael’s account. Instead, no comment was made at all after Michael finished and thus another question was introduced to the group in order to move the discussion forward which was the only occasion where the interviewer had to do this.

The extract below is from another of the mixed groups (all aged fifteen years), and the two boys are in agreement that boys and men are quicker to lose their tempers more quickly than women and can easily be angered.

Owen [m;g8;15]: Some guys have shorter tempers than other people.
Ryan [m;g8;15]: I think boys get angry dead easy.

The last extract of this section ends with a quote from one of the girls, Rose, who explains that not all men are as aggressive as some of the respondents have portrayed but she does make the connection between aggressive and dominant male behaviour, which was made by all the young people in all the groups.

Rose [f;g6;16]: No, not all men are aggressive and dominant. Some are sensitive.

All of the young people were in agreement that men and boys, in general, are more aggressive and violent than women and girls, although their explanations for why this is the case varied. Even this last comment from Rose indicates that men who are not aggressive and are sensitive (suggesting these are mutually exclusive) are the exception to the general rule.

7.2.6: Summary of Gender Constructions

From the data, presented above, it is evident that both the boys and girls were aware of, and to various extents endorsed, the male breadwinner/female dependent model (Skelton and Hall, 2001). Related to this was an understanding that boys were expected to act in certain ways, which conformed to a male dominance model (Connell, 1995). Some of the young men argued that they personally challenged the
hegemonic construction of masculinity (sporty, aggressive, heterosocial) and developed new masculinities which reflect their preference for having girls as friends, for example (Gough and Peace, 2000). However, they were aware that this behaviour potentially placed them at risk of being ostracised by their peers. In order to gain, and retain, peer group acceptance, which was crucial for the boys, they attempted to construct a masculinity that is reflective of hegemonic standards (Connell, 1995; Frosh et al., 2002). This indicates that acceptance of hegemonic masculinity did not necessarily exclude a critical attitude to some of its features. All of the young people were in agreement that men and boys are more ‘macho’ than girls and many of the young people make the connection between the ‘macho’ posturing and heterosexuality, and with aggression, dominance and violence.

7.3: Conclusion

This chapter has presented the participants’ responses in relation to gender differences and behaviour, and gender constructions. The conclusion will present the key findings from this chapter in brief, which will then be analysed further in Chapter 9, in conjunction with the key findings from the second findings chapter (Chapter 8).

1. The young people identified behavioural differences between women and men and gave example of differences in emotional responses and feelings; communication strategies, which they linked to their own experiences of friendships; caring issues which they linked theoretically to issues about gender appropriate behaviour; differentiations in jobs, which were connected to gender constructions and (hetero)sexuality, particularly for men, which they identified with constructions of normative masculinity; women’s preoccupation with body image and appearance, again linked to ‘femininity’ and gender behaviour which was verbalised in pejorative terminology; the salience of peer group acceptance for the boys; and gender segregation in sport, again linked to gender constructions and appropriate masculine and feminine behaviour.
2. In much of their analyses the participants ‘de-gendered’ their responses and used gender neutral language such as referring to ‘people’ instead of women or men.

3. The respondents gave much more time to thinking about role models for boys than for girls and there was a demarcation between the role models the boys selected for boys and those selected by the girls for boys. Both the girls and the boys only considered same sex role models.

4. There was a strong identification with the male breadwinner/female dependent model although at times the participants stressed that this model was a ‘stereotype’ that they did not necessarily agree with. However, as mentioned, it was often impossible to differentiate between the young people’s views and views they presented as the opinions of others.

5. There were many contradictions in their responses, one of which was in relation to women’s equality. Whilst they argued that women had more equality with regards to employment, the words which they wrote in relation to differences in work all clearly stated that women were lower paid and had lower status jobs than men. However, there may also have been an influence of socio-economic status because it was often the participants in the least deprived areas who argued that women had employment equality with men.

6. Some aspects of women’s equality were regarded as retrogressive and ‘unfair’ for men and it was almost exclusively the girls who argued that men/boys are the new ‘victims’ and that women’s equality has deleterious effects on men.

7. The boys accepted hegemonic (male breadwinner) masculinity but some of them constructed alternative masculinities for themselves, although they were aware that they have to adopt specific hegemonic characteristics in order to conform and be accepted by peers (which was crucially important for the boys). The boys who argued that they had non-hegemonic aspects to their masculinity were boys who were in mixed, rather than male only, groups.

8. The ‘swagger’ was repeatedly mentioned, by both the boys and the girls, and is arguably a physical/visual representation of hegemonic masculinity. Although, there was a contradiction inherent in it because whilst ‘swagger’ (and ‘macho’) represent hegemonic masculinity, and hence the ideal, it was
also derided for being too extreme and thus not necessarily desirable behaviour.

9. Both biological arguments and social constructionist accounts were given for men/boys being more aggressive than women/girls but both explanations were linked to gender role behaviour and aggression was regarded as inappropriate 'feminine' behaviour.

10. Whilst the research questions were investigating masculinity, most of the young people framed their responses with respect to women's behaviour. This results in women being held responsible for men's behaviour. Men are thus regarded as the 'norm' against which women are seen as the 'other'. Therefore, the 'norm' of men and male behaviour is never overtly critiqued, although some of the young men explained that they modified their masculinity and did not strictly conform to the hegemonic model, and thus, the young people focus on women and women's behaviour instead. In relation to this, it could also be argued that the boys and the girls are not challenging, or recognising, men's power.

To conclude, all of the young people identified that hegemonic masculinity is very much conceptualised in a heterosexual framework in which women and men's roles are clearly delineated. Whilst the language of hegemonic masculinity was not used, the young people expressed their awareness of the limits of an acceptable (hegemonic) form of masculinity and the limitations of constructing alternative forms of masculinity. Indeed, the young men displayed extremely sophisticated understandings of how to modify their masculinity so that they were accepted, even if they personally rejected some of the characteristics of hegemonic masculinity, as they described it.

Some of the young people's responses are ambiguous because on one level, the majority of the respondents are aware of the male breadwinner/female dependent model and use this model to describe the historical traditional model of gender roles for women and men, and they argue that some men and women still aspire to this construction. Conversely, they also argue that there has been an equalising of roles and this is discussed primarily in relation to men performing more household chores, and women making advances in the labour market. However, this equality was not
regarded as an intrinsic and uncomplicated, improvement for women, and was seen as retrogressive for men. Furthermore, it was primarily the girls who constructed this argument and the boys did not contribute to this discussion in the same depth.

The next chapter (Chapter 8) will discuss the young people’s responses to the discussions of domestic violence and male violence against women in general, which developed from the first part of the discussion as described above.
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Findings 2: Male Violence

8.0: Introduction

As explained, in the methodology chapter, after the initial flip-chart exercise and discussion about gender behaviour and constructions (see Chapter 7), the interview progressed to a discussion of male violence against women, domestic violence/abuse,\(^{56}\) and some statistics on young people's views about interpersonal male violence were presented to the young people for their opinions (Burton et al., 1998). The purpose of this part of the interview was to investigate how the young people conceptualised domestic abuse and they were asked for their definitions and opinions of it. After domestic abuse was discussed, the young people were asked about their awareness of the statistics on young people's views of interpersonal male violence, what they thought of them and whether the respondents made any connections with the discussions about gender constructions, adult male violence and these findings.

Similar to the previous chapter, the structure of this chapter has two parts: Part One, examines the responses in relation to domestic abuse and the second part focuses on the responses given in relation to the statistics on young people's views on male interpersonal violence (Burton et al., 1988). Furthermore, Part One is subdivided into sections focusing on definitions of domestic abuse; gender symmetry in domestic abuse; implications of men as the alleged 'victims' of domestic abuse; explanations for domestic abuse; and consequences of domestic abuse. For reasons of clarity, the section on explanations for domestic abuse has been further divided and the reasons, which the young people gave are grouped under the headings of childhood, self-defence, physicality and control. The second part on young people's views of interpersonal male violence, which is shorter, has been split into two subsections: the first section is on the unacceptability of male violence/abuse; and the second section focuses on the justifications for violence/abuse.

\(^{56}\) As stated, the preferred terminology in Scotland is 'domestic abuse' although 'domestic violence' is also used and thus, this chapter will predominantly refer to domestic abuse rather than violence.
At this stage in the focus group, the young people were much more relaxed and animated and the responses were much more forthcoming, presumably because they had completed the first part of the interview and were now familiar with what was expected of them. Often the groups engaged in quite lengthy debates with each other, which meant that the interviewer’s input was minimal.

There are substantial extracts of text included in this chapter because, like the previous Findings Chapter, the voice of the young people is centrally important. Additionally, in this chapter the young people’s responses often have to be contextualised, in order to appreciate the complexity of the discussion and how they reached their opinion, which necessitates the inclusion of longer extracts of discussions.

**Part 1: Discussion of Domestic Abuse**

**8.1.1: Definitions of Domestic Abuse**

The topic of domestic abuse was introduced after the initial discussions of gender constructions and behaviours. All the groups, except one (see Section 6.3.5, Chapter 6), were asked to explain what they thought was meant by ‘domestic abuse’, including what behaviours they thought defined it, who perpetrated it and who it was perpetrated against.

The first extract is from an all male group and their school is in an area which ranks high on the SIMD scale (66 out of 1222) and is therefore an area with a substantial amount of deprivation. The participants discuss the range of behaviours they consider to be constitutive of domestic abuse:

*Grant [m;g11;16]:* Guys hitting women.
*Stuart [m;g11;16]:* No, a wife. In the home.
*Grant [m;g11;16]:* Plus mental abuse as well.
*Charles [m;g11;15]:* Shouting at them.
*Grant [m;g11;16]:* Taking away all their self confidence. Aye, possessive.
The above extract is an example of how these three boys initially start at a very broad definition of domestic abuse but clearly locate men as abusers and women as the victims and place it within a domestic setting. They correctly identify that domestic abuse refers to a range of behaviours and Stuart specifies that it is violence against wives and not just unknown women in general which reflects the more widely used definitions of domestic violence (Hague and Malos, 1998; Home Office, 2003b, 2003c). The final comment from Grant introduces the concept of possession and could be interpreted as fitting into Stark's (forthcoming) model of domestic abuse, which incorporates coercive and controlling behaviour.

In group 5, which is in a school in an area which contrasts to the previous group whereby it ranks at 1203 on the scale and thus has relatively little deprivation, the young people refer to the Scottish Executive funded adverts 'Behind Closed Doors' (see Section 2.3.1.1, Chapter 2) which were shown on television. These adverts stated that one in five women will experience abuse in the home. In fact, many of the young people based their awareness and understanding of domestic abuse on these advertisements.

Bart [m; g5; 17]: Wife beating.
Megan [f; g5; 16]: That advert on the TV at the moment. It's 'Behind Closed Doors' and it says that 1 in 5 women will live with the threat of domestic abuse every day.
Nicola [f; g5; 16]: It is not always physical.
Megan [f; g5; 16]: The stereotype is a man beating his wife, he comes home drunk and he has lost his job or something.
Nicola [f; g5; 16]: It could be verbal abuse.

Again, the young people expand the definition of domestic abuse from physical violence to incorporate verbal abuse and Nicola emphasises this point which reflects the feminist definition of domestic violence incorporating abusive behaviours other than strictly violence (Hague and Malos, 1998). The participants in a different group (Group 1) also argue that domestic abuse is not just physical and Anna (below) argues that other forms of abuse are more damaging than physical violence, because the damage caused is longer term. As was discussed in the previous chapter, it is often impossible to differentiate between personal views and experiences and when
the young people are making broader generalisations, not based on experience. In
the extract below, Anna argues that verbal abuse is worse than physical violence,
because it is "more hurtful" and that "it sticks with you for a long time". It is unclear
whether Anna is referring to a personal experience or whether this is her
understanding of what would happen, because, as previously stated, the participants
were informed that they did not have to disclose incidents of abuse and it was
problematic to discern whether the participants were indeed referring to personal
experience.  

Claire [f; g1; 15]: Violence does not just have to be physical.
Anna [f; g1; 15]: I think it's more hurtful. If someone slapped me, it would be a lot more
hurtful if someone, aye it would hurt physically obviously, but if someone
says something about you that really hurts you that will stay with you a whole
lot longer than a sting on your face. It sticks with you for a long time.

A discussion in a different group (Group 10 which is all female, and in the same
school as the first extract from the boy group, Group 11) initiates a list of abusive
behaviours and Sara instigates the definition by establishing the gender dimension of
domestic violence (women as victims and men as perpetrators) as the starting point
which again reflects the feminist, gendered, understanding of domestic violence
(Hague and Malos, 1998). Sara, however, then modifies her position by stating that
domestic abuse can be perpetrated by women towards men, but "usually" men are
the perpetrators.

Sara [f; g10; 15]: A woman who gets beat up off their husbands or their boyfriends or
whatever. Sexually harassed and that.
M: Right. Do you all share that view?
Group: Yeh.

---

As discussed in Section 6.3.5, Chapter 6, at the beginning of the interviews it was stated that the
research was not looking for the respondents to disclose any personal experiences. It was a possibility
that the young people may draw on instances of abuse which was why they were given the Resource
List and the contact details of the interviewer (see Appendix IV). Additionally, it was explained that
the researcher would be available after the interview if they wanted to speak further or they could get
in contact at a more convenient time.
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Sara[f,g10;15]: Sometimes you can get the opposite way but it is usually the men who are violent. Comments to them.

Hannah[f,g10;15]: Not letting them out.

Sara [f,g10;15]: Aye not letting them out the door [out of the house]. Not letting them socialise as well.

The first comment by Sara includes sexual harassment, which, as was argued in Chapter 2, can be conceptualised as part of the continuum of male violence (Kelly, 1998a). Arguably, either Sara is using a very broad definition of domestic abuse, or is making theoretical links between different manifestations of male violence and similarly, the last point, refers to men constraining their female partners’ behaviour, which could be interpreted as fitting into the coercion and control model of domestic abuse (Stark, forthcoming).

In another of the groups (Group 13) one of the respondents, Natalie, gives a range of abusive behaviours that constitute domestic abuse and explains that she has been taught this in PSE (Personal and Social Education) as part of her schooling. When asked to whom she was referring she explains that it is usually men being abusive but points out that there are many “exceptions” where it is women being abusive towards men.

Natalie [f,g13;16]: Any form of abuse whether it is verbal, physical, sexual, mental. We have done it all in PSE.

M: So who are we talking about? Who is doing this?

Natalie [f,g13;16]: Generally men doing it to women, but there are exceptions. A lot of exceptions.

It is significant that Natalie is unequivocal in her analysis of the number of “exceptions”, indeed she emphasises this point through repeating it, but it is left unexplained what she bases this understanding on. In another of the groups, Group 3 which is mixed sex and in a school which is very high on the SIMD rank (36 out of 1222), David defines domestic abuse as violence in the home and Mia argues that the assumption is that it is usually the male who is the perpetrator. They both then mention mental abuse and Edward contributes that it can also involve children. In
relation to children, it is unclear whether Edward is referring to mothers or fathers and uses the gender-neutral term “parents”. This is an approach that was identified in the previous chapter where the young people use gender neutral language.

David [m;g3;17]: Violence in the home. Usually the spouse.
Mia [f;g3;17]: You usually just assume that it’s the father or husband. That seems to be a stereotype, that’s the impression. When it’s domestic violence I think that most people assume that it is the dad hitting the children or the wife. But that is not always the case.

David [m;g3;17]: Mental.
Mia [f;g3;17]: Mental.
Edward [m;g3;18]: Sometimes it can be like the parents putting you down and putting their child down. Sometimes they can start to resent them and then that can make them rebel against their parents.
M: So you think that it can be adults against children as well then?
Edward [m;g3;18]: Uh-huh.
Mia [f;g3;17]: I think that any sort of abuse. It’s like physical things like a slap over the back of the head or a push or whether it is just verbal.
David [m;g3;17]: It depends ‘cos like a push isn’t much but it depends on how it is taken. If someone is just angry or something and pushes you out the way, then that is it, you just leave it at that, and that is probably fine. But if someone is being violent and is known to be or is shown to be aggressive then that is different.

In the extract above, David develops the inclusion of children into the definition of domestic abuse and his analysis appears to be framed within an understanding of power relations. What is of concern, however, is the way in which David differentiates between different types of violence which he constructs as more or less serious.

In the following extract from the interview in Group 4 (in an area which is at the bottom of the SIMD scale and ranks 1207), the discussion starts from Jane’s
gendered definition of domestic abuse, and Kay adds that it happens in the home. Leigh raises the issue of children again but it is unclear whether Leigh is referring to child abuse or whether she means the impact on children of violence in the home in general. Both David and Leigh's inclusion of children could be interpreted to reflect ambiguity on what constitutes domestic violence or it could be understood that the young people are developing the feminist analysis of domestic violence as controlling behaviour and the more recent definitions developed by Women's Aid for example, which argue that domestic violence also happens to children who may be directly or indirectly involved (Women's Aid Federation England, 2003).

Rubina and Leigh also categorise types of abusive behaviour but Jane interjects to claim that all abusive behaviour in the home (although it is uncertain whether she is framing it as men as perpetrators against women) constitutes domestic abuse in her opinion. Richard builds on, and develops, this point and remarks that, in terms of definitions, there is no division or scale of violence or abusive behaviour but that all violence or abuse equally constitutes domestic abuse. Kay and Jane both argue that it can be women who are abusive as well, particularly towards children. Kay asserts that domestic violence does happen to men and that it is just not "publicised" as much as abuse towards women. Leigh explicitly introduces the concept of control and argues that domestic abuse is a strategy to assert control over someone else (Yllo, 1993; Stark, forthcoming).

Jane [f;g4;17]: Wife beating.  
Kay [f;g4;17]: Violence in the house.  
Leigh [f;g4;17]: Violence towards children or you mainly think of a male doing that I suppose.  
Rubina [f;g4;17]: It can start with that and then go to the full extent.  
Leigh [f;g4;17]: Actually beating up and like rape and stuff as well.  
Jane [f;g4;17]: No, I think that it is all domestic violence. Arguments. Arguments can make someone feel insecure or unhappy about something.  
Richard [m;g4;17]: Anything from verbal to physical constitutes as domestic violence. If you seek to physically or emotionally harm another person in your home then it is
domestic violence or domestic abuse. That's what it is basically. There is no line that it has to cross before it becomes [interrupted].

Kay [f; g4; 17]: It is mostly advertised as men but some men do have violent wives. But it is not publicised as much as violence towards females and children.

Jane [f; g4; 17]: Also, women can abuse their children. Some mothers get so tired from looking after young kids that they can get violent. But I would say that it is more advertised as men beating up kids or the wife but I do think that mothers do, can be just as responsible for domestic violence.

Leigh [f; g4; 17]: In an attempt to assert control over someone they say oh you are going to do what I say, 'cos you are never going to listen to me any other way and domestic violence is a way of asserting control over someone.

The use of language in the discussion above is important because both Kay and Jane argue that domestic abuse is “advertised” as male violence. The usage of this terminology could suggest that they believe that they are being ‘sold’ an idea, which could explain why they are sceptical of the figures about domestic abuse, and argue that women are also responsible as perpetrators. Furthermore, from these extracts it is clear that the young people are aware of the literature produced in relation to domestic abuse and that they are cognisant of the range ofbehaviours that constitute domestic abuse and do not regard it as strictly limited to physical violence. This excerpt also identifies that there is some ambiguity regarding what the young people define as domestic abuse and whether it incorporates abuse against children in addition to abuse between adults (Women’s Aid Federation England, 2003). This confusion was found in the pioneering research by Mullender and colleagues which found that there was ‘considerable confusion’ over definitions of domestic violence (Mullender et al, 2002; see also Section 5.7, Chapter 5 for a discussion of this).
8.1.2: Gender Symmetry in Domestic Abuse?

Theories of women as perpetrators of, and being responsible for, domestic abuse were discussed in all of the groups to the extent that even when the respondents expressed awareness of the gender asymmetry of domestic abuse, they were still eager to ensure that it was understood that they 'knew' that men were also 'victims'. However, these views were complex and the following excerpts examine these often contradictory views about women as perpetrators. A key point is that even though all of the groups mentioned women being violent, when the respondents suggested reasons for why domestic abuse happened they all framed their discussions and reasons within the parameters of men as the perpetrators, rather than women. This section will therefore examine the responses in relation to women as perpetrators and the next section will examine the responses in relation to men as the alleged victims of this abuse.

The first extract, below, is presented at length because Andrew instigates the discussion of definitions of domestic abuse by referring to men hitting women but then Anna interjects that it "could" be women being abusive towards men. Diane emphasises that the domestic abuse adverts perpetuate the idea that it is men who are the perpetrators when, according to her, it could be women who are the protagonists. Claire also supports Diane's assessment which leads Diane to reiterate her point. This time, however, Diane introduces the notion of appropriate gender behaviour whereby she argues that just because it is assumed that men are the more aggressive, this does not preclude women from ever being abusive. Andrew then further expands this by describing a traditional male breadwinner and female dependent scenario where a woman must do the domestic chores because she is being "looked after" by the man (O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000). It has previously been discussed that young men rather than women are more traditional in their views about women's and men's roles and it is perhaps unsurprising that Andrew develops this analysis, although it is unclear whether this is the opinion which he holds on the matter or if he is presenting what he thinks is the position of others (for a discussion of boys' traditional opinions see Griffin, 1985; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Sharpe, 1994; O'Donnell and Sharp, 2000; Equal Opportunities Commission, 2001; Skelton and Hall, 2001).
Andrew's account of the roles of men and women are significant because he refers to the gender binary but instead of applying the feminine/masculine and aggressive/passive dualities (which are often the most used forms) Andrew refers to women as "feminine" and men as "violent", rather than masculine. It is worth restating that Andrew was the only boy in the group and explained that he did not conform to a hegemonic type of masculine identity and was a bit of an outsider (see Section 7.2.3, Chapter 7). Andrew draws on gender constructions to argue that the violence of women (as seen on television) is more "disturbing" because it transgresses acceptable "feminine" behaviour, which could imply that violence is more acceptable as representative of masculine behaviour. This reflects some of the theoretical literature which argues that as a social construction, violence is understood as constitutive of hegemonic masculinity (Lees, 1996; Hearn, 1998a; see also Section 4.6, Chapter 4). Therefore, whilst Andrew explains that traditional hegemonic constructions of male gender behaviour are constricting for him, he then goes on to present a very stereotyped, traditional, representation of women and appropriate feminine gender behaviour. Diane, however, supports Andrew's analysis of the unacceptability of women's violence in her concluding comment.

Andrew [m; g; 15]: Usually a man hitting a woman.

Anna [f; g; 15]: A man hitting a woman, you automatically think that but it could be the other way around.

Diane [f; g; 15]: See, that's the way it is drummed into your head. Say if it's like an advert or something it is always a woman is getting abused by a man, it is not really seen to be the other way around, but it does happen.

Claire [f; g; 15]: But we never get shown that, even in the domestic abuse adverts.

Diane [f; g; 15]: It is always shown the woman as the victim, but it happens the other way around. Just because men are seen more aggressive that way doesn't mean that woman aren't aggressive at all, because it does happen.

Andrew [m; g; 15]: But in a domestic abuse situation men are portrayed as to be in the house violent, or aggressive, or dominant or, words like that, and they say that they look after them and they do stuff and
they must do whatever they do for women. If they bring in the money that means women must clean up. It’s like they are both trying to balance up but in a way that a woman has to be feminine where a man has to be violent and that is the way it is portrayed in an advert. But the thing is, I saw a programme where it was the women doing the violence and things, and it was pretty much the same things they were doing, like slapping and punching. It started off with slapping and then it was fighting, punching, kicking, throwing stuff and then stabbing people and that, it was, it was quite disturbing to see that a woman could do that to you.

You seem more shocked when you see it. A woman doing it to a man, but when a man. ‘Cos you have been brought up see this sort of thing. If they talk about domestic violence, I can say all of you probably thought oh a man is hitting a woman but it seems a lot more unacceptable for a woman to hit a man.

Diane [f;g1;15]:

The following extract also from Group 1, develops the argument about violence being inappropriate behaviour for women and, additionally, it emphasises how male violence towards women is accepted as “everyday” behaviour, which is significant in relation to the normalisation of male violence (Stanko, 1985). Claire’s comment is more complex to understand because she introduces the concept of criminal proceedings and argues that, if this did happen, the court would be more likely to believe the woman as complainant, than the man. This is in contrast to the reality that women are often disbelieved in the courts regarding male violence, particularly sexualised violence (Lees, 2002).

Emma [f;g1;15]:

I think it is more shocking if you see it [women being violent]. Think how many people would look at adverts, like say you are switching through the channels on the TV and you see an advert about a man beating up a woman, you might look at it for a couple of seconds but you’re just seeing oh that’s everyday and just skip through
that channel but if you come across a channel where you see a woman beating up a man you might stop and watch that more, here what is this, I haven't seen that too much before. 'Cos it's more shocking.

Claire [f; g1; 15]:
The violence is still wrong, whoever it is, it is still wrong, but it is more shocking to outsiders if it is a woman to a man. And if it did go to court, the court would probably believe the woman [rather] than the man about it, like if something happened.

In the same group, below, Emma develops the argument about to abuse by women, but argues that women's behaviour can be different from men's because women do not necessarily rely on physical violence (like men) but are "manipulative" and Diane develops this to argue that women can be insulting to men. Claire then projects a very traditional view of men being "in charge" of women whereby if a women is offensive or abusive towards the man it is worse because his friends may perceive that he is not the dominant one in the relationship (Connell, 1995). Emma also interprets the alleged ability of women to "control their temper" as a technique for further abusing the men and instead of being regarded as a positive characteristic, self-control is implicated in abusive behaviour. Diane and Claire then 'blame' television programmes like the soap opera EastEnders and advertisements for gendering domestic abuse and identifying men as the predominant perpetrators.

Emma [f; g1; 15]:
See going back to talking about violence and men hitting women, what a lot of it, I see a lot of it is, women can be violent but not in their actions but women can be a lot more manipulative. They can get to men, like into their heads, rather than through violence. That's why I think a lot of it is based on men hitting because they are seen as more offensive but women can track that down and stop that before it happens but manipulate them.

Diane [f; g1; 15]:
Yeh, women can make men feel small like in front of their friends or something or just drum it into their
heads that they could insult them and then sort of believe that.

Claire [f; g1; 15]: And the guys are seen to his friends that they are in charge of this woman so if the woman is getting one over them then it isn’t really good.

Emma [f; g1; 15]: And for some reason it seems to be that it is women, I don’t know why, but more women can control their temper more easily than the men could, and they can use that to get to them more.

Diane [f; g1; 15]: That’s what is put in our mind by big programmes like EastEnders and things that drum it into you that it is always the man that hits the woman.

Claire [f; g1; 15]: And even the adverts that are trying to say, this is what you know, but it should be a wider range of things.

One of the more subtle points which the young people make, in different sections, is in relation to how they often invert a positive characteristic, when it is associated with women, into a negative one. This is evident in the extract above whereby Emma states that women are less violent than men, which presumably would be more constructive, but then asserts that they are more “manipulative” which is not generally regarded as a desirable characteristic.

In one of the all male groups (Group 12) Nassar also challenges the gender asymmetry of domestic abuse and regards this as untrue (Johnson, 1998). Mark, however, contradicts Nassar and argues that it is usually men who are violent and describes this in terms of physical violence, whereas William comments that it can also be emotional abuse but that there is a greater propensity for women to do this. Ultimately, William concludes that it is still more likely for men to be abusive because they are “more impulsive” than women.

Nassar [m; g12; 17]: It’s like family disputes. Most people think of it as male towards the females but I would say that is not true.

M: So what do you think it is?
Nassar [m; g12; 17]: A bit of both.
M: What do the others think, what do you think?
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Mark [m;g12;16]: I don't know, I think you can say that there will always like, there's been an argument or something, but when it comes to it, it's normally when the male has really lost his temper or something like that.

William [m;g12;16]: No. It's emotional as well I think but women tend more to be involved in emotional abuse than actual physical abuse. It does happen but I think again males are definitely more impulsive and like they don't think about things before they actually do it.

These extracts have identified that there is an anomaly in the young people's understandings of domestic abuse whereby, whilst they show awareness of the gendered dimension of domestic abuse, they are extremely resistant to accepting this. In all of the groups, where they challenged the gender asymmetry of domestic abuse, there was no complete explanation of why they disbelieved the statistics and the only 'evidence' provided by them was reference to television programmes (Saunders, 1988; Dobash and Dobash, 1992, 2000; Dobash et al, 1993; Kurz, 1993a; Nazroo, 1999).

8.1.3: Implications of Men as the Alleged Victims of Domestic Abuse

As stated, many of the young people were determined in their opinion that men are the victims of domestic abuse at least as much as women (see above). Furthermore, according to the respondents, this abuse is often worse than abuse against women because it can undermine the 'men-as-dominant' image, within which the young people framed much of their viewpoints (Connell, 1995, Equal Opportunities Commission, 2001). Therefore, the more significant element of domestic abuse was not judged in terms of the damage caused by it, but was conceptualised in terms of how it would make men feel and how it would negate their image as the dominant member of the (heterosexual) relationship.

The first extract in this section is from Edward, who argues that violence against men may go unreported because men may not want other people to see them as a 'victim'. Edward's opinion appears to be located in a framework that places the culpability for
the violence with the victim (the man) who allows his wife to perpetrate the abuse against him.

Edward [m;g3;18]: Sometimes I think, see 'cos men are that competitive sometimes a lot of men might be suffering from abuse from their wives but may not want to mention it or take it to the police or anything in case people see them as a sissy because they are allowing their wives to beat them or whatever.

It is significant that, in contrast, when the respondents had constructed women as the victims of abuse, they did not 'blame' the women for the abuse against them and often referred to power and control issues (Stark, forthcoming). The issue of power and control is detectable in their analyses of men as the victims but is construed as men's loss of power, through their abuse, whereas men were exerting power when they were the abusers. Thus, in this conceptualisation, the abuse seems to undermine the men's masculinity, which is defined in very traditional terms, and this is the most important aspect, according to the respondents, of the consequences of domestic abuse towards men.

Richard [m;g4;17]: I mean there could be countless numbers of men who get beaten regularly by women who refuse to report it.

Leigh [f;g4;17]: Probably because they are embarrassed.

Richard [m;g4;17]: Probably because of that image thing. Because they don't want to be seen as weak.

Of significance in the extract above is the way in which Richard suggests that there "could" be numerous men who are subject to violence by women but Leigh's response to this suggestion is to accept it as a truism. Richard's retort is framed within a male dominance model whereby he suggests that men may not disclose abuse because it may undermine their masculinity and make them seem "weak" (Connell, 1995).
In the next excerpt, Becky is confident in her assumption that many men are abused and are too “scared” to disclose this but she does not clarify what this supposition is based on. Diane then introduces the concept of abused men feeling “ashamed” and Emma argues that it is, in fact, “harder” for men to speak about their abuse.

Becky [f;g1;15]: A lot of men are too scared to come forward about something like that.

Diane [f;g1;15]: They are ashamed to say that my wife beats me up. That would probably make a man feel really small against all his mates and things.

Emma [f;g1;15]: Uh-huh. And I think it would be harder for a man to go and say to his mates, or tell somebody what has happened or go and see somebody.

It is significant that the young people emphasise that not only are men abused on a scale comparable to women (contrary to all data suggesting otherwise, see Chapters 2 and 3) but that it is also worse for men (Saunders, 1988; Dobash and Dobash, 1992, 2000; Dobash et al, 1993; Kurz, 1993a; Nazroo, 1999). The participants’ rationale for this is because they are framing their understandings within a male dominance model of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1995). Thus, in this analysis, for men to be situated in a less powerful position (because of their abuse) than their female partners, undermines traditional gender relations in which men are invested with more power than women (Brittan, 1989). This analysis also suggests that the participants are cognisant of, although resistant to, the feminist informed analyses of domestic abuse (as advocated in the domestic abuse awareness campaigns sponsored by the Scottish Executive and Glasgow City Council, see Section 2.3.1.1, Chapter 2) which centralise the issues of power and control.

8.1.4: Explanations for Domestic Abuse

This section of the analysis focuses on the reasons the participants gave in response to the question asking for their opinions about the causes of domestic abuse. The interviewer was exploring whether the preceding discussion on gender roles and constructions would inform the reasons the participants offered, or whether their explanations would have different foundations. One issue that emerges is that,
unless otherwise stated, in the reasons given for domestic abuse, the form of domestic abuse is presumed to be physical violence, even though, in the earlier section when the respondents were defining domestic abuse they discussed the range of behaviours and were clear that it was not limited to physical violence (see Section 8.1.1). Additionally, unless the respondents explicitly name women as the perpetrators, all the reasons given for domestic abuse are framed with the male as the perpetrator which also contradicts the above section where they explain, at length, that it is a misunderstanding to always conceptualise women as the victims of domestic abuse and men as the perpetrators.

For reasons of clarity, this section has been divided into various subsections with the 'reasons' grouped under these headings. To reiterate, the data was organised through a thematic analysis, and consequently these various subsections are a result of the participants' responses rather than their answers being made to fit into an existing schema. However, some of the extracts involve discussion between the respondents in which various reasons are given for domestic abuse, therefore, it is not always possible to discretely classify the 'reasons', which, as stated, is characteristic of the dialogical nature of group interviews.

8.1.4.1: Childhood

A number of the groups grounded their explanations of domestic abuse in childhood experiences. In the first extract below, Sara gives an account of men being the "man of the house" which fits into a male dominance model of masculinity (Skelton and Hall, 2001). Hannah however, argues that it is less related to the male dominance model and more directly linked to negative childhood experiences. In a different group (Group 4), Narinder also suggests that it could be a result of a "bad childhood" (and uses gender neutral language) which was a reason offered by a number of the respondents (see below).

Sara [f;g10;15]: It's supposed to make them look better, if they are the man, they are the man of the house, sort of thing.

Hannah [f;g10;15]: They might have got bullied when they were younger, so it is part of that.
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Maybe it passed down from when they were younger. Following in their family.

Narinder [f;g4;17]: I think that it is, em, if someone has had a bad childhood or witnessed aggression in their childhood as well.

Pauline (Group 5) also suggests that childhood experience is significant to domestic abuse but Ian argues that the real problem is because this abusive behaviour is "tolerated". Furthermore, Ian makes a theoretical link between the "rough" conduct of boys which is then naturalised as gender appropriate behaviour, which, in this analysis, clearly connects normative masculinity and aggression (Hearn, 1998a, 2001). As the dominant member of this group, Ian had a certain authority when he spoke and usually the rest of the group would remain silent instead of talking over each other as they would do when other group members spoke and therefore Ian was able to ‘lead’ the conversation in different directions as he chose (See Section 6.3.3 and Section 7.2.1 about the role of the dominant male in focus groups). Where the rest of the group do not agree with him, they never challenge him directly and instead say what ‘their’ opinion is on the matter rather than what the ‘correct’ position is. In the excerpt below, the connection made by Ian between boys’ socialisation and violence is disregarded by the group, and Nicola reverts to focusing on “upbringing”.

Pauline [f;g5;16]: Yeh they are brought up that way.
Ian [m;g5;16]: I think the fact that it is tolerated is the problem. If they are being rough it’s said well they are only being boys. That makes it say that the two things are interlinked in a way that they shouldn’t be.
Nicola [f;g5;16]: I think it’s their upbringing.

Edward (Group 3) also refers to children’s upbringing and the socialisation process, and media influence, which impacts on this. Edward cites the example of wrestling programmes and whilst he remains gender neutral in his description, it could be argued that, typically, boys are more interested in this than girls, and as such Edward may be referring to boys and boys’ behaviour (see Section 7.1.8, Chapter 7).
Sometimes it can be down to, see a lot of kids now can be watching the wrestling and stuff and then they are acting that out as well but they don't realise they can actually hurt each other. And then they are just brought up that way. And they just accept being violent as a way of life.

In the excerpt below, Mark refers to childhood and the way that young people may be brought up to believe that violence is acceptable, which is developed by William and both use gender neutral language. William, however, initially uses gender neutral language, but then describes a specific scenario where a girl might be violent which suggests that, in this extract, the respondents are using ostensibly gender neutral language but are actually referring to boys and men. Furthermore, William explicitly introduces the concept of appropriate gender behaviour and how the use of violence is deemed more acceptable for males than for girls or women which again perpetuates this traditional view of women and men (Skelton and Hall, 2001).

I think what causes it is that it might be that they grow up thinking that violence is right, maybe through their parents and that.

Yeh, definitely because I think that, like if someone is being tormented at school by a bully and it's like verbal and everything and that, then they hit them just once and it stops and they are seen as the hero. But if a woman, kind of, if a girl, is bullying another girl and she hit them then she would probably be seen as a psycho.

The final quotation in this section is from Julie who suggests that domestic abuse may be resultant from boys (and girls) witnessing it in their homes when they were younger which reflects the cycle of violence theory of domestic violence (Walker, 1983).

See a lot of guys like, maybe they have been brought up with it in their own house and a lot of women when they were young, maybe they were brought
up with violence. Like that is what we talked about in drama. It is the women, a lot of women who are in domestic abuse relationships, they tend to grow up and go with somebody because that is all they know, somebody similar.

Julie’s conclusion, which is that women are implicated in their abuse, is problematic because she argues that women “go with” abusive men because “that is all they know”. This position of Julie’s has the consequence of placing culpability for abuse onto women which is a diametrically opposite, and fundamentally incompatible, view to the feminist theoretical understanding of domestic abuse which firmly locates the responsibility with the abuser rather than with the victim/survivor (Hague and Malos, 1998; Women’s Aid Federation England, 1998, 2003).

There are clearly a number of different kinds of core explanatory models being drawn upon in this section and it is problematical to distinguish between the individualistic ‘bad childhood’ explanatory model and the socialisation process/gendered model.

8.1.4.2: Self-Defence

The following excerpt from Group 1 has been included, at length, because it is illustrative of how the conversational dynamic of the focus group influences the responses. Self-defence is provided as an acceptable usage of violence but it is referred to in gender-neutral language and constructed in terms of it being a reactive response, a “reflex”, and the violence is decontextualised.

Claire [f;g1;15]: What if it is retaliation?
Andrew [m;g1;15]: If it’s self-defence.
Claire [f;g1;15]: If it’s self-defence.
Diane [f;g1;15]: Only in very drastic circumstances is it acceptable.
Claire [f;g1;15]: ‘Cos if someone does hit you then you would hit them back.
Andrew [m;g1;15]: It’s a reaction.
Claire [f;g1;15]: It’s a reflex.
Anna [f;g1;15]: You don’t think about it you just do it.
Diane [f;g1;15]: I think that if you start it maybe then it is wrong 'cos there is probably a better way to solve it than that.

Claire [f;g1;15]: But if it is self-defence though?

Diane [f;g1;15]: In certain circumstances it's OK but I don't think that anyone should start it with violence. They should start by talking it over and if it leads to violence I think that's wrong 'cos they should have been able to control it.

Claire [f;g1;15]: So obviously their relationship wasn't that strong if they have to resort to violence.

Group: Yeh.

Claire [f;g1;15]: They should have walked away from it.

It appears that the participants develop the discussion from self-defence to a context of interpersonal relations because Diane argues that "they" should discuss and "control" the problem, whereby Claire suggests that the fault lies within the strength of the "relationship". One interpretation of this piece of dialogue is that the young people start off by talking about self-defence but then move on to discussing a relationship between two adults in which both are equally responsible for the violence.

8.1.4.3: Physicality

A lot of the young people suggested that physical strength played an important role in why men resort to violence and why women use different techniques (according to the participants) when acting abusively.

In the extract below, John, in an all male group based in a school in an area with high deprivation, reasons that men are violent because they are physically "more powerful". Charles argues that this is why women are not as violent although he comments that he is not trying to be "sexist" when he says this, rather, he is alluding to a physical difference. Charles then argues that men are violent because they can "get away with it"; simply, they do it because they can. Furthermore, Charles argues that the normalcy of violence between men is such that it reduces the seriousness of this violence, as opposed to violence between men and women (Dobash and Dobash, 1998b). John and Charles both explicitly introduce the concept of power into their
analyses, although it is ambiguous whether this is related to power as a social relation or power in relation to physicality.

*John [m; g11; 16]*: ‘Cos they’re more powerful.

*Charles [m; g11; 15]*: I don’t think women are strong enough. I don’t mean to sound sexist or anything it’s just the way men are. Men are more powerful than women. I don’t think a woman could get away with it, to hit a man. ... ‘Cos he knows he can get away with it at home. ... I think it is a power thing. He wants to show he is more powerful. ... I think two guys fighting in the street is less serious, ‘cos guys fight all the time, it is acceptable.

Julie, in an all female group, in a school which ranks quite low on the SIMD scale (904 out of 1222) but which only has just over a quarter of pupils eligible for free school meals, also argues that men are more violent because they are physically stronger than women. When asked if the reason for domestic abuse was exclusively related to physical strength, Natalie argues, like Charles above, that men do it simply because they can.

*Julie [f; g13; 16]*: Well the only reason I think that there is so many males hitting the women is because they are naturally stronger.

*M:* It’s about strength?

*Natalie [f; g13; 16]*: They know they can get away with it.

*Julie [f; g13; 16]*: Uh-huh, ‘cos if you are going to be fighting with a guy right, say I was just fighting with a guy, the chances are he is going to batter [beat up] me just because he is bigger and stronger.

The final extract in this section is from Kay (Group 4) who locates the cause of domestic abuse in men’s physical size. Kay, however, argues at length that these men do not intentionally cause damage but inadvertently do so because they are unaware of their physical power.

*Kay [f; g4; 17]*: I think sometimes the guys don’t actually realise that they have got so much strength if they are really worked
up, they forget the amount of strength
they have, and it’s not till after they
have done, that they realise actually I
have more strength than I thought I had.
And because they are so worked up they
don’t actually realise what they are
actually doing.

It is interesting that Kay asserts that this is the reality of what happens and that men
genuinely are unaware, which may be interpreted as a defence for their
violence/abuse. This argument developed by Kay suggests that this position of
constructing men as unknowing perpetrators is in contrast to the feminist power and
control analysis which argues that men are responsible for their violence and abuse
(Yllo, 1993; Radford and Stanko, 1996).

8.1.4.4: Control
Some of the groups argued that domestic abuse was a means for men to exert control.
In the extract below, Natalie argues that domestic abuse is a male response to women
“getting stronger”, being more autonomous and entering the labour market (for a
discussion of the participants views of women’s employment see Section 7.1.4,
Chapter 7).

Shazia [f;g13;17]: To keep control.
Natalie [f;g13;16]: They [men] feel threatened because
women are getting stronger now. They
are working more, it’s not like they are
sitting about the house all day waiting
for them.

The issue of control was understood, and explained, by the respondents in different
ways. Indeed, Nassar, below, names it as men being “on top”, which has been
interpreted by the interviewer to reflect a power relation.

Nassar [m;g12;17]: It’s as I say they are not, they can’t take
it emotionally. They have to have an
argument. Men can’t take it as well as
women so they want to do something to
show the other men that they are on top.
So that is why men resort to violence.
Kay and Leigh are both explicit in their identification of control as a means of men/boys being in control of their female partner (Stark, forthcoming). Kay aligns the controlling behaviour to an insecurity in how the “guy” perceives his relationship. However, Kay also refers to women almost as individuals without autonomy or agency because she argues that the man has to be in control of his partner or else “someone will take her away”. Leigh expands this point and argues that the perceived “insecurity”, which engenders controlling behaviour, is related to “insecurity” with the relationship and with “themselves”.

Kay [f;g4;17]: 
I think sometimes that guys can be a bit scared 'cos if they are going out with their girlfriend and she is good looking or something then he might lose her or something. So he has got to be in control of it so he won't lose the person or someone will take her away or something like that.

Leigh [f;g4;17]: 
It is control and it is based on insecurity to a certain extent. Well if you are losing the person then they want to be able to control. They don't want to not be in control of the situation. They don't want to lose someone because they are insecure about themselves.

This argument is also reminiscent of the previous discussion (Section 8.1.1) in which the young people discussed the issue of possession (ownership). In the extract above, Kay discusses a scenario of a man losing his girlfriend and having to be in “control” to circumvent this. Furthermore, Kay links the idea about losing the girlfriend to body image, whereby if a woman is “good looking” then that could potentially lead to the boyfriend losing her (see Section 7.1.6, Chapter 7). This could also be construed as another example of a socially desirable status, attractiveness, being turned into a negative quality due to its attachment to girls/women; because it is cited as a potential source for the boyfriend having to “control” his girlfriend so that he will not “lose her” to someone else. This also places culpability for his controlling behaviour onto the girlfriend (see above).

In the extract below, Richard, the only male in the same group as Kay and Leigh, develops two main points: firstly, that women may not use physical violence as much
because of their inferior strength; and secondly, in relation to this, women may use other forms of abusive behaviour in order to control their male partner. Rubina suggests that women may resort to other non-violent methods such as psychological abuse and Richard argues that women “will play mind games” (note that Rubina is much more tentative and says “might” whereas Richard says “will”). Richard becomes very animated in this discussion and he describes a scenario in which a woman he “knows of” controls her husband through these “mind games”. Richard universalises this experience to argue that domestic abuse is asymmetrical.

Richard [m; g4; 17]: I think that women might not resort to violence as much because they are aware of the differences in strength. There are occasions where a woman will be stronger than a man but not very often. Therefore they will think about it and they will exert control in other ways.

Rubina [f; g4; 17]: They might abuse them psychologically or that.

Richard [m; g4; 17]: They will play mind games. Like if they say or they will just start doing certain things or do things to wind the guy up and the guy will get worn down and if he has self control he won't resort to violence and then he will just come under her control and she will start saying where are you going and then he will tell her, and why are you doing that, and blah blah blah and eventually she will say that you can or can't go and he will listen. I know it has, I know of a family where the woman is in control. If the guy wants to go and do something he has to check with his wife first to see if he can go and do it and if she says no then it's no. As simple as that. So it does work the other way. But she doesn't resort to violence or anything like that, she just tells him basically.

In this extract, Richard discusses the issue of power in interpersonal relationships and argues about women being in control in a general sense and then discusses a scenario involving “a family” he knows. Richard's account is much more woman-blaming.
because he says that women "play mind games", will "wind the guy up", so that "the guy" will get "worn down" and "come under her control". He substantiates these assertions by citing the family in which he claims this happens, and specifically states that in this family the "woman is in control", which could suggest that this requires discussion because it is against the 'norm' of the man being in control (Stark, forthcoming).

8.1.4.5: Summary of Explanations for Domestic Abuse

This part of the interview, about reasons for domestic abuse, engendered the most amount of debate and discussion from the participants. Throughout the entire interviews, all of the young people thought carefully about their responses and attempted to reach a consensus for their opinions. In this section of the interview, however, there was less of an agreement about an adequate explanation for domestic abuse, and the participants could not find a monocausal (which is what they were seeking) explanation that reflected their opinions.

The first extract below is from Megan and occurred towards the end of the interview, where she was becoming visibly frustrated. After repeatedly trying to establish a discrete reason for domestic abuse, which was conceptualised by Megan primarily as men abusing women, she concluded that all the suggested reasons for this abuse are inadequate and ultimately men use "any excuse" to justify their behaviour in maintaining dominance.

Megan [f;g5;16]: Well they use any excuse. People will always say well you know guys are always necessarily going to have to use violence to get their way and stuff and they are more likely to whereas women aren't. But there is no excuse for it, do you know what I mean?

58 This is, of course, the interviewer's interpretation but this judgement is based on the evidence that Megan had a huge input in the group and was attempting to provide explanations for domestic abuse that she, and the rest of the group, agreed with. However, Megan could not locate a discrete answer, and neither could anyone else in the group and her mannerisms and behaviour suggested that this was frustrating her. This interpretation could, however, be misplaced.
Richard’s final comment to providing explanations for domestic abuse encapsulates two reasons: the first because, in his gendered analysis, it is an effective method for men to achieve their goal of remaining in control; and secondly that men are violent because “it makes them feel good”.

Richard [m;g4;17]: Probably because he got the result that he wanted. Yeh, so why try and struggle with other means when this is tried and tested and it works. ... Sometimes, it’s not always the case but sometimes, men are just unstable in the head and they just start hitting folk because it makes them feel good.

The final comment in this section is by Ian who develops a sophisticated analysis of why men are violent and the ways in which male violence is often minimised and not named by the perpetrators as abuse. This issue of recognising and ‘naming’ male violence as violence was a central development for feminist theorists (Kelly, 1988a; see Section 2.2, Chapter 2).

Ian [m;g5;16]: Do you think guys get into situations where they do something and they don’t see it as domestic abuse? They just see it as what they need to do to get the situation the way they like it. To link the tag of domestic abuse to an individual action, which people won’t do, people will think oh I am not breaking her arms, I am not giving her black eyes, so that is not domestic abuse. Not realising that what they are doing is just a different type of it, you know.

This section has illustrated that the participants challenged each other and attempted to provide adequate reasons for the occurrence of domestic abuse. However, this part of the interview presented difficulties for the participants because they could not reach consensus agreements as to the causes of it. Furthermore, when they attempted to provide reasons, domestic abuse was generally described as physical violence except when they framed their discussion with women as the perpetrators. This is in contrast to the start of the domestic abuse discussions when they were explicit that
they understood domestic abuse to comprise a range of behaviour not limited to physical violence (see Section 8.1.1). Furthermore, the young people introduce concepts of power, coercion, control and constructed gender distinctions, and the implications of this will be discussed in the next chapter (Chapter 9).

8.1.5: Consequences of Domestic Abuse
Towards the end of this discussion on domestic abuse, the young people were asked for their opinions as to what they thought the consequences of domestic violence were. In relation to this, the young people focused more on the women’s experiences as victims of abuse, and thus returned to the framework of men being the perpetrators which is in contrast to some of the earlier dialogue which emphasised that women were also perpetrators. Some of the discussions, shown below, revolve around the young people’s incomprehension as to why women stay in abusive relationships. This is indicative of some of the literature which asks why women stay, in contrast to the feminist critique, which asks ‘why do men use violence’ (Hague and Malos, 1998).

In the first extract, shown below, the respondents argue that women stay in abusive relationships because they are “scared” to leave them and the issues of trust and isolation are raised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hannah [f;g10;15]:</th>
<th>Scared. They are scared.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara [f;g10;15]:</td>
<td>Nobody to talk to. ’Cos if they do say anything, it might end up making things worse for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M:</td>
<td>So there are not enough people to talk to about it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara [f;g10;15]:</td>
<td>They don’t know who to trust anymore after it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lengthier extract, below, also focuses on women’s fear and the respondents engage in a dialogue with each other about the reasons that women stay in abusive relationships. The conversation starts off with the issue of fear but moves onto financial constraints that women may face. This analysis reflects the earlier discussion, which located men and women in a male breadwinner model, with
women perceived to be financially dependent on their male partner (Section 7.2.1, Chapter 7). Megan, however, states that even though she accepts the financial arguments, and the fear elements, she still finds it difficult to understand why women stay in abusive relationships.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Bart \{m; g5; 17\}:} & \quad \text{They are scared to leave 'cos they think the guy will come after them.} \\
\text{Nicola \{f; g5; 16\}:} & \quad \text{But if a woman has got, if there is a family of five children and the man is the only person who brings in financial support how is she meant to leave. How can she?} \\
\text{Ian \{m; g5; 16\}:} & \quad \text{Isn't there enough support for women who want to leave domestic abuse?} \\
\text{Nicola \{f; g5; 16\}:} & \quad \text{No there is not. I don't think there is.} \\
\text{Megan \{f; g5; 16\}:} & \quad \text{Why do people put up with it? Why don't they leave? I've never been in the situation so I don't know. But I find it hard to understand. I know if there is children and economic stuff and money and things.} \\
\text{Bart \{m; g5; 17\}:} & \quad \text{They are scared to leave.} \\
\text{Megan \{f; g5; 16\}:} & \quad \text{But I know that there is a place in [name of area where there is a refuge] for women, so there are places to go.}
\end{align*}
\]

This particular discussion continued for some time and towards the end of it, Ian introduced the notion of "shame". Arguably this moved the discussion away from structural factors to factors concerned with the social or cultural acceptance of domestic abuse. In this analysis, Ian focuses on women feeling ashamed of their husbands abusing them, but there is no discussion of the shame that husbands might feel for being abusers. Similar to the discussion above, this focuses on women's role as the victims of abuse rather than men as the perpetrators.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ian \{m; g5; 16\}:} & \quad \text{But there is a shame attached to it.} \\
& \quad \text{There is a shame in saying my husband beats me so I am leaving him. You know, so people would lie about it.}
\end{align*}
\]

As the dominant male in the group and as a very articulate and confident young man, Ian expresses his views in a very authoritative manner although for the statement above he does not explain how he knows that women feel and react like this and no
one in the group asks him to substantiate this statement. The final quotation from Emma and Claire, from a different group but based in an area which is closely ranked with Ian’s school, brings the discussion back to what differentiates domestic abuse from stranger violence and that is the interpersonal element of it which supports a feminist definition of domestic violence (Hague and Malos, 1998). Claire adds that women may be in love with their assailant which problematises the situation further.

Emma [f; g; 15]: See talking about EastEnders and stuff well I think it is really hard for men and women to escape that. Say a man is beating up a woman I think it’s really hard for her to go and tell someone.

Claire [f; g; 15]: Especially someone that they love.

One of the key points to emerge from these extracts is the element of secrecy attached to disclosing domestic abuse and there is an implicit assumption by the participants that shame and secrecy are integral to the existence and perpetuation of domestic abuse (Barron et al, 1992; Women’s Aid Federation England, 1998).

8.1.6: Summary of Domestic Abuse Discussion

The extracts above identify that the participants have a complex, if perhaps contradictory, understanding of domestic abuse and an awareness of the statistics as presented by the Scottish Executive domestic abuse campaigns. The first section, which asked the young people about definitions, revealed that they knew that domestic violence comprised a whole range of abusive behaviour from physical violence, to emotional and mental abuse, to financial issues and controlling behaviour, which suggests that the information about domestic abuse is reaching the young people. At this stage, the young people located men as the perpetrators and women as the victims. However, in contrast to their initial statements, and in contradiction to all the information about domestic abuse which identifies that it is a gendered phenomenon, the young people argued that women are also implicated as perpetrators of domestic abuse. There was a suggestion by some of the young people that there was in some way a media ‘cover-up’ to minimise the levels of abuse perpetrated by women and that the only reason that any attention was paid to this was
because it was more "shocking" to see women, in this analysis, being violent. This developed into a discussion by the various groups that men would be too ashamed to admit to their partners being violent towards them because this would undermine their masculinity. Similarly, the discussion revolved around a male dominance model and intrinsic to their analysis in this context is the principle that hegemonic masculinity is synonymous with dominance (Connell, 1995).

As explained, this study developed from two of the key findings from the Zero Tolerance Trust (1998) research. The next section in this chapter examines the young people's responses when they were presented with these findings.

**Part 2: Response to Statistics on Young People's Opinions on Male Interpersonal Violence**

**8.2.1: Young People's Opinions on the Acceptability of Male Interpersonal Violence**

As explained, the aim of this research is to examine young people's attitudes towards male violence against women and specifically domestic violence. Previous research suggests that young people do have a high tolerance and expectation of male violence which was one of the findings of the Zero Tolerance Trust (1998) research. This research identified that one in two young men and one in three young women thought that in some circumstances it was acceptable for a man to hit a woman or force her to have sex (Burton et al, 1998). These statistics were presented to the young people, after the domestic abuse discussion, in order to explore the young people's views of this tolerance of male violence and whether these young people shared these opinions.

This structure of this section has two parts: the first part presents the views of the young people who argue that male violence is never acceptable and the second section presents the views which argue that sometimes male violence is justified. It should also be stated that this section is shorter than the previous, because, as the final topic there were constraints on time in which to discuss it. This was primarily
because the interviews lasted for the duration of a class lesson and in different schools the time of the class varied.

8.2.2: The Unacceptability of Male Violence / Abuse

This section will present some of the responses in which the respondents argue that male violence is never acceptable. However, it should be noted that most of the participants initiate the discussion by arguing that violence is wrong but then develop responses that suggest that it is sometimes excusable.

In the following extract, Mia argues that it is never acceptable to force someone to do something they do not want to do. To substantiate this, Mia attempts to construct scenarios where a violent response could be "acceptable" but ultimately concludes that there are none.

Mia [f;g3;17]: No matter what the circumstances, it is never acceptable to force anybody to do something. I think it's, you shouldn't force somebody to do something they really didn't want to. I cannot think of any other circumstances where it would be acceptable to hit somebody. I don't know, if they said something extremely nasty about your family or something, even then, that's at a push. That is stretching it. No, I don't think it's acceptable to hit anybody.

The quotation from Mia, above, is ambiguous about where she is locating this violence, and it could be argued that she is not strictly focusing on domestic abuse, or interpersonal violence. In contrast, the quotation below, from Leigh, clearly situates the violence in an interpersonal adult relationship and argues that there is never "any excuse". Leigh then introduces the concept of rights in relation to the fact that whilst a man might not agree with a woman he still does not have "the right" to be abusive and, also, that women should be able to exercise their own decisions.

Leigh [f;g4;17]: I don't think there is any excuse. There is no excuse. No, 'cos you could walk
out or go for a walk or something. Or just leave her because obviously she didn’t really care enough about him. But I think there is no excuse to hit a woman. Yeh, they have a right to comment but they don’t have the right to disagree to the extent of violence. They can say they don’t like it but at the end of the day it is the woman’s choice.

Leigh’s analysis can be compared with one of the key points raised in the previous section on domestic abuse, whereby she blames the woman for the abuse because she argues that “obviously she didn’t really care enough about him” which removes agency from the man, for his abuse, and relocates culpability onto the woman (Radford and Stanko, 1996). In the extract below, Fozia also argues no one should force someone else to do something against their wishes. Fozia introduces the issue of “control” and argues that forcing someone to do something is about controlling them (Stark, forthcoming). However, Fozia does not argue that control is exerted on someone else but that they give over control, which is problematic because it suggests that this makes the victim, rather than the perpetrator, responsible for control dynamics.

Fozia [f;g6;16]: I don’t think you should make someone do something if they didn’t want to. It’s like giving control to that person and they have control of you.

Bethany’s argument (below) could be interpreted as being located within a gender constructionist framework in relation to what is deemed socially acceptable behaviour for men and women (see Carrigan et al, 1987; Kimmell, 1990; Hearn and Collinson, 1994). She argues that it is socially unacceptable for men to hit women, but more tolerable for women to hit men, which, for Bethany, can be used as an excuse for women to hit men.

Bethany [f;g8;15]: Some women would say it is alright to hit a guy because it’s a guy. Some guys would say “oh no I wouldn’t hit a woman” so maybe some woman feel they could get away with doing it to
them. But I don’t think it is right either way.

This statement from Bethany suggests that more women hit men, than vice versa, which again denies the statistics about the asymmetry of domestic abuse (Dobash et al, 1992). This also links into the previous conceptualisations about gender role behaviour and the assumption that it is unacceptable for men to hit women, which in Bethany’s analysis, suggests that women take advantage of this and hit men with impunity.

All of the groups were asked for their views about degrees of violence in relation to whether they conceptualise ‘less severe’ violence as more acceptable. Sara is categorical that the level, and type, of violence is irrelevant and similarly she is unequivocal that it makes no difference whether the perpetrator is male or female. However, when she explains why it is wrong for women to hit men she maintains that it is because it will provoke the man and cause him to be more violent towards the woman. At no point in any of the groups was it suggested that men should not hit women in case women retaliate. Thus indicating that despite the argument about women’s violence they do have an implicit view that male violence has a greater impact.

\[
\text{M:} \quad \text{What about if they say "oh it was just a slap, it was just a push"?}
\]

\[
\text{Sara \([f;g10;15]\):} \quad \text{It’s still not the point.}
\]

\[
\text{M:} \quad \text{What if she does it to him, is that still as bad?}
\]

\[
\text{Hannah \([f;g10;15]\):} \quad \text{Aye.}
\]

\[
\text{Sara \([f;g10;15]\):} \quad \text{Aye. 'Cos that will just make him more determined to hit her back, more often.}
\]

In response to the Zero Tolerance Trust (1998) finding relating to men forcing women to have sex, three of the young people in another of the groups are unequivocal that this is rape and can never be justified.\(^\text{59}\) Andrew argues that regardless of what the assailant says, if the woman does not consent, then it is rape.

\(^{59}\) Not all of the groups were asked about this statistic because as discussed, some of the catholic schools set the condition that I could not talk about ‘sex’.
Chapter 8

Anna [f; g1; 15]: If it is forced on you then it is rape.

Andrew [m; g1; 15]: No matter what sort of rape, if you say "no" and he says "yeah" and he forces you to do it then it is still rape.

Emma [f; g1; 15]: No, I don't think that violence can be justified.

This statement reflects the discussion in relation to the continuum of violence which is located in a power analysis of male violence/abuse (Kelly, 1988a). In contrast to the previous sections, which identify that the participants often 'excuse' male violence, Andrew is unequivocal that in his opinion, a woman is raped if she is forced, regardless of the justifications given by the perpetrator (Lees, 2002). It is worth reiterating that the catholic schools prohibited any discussion of 'sex' and so this prohibited a full exploration of this issue.

8.2.3: Justifications for Violence/Abuse

One of the issues that came through in all of the groups, to varying degrees, was the contradictions in the young people's views. All the initial responses of the young people argue that male violence should never be legitimated and indeed, that violence in general should never be validated. However, as can be seen in the previous domestic abuse section, the participants constructed scenarios where violence/abuse could be seen 'by other people' to sometimes be acceptable. This rationalisation is also done in this part of the interview, whereby initially all of the participants argue that violence is never acceptable and that women should never be made to do anything they do not want to. However, when asked further questions on this issue, the participants presented circumstances where it could be justified.

There are a number of complexities within this data because the participants often dissociate themselves from their answers by stating that the opinion they are expressing is not necessarily a position they endorse but that 'some other people' might believe that this is the case. Thus, there is no way of knowing whether these were attitudes held by the young people who may feel that it would be inappropriate to admit to these beliefs and therefore distance themselves by projecting these attitudes onto 'other people'; whether the young people genuinely did not hold these attitudes but were aware of the arguments and attitudes of other members of society;
or whether they were uncertain on these points or themselves actually held mutually contradictory views.

One reason that is offered for previous justifications of male violence is verbalised by William, below, in an all male group, who argues that people are more informed now than they were previously, and now understand that male violence is unacceptable. William suggests that the various campaigns on domestic abuse (see Section 2.3.1.1, Chapter 2) have increased public awareness, which could be interpreted as a validation of the efficacy of the campaigns because it suggests that, for William at least, these various campaigns have had some impact.

*William [m; g12; 16]:* Yeh, I think it is surprising that so many people, even women, thought that it was acceptable. But I think it is probably because people were more naïve then. It wasn't like portrayed in the media or through the government or whatever. It's like now there is a law and it is like soap operas and all that are all domestic abuse and things like that.

Another reason put forward by the young people for male violence is in relation to a sudden loss of temper. In the excerpt below, the participants use gender neutral phraseology until Edward specifically talks about men. Edward also differentiates between how women react (in a non-violent way), and how men react (in a violent way), and therefore he is delineating between, and constructing, gendered responses to a given situation.

*Mia [f; g3; 17]:* Maybe it's because they are in a blind rage, which is not making it acceptable but I don't know, they lost their temper to the extent that they didn't know what else to do. They had shouted that much, they just, I don't know.

*David [m; g3; 17]:* But, it shouldn't really get to that stage. It shouldn't but maybe it does, everybody gets angry, maybe they just take it to extremes.

*Mia [f; g3; 17]:* Maybe it's just in men's, it's just a way men react. Women would stand and argue before they would hit each other.
But I think that men are more aggressive that way, they would lash out in violence before they would actually sit and go through and argue something out or talk about something.

The extract, below, is from a dialogue between two boys, Bart and Ian, about the normalisation and prevalence of male violence. Both Ian and Bart comment that they are not “surprised” by the Zero Tolerance (1998) statistics. Ian goes on to explain that male violence is normalised and accepted to such an extent that it is joked about by men (Stanko, 1985; Hearn, 1998a). (In his next sentence Ian refers to “people” so it is unclear whether he still means men or actually means men and women.)

Ian [m; g5; 16]: To be honest, while it is a horrible statistic, I am not surprised.
Bart [m; g5; 17]: Yeh, I am not.
Ian [m; g5; 16]: I have grown up among young men who think it is hilarious and that scares me. Yeh people make jokes about it. And they will say they are against it but you wonder how they can truly condemn something that they find so funny, you know. If it really is such great fun to beat a woman then how can you say that you would never do it, you know?

Ian is clearly worried by the normalisation and minimising of male violence because he makes the connection between men/boys who joke about violence and the potential of them being future perpetrators (which reflects the cycle of violence theory of domestic violence, see Walker, 1983).

As explained, the participants all initially argue that male violence is never justified but then offered suggestions about situations in which the violence could be understandable. The quotation from Rubina, below, suggests a women blaming justification, because she argues that sometimes women do not “live up to” their expected roles. It is uncertain what the role is that women are meant to live up to but it does suggest that Rubina is locating her argument in a male dominance model as many of the other participants do (Skelton and Hall, 2001). Furthermore, as
explained earlier, it is sometimes not clear if the young people are expressing their own opinion or stating what they perceive the opinion of 'others' to be. Rubina explains at the start of her statement that this is not "necessarily" her own belief that she is presenting, but she does not elucidate whose opinion this is meant to reflect.

Rubina [f;g4;17]: I don't necessarily agree with this but some things do happen in the occasion where the woman isn't really living up to what she is meant to.

As part of this discussion the groups were read out a vignette of a scenario involving a young man who is in a relationship with a young women who wears clothes that he objects to, such as tight jumpers and short skirts. The young woman continues to wear the clothes to the annoyance and disapproval of her boyfriend. Ultimately the young man is violent towards his girlfriend because he believes that he was provoked by her continuing to wear the clothes which he objected to. The young people in the groups were asked whether the boyfriend's reaction was justified and if so, why they believed it was. Many of the young people initially responded to this by stating that violence is never acceptable and that the boyfriend’s reaction is inappropriate. However, the discussion the participants had amongst themselves often led to them excusing the violence, because, they explained, the girlfriend had intentionally provoked her boyfriend. At no point did any of the young people suggest that the boyfriend had no right to tell his girlfriend what to wear and instead the discussions focused on the degrees of the violent response rather than the fact that the boyfriend was controlling his girlfriend (Stark, forthcoming).

Richard [m;g4;17]: She knows that he doesn't like it so she knows that it is going to get on his nerves. Therefore if he hits her, then ok it is not right, but she has provoked him. And if it has been going on for a while then his emotional endurance is just worn right down. Now that guy can either, he has two options: he can either go straight for the door and leave the room; or breaking something material. Depending on how much she has worn him down through annoying him wearing whatever she is wearing, is going to determine the outcome.
In the quotation above, Richard is clear that the young woman did indeed provoke her boyfriend because she knew how much he did not like her wearing these clothes. Thus, again the response reflects a victim blaming attitude towards male violence and a justification of male dominance (Hague and Malos, 1998; Women’s Aid Federation England, 1998, 2003). However, what is interesting is Richard’s refusal to accept gender asymmetry in domestic abuse and his woman blaming perspective on domestic abuse which is significant because Richard was the only male in his group and persistently dominated the discussion. For instance, in his first excerpt in Section 8.1.1 he is clear that all forms of abuse is domestic violence whereby he states that “Anything from verbal to physical constitutes as domestic violence. If you seek to physically or emotionally harm another person in your home then it is domestic violence or domestic abuse”. He then argues that women are violent to men but because of men not wanting to look weak they do not report it (Section 8.1.3). Richard then becomes very animated when he describes the way in which women are more manipulative than men and are manipulative in order to control their male partners (Section 8.1.4.4). However, when he then tries to explain the reasons for domestic violence, when it is physical violence, he reverts to constructing men as the perpetrators and argues that they are violent because “it makes them feel good” (Section 8.1.4.5). However, the most concerning factor about Richard’s analysis is that in the excerpt above Richard does not question the right of the boyfriend to dictate his girlfriend’s clothing and it is only the level of his violent response which is analysed. Furthermore, due to Richard’s dominant position none of the other group participants challenge his statement and ask why Richard does not question the boyfriend’s response.

8.2.4: Summary of Young People’s Responses to Male Interpersonal Violence
The responses in this section suggest that, through the various justifications given for male violence/abuse in individual circumstances, which often blame the victim, there is still a tolerance of male violence. At the start of the discussion about the Zero Tolerance (1998) findings all of the young people argued that violence was never justified and that women should never be made to do things they did not want to do, but, as the discussions progressed, it appeared that the majority of the young people...
did rationalise this violence in specific circumstances or failed to challenge those who did so.

Some of the young people were, however, adamant that violence is never acceptable and for example, named forced sex as rape, regardless of the beliefs of the assailant (see Section 8.2.2). Others suggested that male violence was previously more tolerated because people were less informed, which suggests that the media campaigns and strategies against male violence are, to a certain extent, having an impact (see Section 2.3.1.1, Chapter 2, for a discussion of these measures). However, some of the young people also argued that there are certain circumstances, often related to women/girls questioning or challenging men/boys, in which male violence is justifiable which exemplifies the contradictions in the young people's opinions.

8.3: Conclusion
To conclude, there are certain ambiguities remaining about the views expressed in the data in this chapter, and indeed the previous chapter. It is not always clear whether the young people are giving their opinions or what they perceived other people's opinions to be. The key points to emerge from this chapter are presented below and are briefly discussed.

1. The participants are aware that domestic abuse comprises myriad different abusive behaviours and is not limited to physical violence. They are aware of the campaigns and through these have an understanding of the gendered dimensions of it. Furthermore because of the (feminist informed) campaigns they are aware of the issues of power and control.

2. However, they do not accept the gender asymmetry of domestic abuse.

3. The participants initially argue that there are never any excuses for male violence but then proceed to give various reasons for it. Most of these justifications for male violence/abuse are predicated on placing blame with the woman/girl either as perpetrators of non-violent abuse or for antagonising the male into it.
4. Many of the young people construct women as more ‘manipulative’ and more abusive towards men, which is worse than the alleged abuse of women by men because this abuse is seen to undermine men’s masculinity. This is seen as the worst consequence of the abuse because the participants’ analysis is framed within a male dominance model. They are aware of the language of power and control but invert this to argue that abuse is worse for men because it undermines the power they should have as men which is based on the assumption that women should have less power.

5. The issue of masculinity/femininity and appropriate gender behaviour is mentioned throughout, but because they argue that women are also responsible as perpetrators they cannot conceptualise domestic violence as male violence and thus cannot name gender as centrally important. Thus, whilst they struggle to construct a central monocausal explanation for domestic abuse, the one variable they have confused and contradictory positions on is that of gender power.

6. Whilst the participants discuss the influence of power, because of not naming this abuse as part of a system in which men are vested with the power, this means that they cannot conceptualise power as a hierarchical phenomenon enmeshed in gendered relationships and predicated on a male dominance framework.

7. Women are also blamed for their abuse because they do not meet the requirements expected of them, which feeds into conceptualisations of appropriate gender behaviour based on the male breadwinner/female dependent model.

8. The participants are much more judgemental about women, whether as victims or alleged perpetrators, than men and there appears to be a higher expectation of women and greater sanctions if women transgress appropriate feminine behaviour. In relation to this, the respondents invert many of the positive characteristics associated with women into negative ones.

9. The young people regard the male as ‘norm’ within the heterosexual gender binary framework, and consequently do not challenge male violence, because it is regarded as something that men do. As the ‘norm’ this behaviour is also construed as ‘normal’, which makes it problematic to challenge.
10. In their analyses, often when there is agency for the man (for the violence), the blame is relocated onto the woman. The young people tend not to have a complex critique of men's behaviour but accept it as an inescapable 'norm'. Thus, whilst they look at men's behaviour and are often condemnatory, they also accept it (which is linked to the analysis of men as the 'norm').

One of the features to emerge from this discussion is that, like the responses presented in Chapter 7, the young people locate their conceptualisations within a heterosexual and gender differentiated framework (Frosh et al, 2002). This then impacts on how they conceptualise domestic abuse, as the various discussions are all premised within these parameters.

A positive finding is that the young people are cognisant of the campaigns which emphasise that domestic abuse comprises a range of behaviours but they do not seem to understand the power and control issues expressed in these feminist informed campaigns. They also appeared antagonistic to accepting the gendered dimension of domestic abuse and challenge the gender asymmetry of it (Saunders, 1988; Dobash and Dobash, 1992, 2000; Dobash et al, 1993; Kurz, 1993a; Nazroo, 1999). The respondents argue that it also "happens to men" and that it is worse for men because it undermines their masculinity. Thus, the young people are still referring to gender constructions and appropriate masculine roles, which are formulated on the construction of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1995). The participants considered many variables to explain domestic violence but did not explicitly centralise gender power, even though they found all the other explanations inadequate, because they accept gender differentiation as primary and 'taken-for-granted'. The responses to the Zero Tolerance Trust (1998) findings reflect the analyses of domestic violence whereby initially they argue that violence is never acceptable but then justify it when it is placed in the context of heterosexual interpersonal relationships and the dominant role of the male which indicates a state of uncertainty.

From the data it is unclear whether the socio-economic demographics of the area in which the school was situated, as placed on the SIMD rank, had an influence on the responses which were given. It does, however, seem to be the case that the types of
views about male violence, the gender symmetry of domestic violence and the propensity for women to be perpetrators cut across all these demarcations.

The data in this chapter and Chapter 7 have emphasised the key findings of the empirical work. The next chapter will discuss the implications of these findings in relation to the theoretical framework of this thesis.
Chapter 9
Discussion Chapter

9.0: Introduction
There are four research questions which this study started with and which the empirical research explored:

1. How is masculinity constructed?
2. What are young people's understandings of male violence?
3. Do young men and women accept male violence as part of male gender identity?
4. What is the relationship between masculinity and violence and how is this translated in interpersonal relationships?

This chapter will consolidate the data from Chapters 7 and 8 and discusses how the data addresses the four research questions. However, there are also some general points which can be made. Firstly, it is difficult to ascertain how much the sex composition of each group affected the responses that were given. As was argued in Chapter 6, the research literature suggests that boys will generally dominate group discussions (Hood et al, 1996). In this study, it appeared to be the case that in the groups where there were males in them, there was one male who would dominant the discussion. Where there was only one male he would still dominate but if the girls did challenge the male they did so as a group and not individually. From this limited sample, it appeared that there was a balance of power in favour of the boys, or the dominant male, which could only be challenged by the girls if they did so collectively. In relation to this, when the boys spoke about challenging normative constructions of masculinity it was the boys who appeared to embody this normative or hegemonic form of masculinity, in that they were open about their heterosexuality, were very 'macho' in their appearance and demeanour and were very popular with the other pupils, who were able to do so. This was conveyed through the anecdotes about their school and social life and their general behaviour. Thus, it was only the boys who were clearly heterosexual and embodied, or displayed, hegemonic
masculinity that were able to make comments about men being emotional and caring and suggesting that men were capable of feeling and acting in a way that was oppositional to hegemonic masculinity. Additionally, some of the boys, who defined themselves as outsiders, discussed the ways in which they did not conform to the hegemonic ideal of masculinity and instead had a different masculine identity which contradicted this. However, these boys also explained that in order to be accepted, by other boys, they had to appear to personify the hegemonic form of masculinity even though this meant suppressing their true character.

Secondly, it is also difficult to determine whether the socio-economic composition of the area in which the group was situated influenced the responses the young people gave. The data does indicate however, that the answers crossed these class boundaries and that whilst there were differences in opinion, some of the general points were reflected in all the groups in the various socio-economic locations.

9.1: Research Question 1: How is Masculinity Constructed?
This section will address the first research question in relation to how the young people conceptualise masculinity or male gender behaviour. It has been split into subsections covering gender differences, the male breadwinner/female dependent model, women's equality, hegemonic masculinity and then these are linked to a more theoretical discussion of these issues.

9.1.1: Gender Differences
The young people who took part in the empirical research, perceived men and women to be fundamentally different in a multitude of ways. They argued that women were more emotional, more caring and better at communicating than men, which they linked to biological arguments based on women as nurturers/mothers (O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000). However, as mentioned above, some of the 'macho' boys did argue that men were also capable of having a caring side. They argued that women and men had different jobs, which they linked to social constructions of gender and perceived gender roles and behaviour. They also argued that there were physiological differences (although not necessarily focussing on reproductive
challenges) based on men being physically stronger than women. The necessity of peer group acceptance was emphasised more by the boys than the girls. School work was rejected by many of the boys because it was conceptualised as ‘girls’ work’. Consequently, as girls’ work and hence feminine, it was something that boys had to be seen to be rejecting or else their masculinity would be questioned which would affect their peer group acceptance (Frosh et al, 2002).

Sport was gender segregated with boys and girls participating in different sports, such as netball for girls and football for boys, and this gender segregation was perpetuated by the participants’ schools. When asked to select role models, the role models that the boys and the girls opted for the boys were significantly different, with the boys opting for sportsmen whom they described as ‘tough’ and ‘macho’ and the girls for sportsmen whom they regarded as more family orientated and less ‘macho’. This suggests that the girls and the boys had conflicting views about the aspired qualities of masculinity. Neither the boys or the girls gave much time to discussing role models for girls, although some of the girls selected female role models based on their looks and physical appearance. Both the boys and the girls only selected same sex role models and it appeared to be understood that a role model would have to be the same sex as the person they were selecting it for.

The young people accepted, and based their discussions on, the differences between women and men on a gender segregated model of femininity and masculinity and located women and men as oppositional (Skelton and Hall, 2001). Part of this discussion revolved around perceiving boys and men to be more aggressive than women or girls and this was predicated on biological and social constructionist explanations (Carrigan et al, 1987; Kimmell, 1990). Both of these explanations converged around the understanding that aggressive behaviour was appropriate for men/boys but inappropriate for women/girls because it transgressed normative gender constructions of femininity (Ewing and Schacht, 1998).

A further point that the young people identified was the way in which an attractive appearance was deemed more important to the girls than the boys and both the girls and boys understood that women are judged on appearance (as located within the heterosexual model). Whilst it was argued that women look good (for men) this was
also constructed as problematic because the young people argued that a girl who is
too good-looking can threaten a boyfriend’s ‘ownership’ of her because her status as
his girlfriend may be threatened by other men being attracted to her (Stark,
forthcoming; see Section 8.2.3, Chapter 8). This contradiction is a paradox of
patriarchal heterosexual gender constructions in which women are encouraged to be
attractive (for men) but which is subsequently used as an excuse for men’s
controlling behaviour (see Stark, forthcoming).

9.1.2: Male Breadwinner/Female Dependent Model

The differences between women and men that the participants constructed, or
explained, were predicated on a male dominance/female dependence (heterosexual)
model which significantly influenced their opinions about gender roles and
behaviour (see Section 9.1.1). Part of this discussion focused on men’s breadwinner
(dominant) role and women’s subordinate role, which were often in contradiction to
their discussion of women’s equality and entry into the labour market (see Section
9.1.3). In relation to this male dominance model, the boys (and the girls) did not
explicitly recognise or challenge the power differentials integral to this model
although, paradoxically, it was implicitly understood by the participants, as was
evident through the ensuing discussions, that men/boys are more powerful (in several
ways) than women/girls (see Section 9.3.1).

The radical feminist analysis of gender constructions, applied in this thesis, argues
that gender, as currently socially constructed, reflects patriarchal values which
position men as more powerful than women and which perpetuates the male
that the young people identified, were based on their experiential knowledge and
knowledge of other social spheres, such as the workplace, despite their perceptions
of change here, and were still predicated on a model which reflects normative
(patriarchal) assumptions about women’s and men’s roles such as women being
carers and men being more ‘macho’ (Skelton and Hall, 2001). Thus, arguably, the
young people are working within a patriarchal model of gender constructions on
which to base their analyses.
This male breadwinner model is arguably interconnected to the hegemonic masculinity model because the construction of the hegemonic ideal is predicated on a power binary model in which men are the 'norm' and women are the 'other' (de Beauvoir, 1974 [1949]; Connell, 1995). Additionally, this breadwinner model justifies men's power over women as 'providers', which is an assumption that the young people appeared to endorse.

9.1.3: Women's Equality

The discussion about women's equality was very contradictory. The young people argued that women now have more equality than previously, as evidenced through women's entry into the labour market. This, however, was in contradiction to their earlier discussions about women's jobs in which they argued that women were paid less than men and had lower status jobs, such as cleaners and carers, and this was argued in the context of women's gendered status.

The issue of women's equality was not regarded solely as a positive development for women but was instead constructed as retrogressive and punitive for men. Indeed, it was primarily the girls who argued that women's equality was 'unfair' for men. This rationalisation constructed men as the 'victims' of women's equality both in relation to their direct experiences in the classroom where girls' improved performance in school grades was seen as detrimental to boys (even though they argued that girls worked harder than the boys), and for women's equality in the wider social sphere (Skelton, 1998). Thus, in one respect, women are taking responsibility for men, as the 'other' to which the male 'norm' is perpetuated (see Section 9.3.2) and women's equality can only be understood in relation to the 'traditional' patriarchal relationship.

9.1.4: Hegemonic Masculinity

Both the boys and the girls were cognisant of hegemonic and counter masculinities, although, like the other topics discussed, there was a certain amount of ambiguity over how they constructed, and regarded, masculinities. The boys argued that they were aware that there was a standard of hegemonic masculinity (although they did
not use this precise terminology) and that this was the type of masculine identity they were expected to meet (Connell, 1995). When asked to define this particular type of masculinity the boys and girls repeatedly mentioned two words: 'macho' and 'swagger'. The participants had difficulty in articulating what they meant by 'macho' but explained that macho behaviour was explicitly, and uniquely, masculine behaviour – albeit in a somewhat exaggerated form. The 'swagger' was understood as a visual representation of this 'macho' masculinity and it could not be applied to women or girls. The young people argued that this 'macho' and swaggering behaviour seemed, at times, ridiculous and they regarded some of the boys who adopted this with derision. The boys explained that, nevertheless, this behaviour identified hegemonic masculinity and was thus the type of masculine identity that they should be aspiring to (Connell, 1995). All of the boys argued that their own masculine identities were judged against this hegemonic standard, and that any deviations from this type of masculinity risked censure. As discussed, peer group acceptance was centrally important for the boys, which explains why there was concern over the types of masculinity they developed (Frosh et al, 2002). Some of the boys did explain that they were more comfortable with other forms of masculine identity, which involved being friends with girls, not playing football, and being studious for example, which did not conform to the hegemonic standard, but they were clear that they had to appear not to do these things in order not to be labelled as different or feminine (Epstein, 1997, 1998; Epstein et al, 1998, 2001).

Linked to the formulation of hegemonic masculinity is the (implicit) association of heterosexuality. Whilst this issue was not explicitly discussed in the interviews (see Section 7.1.5, Chapter 7), as was previously argued, there was strong homophobia, which was less related to sexual behaviour and more related to association with the feminine (Nayak and Kehily, 1996). Indeed, the participants in the focus groups, and the literature discussed in Chapter 5, make the connection between the vilification of female related issues and homophobia so that anything seen to be feminine is intrinsically less valued than the masculine equivalent (Nayak and Kehily, 1996).

As mentioned above, the issue of peer group acceptance was of much more importance to the boys than the girls but significantly, and paradoxically, the young people were more concerned with the implications of girls transgressing appropriate
gender behaviour (O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000). Thus, whilst attaining the hegemonic standard of masculinity was centrally important, there was much more discussion about the implications of girls and women transgressing feminine standards as defined by the participants. It appeared that, whilst the boys self-regulated their constructions of masculinity they also regulated what they regarded as appropriate standards of femininity which is arguably because they are vested with the power to do so.

9.1.5: Discussion of Research Question 1

It is clear from the empirical data that the young people frame their analyses of gender constructions within a male dominance model, although their understanding of, and attitude towards, gender power is ambiguous and contradictory. The boys argued that they are aware of the implications of hegemonic, and counter, constructions of masculinity though mainly in the context of personal behaviour and 'lifestyle' issues. As evident from the empirical research and substantiated in the literature, linked to this normative hegemonic masculinity are misogynistic and homophobic ideologies that are integral to this construction (Nayak and Kehily, 1996; Redman, 1996; Flood, 1997).

However, it is also the case that there is some contradiction and ambiguity regarding how the young people conceptualise masculinity and how the young men construct their own masculine identity. Some of the boys explained that they rejected much of what was regarded as hegemonic masculinity and had different ways of being masculine. This involves the boys being friends with girls and liking different types of music, which do not reflect hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1995). However, the boys that did this were also aware that they had to be careful that they countered this behaviour with a masculinity that was more hegemonic in order not to be completely ostracised by other boys which was still very important (O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000). The point about their masculinity being judged was always in relation to how other boys saw them rather than how the girls perceived them.

The particular radical feminist theoretical framework which is applied in this thesis argues that due to the power dynamics embedded in the categories, it is possible to
conceptualise men and women belonging to two distinct sex classes: the sex class of women and the sex class of men (Dworkin, 1974, 1997; Rowland and Klein, 1996). The sex class distinction is not predicated on a biological imperative but, as was argued in Chapter 1, it is the social meaning attached to the two categories, as they presently exist, that facilitates an understanding attached to the two categories, as they presently exist, that facilitates an understanding of the sex class in relation to power relations (Dworkin, 1987; Richardson, 1996; MacKinnon, 2001; Thompson, 2001). Concurrent with this rationalisation is the belief that men reap Connell’s (1995) 'patriarchal dividend' whereby the social structure, as it is constructed within a patriarchal framework, bestows upon men an inherent power privilege (although all men experience this differentially).

This theoretical position works within the gender binary construction and argues that gender constructions are naturalised to the extent that they are normatively accepted and acculturated into every-day life (Rowland and Klein, 1990). The literature on masculinity and young people’s views and experiences of masculinity, is at times, critical, but generally does not challenge the assumptions of men as ‘norm’ and women as ‘other’. Critiques of male gender behaviour, and male violence, often condemn male violence and abuse as problematic but this is based on an examination of ‘masculinity’ (McMahon, 1993). The radical feminist theoretical position which is applied in this thesis argues that it is not enough to suggest that men employ different means for ‘conflict resolution’ but must challenge the fundamental assumption that men are more dominant and that women who challenge their positions deserve censure (Dobash and Dobash, 1979). Thus, when the participants discuss the boyfriend/girlfriend scenario, they debate the boyfriends’ response but they do not argue that the boyfriend should not be dictating what his girlfriend can or cannot do or wear: his power position is left uncontested. The radical feminist analysis is therefore crucial because it challenges the fundamental dichotomies of male and female and their related power status (Ewing and Schacht, 1998). Without this theoretical position any analysis of behaviour resultant from these gender constructions (e.g. violence) will only by superficial (Lundgren, 1995). It is not about managing abuse or violence, instead it is about eradicating the understanding that men (and their wants) should be prioritised because it is this basis that facilitates the justification of men’s behaviour irrespective of how this is then manifest (Itzin, 2000).
9.2: Research Question 2: What are Young Peoples' Understandings of Male Violence?
This question was addressed through the young people’s discussions about domestic violence and male violence in general. As can be seen from below and from the data in Chapter 8, despite their rejection of domestic violence the young people had an expectation and acceptance of male violence, and an acceptance of it in certain contexts, when it was located within interpersonal heterosexual relationships. This view was held in relation to all heterosexual couples, regardless of marital status or age.

9.2.1: Knowledge of Domestic Abuse
The young people had a comprehensive awareness of different types of domestic violence, which they understood to encompass a range of abusive behaviours, not strictly limited to physical violence. The Glasgow City Council/Scottish Executive campaigns are feminist informed and argue that domestic abuse is a male abuse of power, which the young people initially appeared to accept (see Section 2.3.1.1 Chapter 2). However, there was a contradiction in how the participants defined domestic abuse and what they actually understood it to be. Initially they discussed the range of behaviours constituting domestic abuse but in the latter parts of the interviews, during the discussions, there was a tendency to frame it strictly as physical violence (unless they were referring to women as perpetrators) and many of them fundamentally rejected the substantiating evidence of the gender asymmetry of domestic abuse (Saunders, 1988; Dobash and Dobash, 1992, 2000; Dobash et al, 1993; Kurz, 1993a; Nazroo, 1999; see also Section 8.1.2, Chapter 8).

Many of the participants repeatedly emphasised that, whilst the literature and campaigns state that predominantly men are the perpetrators and women the victims of domestic abuse, they ‘knew’ that women are equally (if not more) responsible, and that men are also victims. Two points emerge from this: firstly, when the young people discussed domestic abuse they referred to physical violence but when they constructed women as the perpetrators they spoke about a range of abusive behaviours, and furthermore, argued that these other forms of abuse were worse than physical violence. The second point is that this alleged abuse of men was
constructed by the young people as worse than abuse of women because it undermined men’s masculinity and, hence, power status. This discussion therefore identified that the participants regarded men as inherently and necessarily (as a group), more powerful than women and that their abuse was worse than abuse against women because it was a challenge to men’s status.

It can thus be deduced that the young people have not accepted that aspect of the feminist informed campaigns about domestic abuse, which categorically state the gender asymmetry of domestic abuse and the power and control analysis which is intrinsic to the feminist critique (Saunders, 1988; Dobash and Dobash, 1992, 2000; Dobash et al, 1993; Kurz, 1993a; Stark, forthcoming).

9.2.2: Discussion of Research Question 2

The central form of male violence that was investigated in this research project was domestic violence although it was argued that it is more helpful to contextualise domestic violence as part of the continuum of male violence (Kelly, 1998a). One of the factors that differentiates domestic abuse from other forms of male violence is that the perpetrator and victim are in, or were in, an intimate relationship with each other (Hague and Malos, 1998). Whilst rape victims may be raped by their partners or someone they know, and children who are sexually abused are often abused by someone they know, the definition of domestic violence/abuse is predicated on the victim and abuser being in a relationship (or previously in a relationship) with each other, whatever the form of violence they have experienced (Hague and Malos, 1998).

Chapter 3 explained that different theoretical positions locate the ‘reasons’ for domestic violence in myriad bases. Briefly, individualistic models often pathologise men, which is inadequate at accounting for the number of perpetrators and can be woman blaming (Stordeur and Stille, 1989). Sociological analyses are multifactorial and often centralise structural (external) factors such as stress, unemployment, interpersonal power arrangements, or drug and drink dependency, for example (Gelles, 1983, 1987, 1993, 1997; Straus et al, 1980). These different sociological accounts are also insufficient because, primarily, they fail to recognise the gendered
nature of domestic violence (Dobash and Dobash, 1979, 1994). The Family Violence approach, for example, does recognise gender in its analysis but sees gender as only one variable amongst others, rather than give it primary importance, as in the feminist analysis (Gelles, 1983, 1993). In contrast, the feminist analysis recognises that there may be contributory issues such as individual psychological problems or external factors, but argues that the main element of analysis in domestic violence must be gender, and that domestic violence must be understood as an exercise in exerting power and control (Bograd, 1988; Kurz, 1993b; Hague and Malos, 1998).

The radical feminist analysis of domestic violence applied in this thesis argues that domestic violence has commonalities with other forms of male violence and abuse and that there are individual, social and political effects of domestic violence: through the violence/abuse individual men exert power and control over individual women and, structurally, women as a class are kept subordinate to men as a class (Dworkin, 1987, 1997; Yllo, 1993; MacKinnon, 2001). Integral to this analysis is an understanding of 'masculinity' and male gender behaviour and the way in which dominance is part of normative masculinity and male violence an expression of it (Hearn, 1998b; 2001).

As argued, the majority of the young people are cognisant of the awareness-raising literature on male violence but question the gender asymmetry of domestic abuse and argue that women are equally culpable as perpetrators if the wider definition of domestic violence is accepted. The analysis of domestic violence as 'ungendered' is reflected in a considerable amount of the literature on domestic abuse, which often minimises the gender dynamics of domestic abuse or, where there is an acknowledgement of men as perpetrators, other external or psychosocial reasons are given as explanations (Gelles, 1983, 1987, 1993, 1997; Straus et al, 1980; Stordeur and Stille, 1989). The feminist analysis is the only analysis which recognises the centrality of gender to domestic abuse (Bograd, 1988; Kurz, 1993b; Hague and Malos, 1998). Even though this analysis informs some of the literature which the young people are exposed to, they choose to discard certain aspects of it such as recognising male violence as a manifestation of male power, and this leads to the contradictions in their analyses.
9.3: Research Question 3: Do Young Men and Women Accept Male Violence as Part of Male Gender Identity?

It appears to be the case that young people do indeed accept male violence as part of male gender identity. This is argued through two main points: firstly, the young people accept and do not overtly challenge men's power and their dominant status. Secondly, and in relation to this point, they accept men as the norm and as the norm they cannot challenge male behaviour. This is not to suggest that they accept male or female violence, which they do denounce as wrong, but they accept justifications for men's violence. Their analysis is based on the fact that if men are challenged and hence their power positions are challenged then it is excusable to react accordingly, even if this is through violence or abuse.

9.3.1: Power

The issue of power was tremendously contradictory because, based on the framework of the male dominance model, both the boys and the girls implicitly understood that men are more powerful than women but did not explicitly state this. It can be argued that the participants were aware of women's subordinate status through their discussion of the male breadwinner/female dependent model and through their direct experiences such as the girls' failed attempts to play football in their schools or in the school work example where the girls' argued that they were getting better grades than the boys which was unfair for the boys and which was drawing on the 'crisis in boys' underachievement' debate (Skelton, 1998). Thus, the girls on an experiential and theoretical level, were cognisant of their subordinate status in relation to the boys but neither the boys nor the girls explicitly challenged boys' and men's greater power.

As argued throughout this thesis, hegemonic masculinity, as a social construction, cannot be understood without recognising the power elements embedded in it (Brittan, 1989). What it is to be a man and a woman are socially constructed within a framework that endorses and reflects patriarchal ideology, so that masculinity, and male behaviour, are predicated on maintaining male dominance (Hearn, 1987, 1999, 2001). The participants implicitly appeared to conceptualise power and superior status as intrinsic to masculinity, but in the initial discussion when describing the
differences between women and men, the issue of power and status was not explicitly analysed, although it was implicit in many of the discussions, such as in relation to men's careers (see Section 7.1.4, Chapter 7) or through constructing men as victims of domestic violence (see Sections 8.1.2 and 8.1.3, Chapter 8).

This may be resultant from confusion over the definitions and understanding of power because at some points it appears that the young people are referring to power and status as individual strength but at other times power is understood as structural power. Thus, the girls' refer to their behaviour in terms of their limited access to structural power and to their lesser physical power in relation to the boys. Both these analyses and understandings of power are important to the young people's discussions of domestic violence because, in relation to structural power, this may be why they construct male violence as understandable and excusable. In this analysis they legitimise men's abuse of women who, according to them, transgress their respective submissive role as women, in deference to the male dominance role, and thus challenge men's structural power. In relation to physical power, this may explain why some of the young people argue that women are more manipulative than men because they are arguing that women cannot match men's physical strength and power and thus have to utilise other methods to exert power.

9.3.2: Men as the 'Norm'

It is suggested that, due to the male dominance model which the young people had largely internalised as their theoretical framework, the responses tended to situate men as the 'norm' against which women were regarded as the 'other' (de Beauvoir, 1974 [1949]). Whilst there was discussion about the various forms of masculinities, when women were discussed it was almost always in relation to men as the 'norm' and hence they assumed a masculine homogeneity (Connell, 1995). Thus, men and women were conceptualised as two discrete categories with men the point of reference for both other men and women.

Linked to the issue of men and masculinity as the 'norm' is the issue of power: because men are seen as the 'norm' it is easier to understand why the young people do not challenge the inherent power vested in men. If something is the 'norm' it is
neutralised and naturalised and thus male power becomes almost inevitable and is therefore not problematised. It is suggested that the young people do this because, by positioning men as the 'norm', they cannot challenge men's power precisely because it is normalised. Therefore, women's status is challenged because women are the 'other' to the 'norm' which means women have a changing status (not fixed) which can be analysed. Thus, they accept the construction of men as the 'norm' and women as the 'other' and it is only when they examine men in isolation that they are critical which suggests that they need the feminine in order to justify masculine behaviour. As previously argued, in order to understand masculinity it is essential to focus on femininity because both are inherently relational concepts; they derive their meaning from each other and are inextricably linked (Brittan, 1989). The meanings attached to each are socially constructed and are embedded in patriarchal (male domination) ideology (Héster, 1992). Patriarchal interpretations thus construct masculinity as the 'norm' against which femininity derives its meaning as the 'other' (de Beauvoir, 1974 [1949]; see Chapters 1 and 5).

9.3.3: Discussion of Research Question 3

Central to the radical feminist analysis of male violence used in this thesis is that it is globally endemic and affects most women and men (Stanko, 1985; Kelly, 1988a; Kelly and Radford, 1996). It affects most women because women can never predict when male violence will occur, and hence they have to restrict their behaviour accordingly, and it benefits most men because it contributes towards the continuance of the system of male dominance known as patriarchy (Kelly, 1988a; Rowland and Klein, 1990; MacKinnon, 1996; Richardson, 1996; Thompson, 2001). Feminists were among the first to 'name' women's experiences of sexual violence, specifically as violence by men against women, and centralised the woman's interpretation of the violence as the key component in defining the experience which often was in contrast to the legal definition, for example (Kelly, 1988a; Williamson, 2000). This focus on women's definitions led feminists to reconceptualise some normalised male behaviour as sexual violence (i.e. sexual harassment). Kelly (1988a) argued that it was more useful for women to place their experiences of male violence within a continuum of behaviours rather than to compartmentalise their experiences into limited definitions and thus developed the 'continuum of violence' analysis (Kelly,
1988a; see Section 2.2, Chapter 2). In this feminist analysis, patriarchy is both an ideology, which supports the belief that men are the 'norm' against which women are 'other', and it is institutional, with social structural support. The relationship between patriarchy and male violence is mutually supportive because patriarchy tends to justify and minimise male violence, which contributes to its perpetuation, and male violence helps maintain patriarchy (Kelly, 1988a; Rowland and Klein, 1990; MacKinnon, 1996; Richardson, 1996; Thompson, 2001).

Clearly, the participants accept male violence, where it is acknowledged, as constitutive of male gender behaviour. Violence and abuse are problematised more when it is women who are the perpetrators. This is arguably predicated on their understanding of men as dominant because some of them argue that it is almost legitimate for men to be violent or abusive towards their female partners if the female is not meeting the appropriate feminine (submissive) standard. Indeed, the young people conceptualise the man as the final arbiters in the relationship and thus if there is not acquiescence to his wishes then his responsive behaviour is understandable, even if it is violent. Many of the young people do appear to accept male violence as part of male gender identity because they appear to accept the dominant position of men and the submissive position of women, as their framework for understanding gender behaviour. Thus, if they accept the men as 'norm' and men as dominant then their framework would imply that they accept male violence as a legitimate expression of masculinity. It is problematic to discern whether young people see the levels of male violence and then argue that it is constitutive of male gender behaviour, or whether they know the arguments which legitimate male violence as male gender behaviour. However with regard to domestic violence, the young people appear to accept that men should be more powerful (structurally) which means that they are legitimated in the violence if it is precipitated by women challenging this power relation. Thus, the position develops that young people accept the excuses and rationales for male violence and abuse if they are framed as a response to the man's power position being challenged. This means that women are not only less powerful in relation to men but that any behaviour which the man does not like can be construed as a challenge to his authority, which in this analysis can be rebuffed with violence or abuse. However, a certain caveat must be inserted at this juncture because, as was discussed in the previous two chapters, at times it was
impossible to establish if the young people were giving their own opinion; giving the opinion of others – as they perceived it; or giving their own opinion which was presented as the opinion of others. Thus, it may well be the case that the young people were in fact describing views of others as they interpreted them. Arguably, however, most of the time the young people did give their own views or gave an opinion of 'others' which did actually reflect their own opinion. This is argued because where they presented a view which they did not agree with they categorically stated that they did not agree with it and distanced themselves from it.

It would appear that by accepting the male dominance model, the young people are left in a position in which they have to accept male violence and abuse as constitutive of male gender behaviour even though they may be critical of some of its manifestations. This contention is substantiated through the literature which argues that young people have an exceptionally high tolerance of male violence and offer legitimations (often women blaming) for why men and boys are abusive to their female partners (Wolfe et al, 1997; Burton et al, 1998; Dublin Women's Aid, 1999; Mullender et al, 2002).

9.4: Research Question 4: What is the Relationship Between Masculinity and Violence and How is this Translated in Interpersonal Relationships?

From research question three it is apparent that young people generally accept male violence as a constituent of hegemonic masculinity. Such is the acculturation of violence into normative masculine behaviour, at least within the context of heterosexual interpersonal relationships, that it therefore presents some extremely concerning consequences because it appears that the young people almost have an expectation of male violence to which they are unable to mount a coherent challenge.

9.4.1: Men as the 'Norm': Violence as the 'Norm'

As discussed above, young people regard men as the 'norm' and thus, what men do, i.e. male behaviour, is also regarded as normative. This partly explains why young people do not challenge male violence (domestic abuse) because it requires challenging normative behaviour. What is regarded as more 'normal' is deemed more acceptable and, because men are the 'norm', their behaviour is therefore more
justified. In this analysis, the young people constructed women as the perpetrators of domestic abuse because it fits into their analysis to challenge women’s behaviour because they have constructed it as the ‘other’ and therefore more open to critique.

This means that the participants cannot adequately challenge male gender behaviour, even when it is violence, because it does not fit into their framework to challenge the ‘norm’. Hence, male violence is regarded as a constituent of male gender identity and as relatively inescapable. Many of the young people accept male violence as constitutive of male gender identity, or masculinity, but they cannot problematise it precisely because of the way in which they have constructed their analyses of normative masculinity (Hearn, 1998a).

9.4.2: Relocating ‘Blame’ onto Women

Related to the point above, are a number of issues, which emerge primarily in relation to the ways in which the participants relocated the blame for domestic abuse away from the male perpetrators and onto women. This part of the discussion was full of contradictions because initially all of the young people argued that violence was never acceptable. However, when they constructed scenarios, and were presented with the scenario involving the teenage (heterosexual) couple (see Section 8.2.3, Chapter 8), most of the young people constructed justifications for the violence of men and boys towards their female partners. Significantly, almost all of these justifications were predicated on placing culpability with the female victim.

In the discussions, almost every time there was agency for the male with respect to violence/abuse, the participants refocused the responsibility for it on to the girl/woman. Indeed, the young people were so determined to place culpability with women that, even when they recognised power and control in domestic abuse, they argued that women “give control” to the male partner through the abuse rather than argue that he exerts control over her, through the abuse (see Section 8.2.3, Chapter 8). Furthermore, some of the young people suggested that some men have no option but to use violence against their partner because she does not meet the standards of femininity and compliance, which are required in the male dominance model (see Sections 9.1.1 and 9.1.2; Head 1999; Visser, 2002).
Chapter 9

9.4.3: Gender Constructions and Domestic Violence
The participants spent considerable time trying to locate a moncausal explanation for domestic abuse (see Section 8.1.4, Chapter 8). Even though the first part of the discussion was about gender identity, and primarily male gender identity, the young people did not see gender constructions as a contributory factor in domestic abuse. The young people did not examine masculinity in relation to their conceptualisation of the male dominance model as significant to domestic abuse. It is therefore suggested that the participants argued that domestic abuse is symmetrical in order that both women and men are regarded as perpetrators, which circumvents any analysis of male gender behaviour which reflects the individualistic and sociological explanations of domestic violence as discussed previously (Gelles, 1983, 1987, 1993, 1997; Straus et al, 1980; Stordeur and Stille, 1989). Also, because they do not focus on gender as the explanatory framework for domestic abuse, it explains why they search for external 'reasons' for male violence/abuse.

The participants did not discuss the power dimension of masculinity even though many of them argued that women's alleged violence is worse because, in effect, the women are challenging male behaviour, which is a challenge to male power. If men are the norm, and gender constructions are naturalised, and male violence is regarded as constitutive of masculinity, then this partly explains why the young people often relocate the blame for men's violence onto women. This explains why the girls take responsibility, and place it with women, for boys'/men's behaviour, and for boys'/men's abuse and violence. Thus, because they reject the gender asymmetry of domestic abuse and argue that women and men are both perpetrators, they cannot conceptualise domestic abuse as male violence and they are therefore prevented from identifying gender constructions as centrally problematic (Saunders, 1988; Dobash and Dobash, 1992, 2000; Dobash et al, 1993; Kurz, 1993a; Stark, forthcoming).

The contradiction remains that, even though the participants do not explicitly name power or gender constructions as fundamental to domestic abuse, many of the young people argued that women's abuse of men is worse than men's violence towards women because, in this analysis, they implicitly suggest that the women are challenging and undermining men's positions of power and dominance, as related to the male dominance model of gender constructions. The young people were, in an
unacknowledged way, introducing power and gender into their analysis but because of their analysis of gender constructions they do not, or cannot, explicitly identify that power is differentially vested with men. Thus, gender constructions are almost constructed as ‘different but equal’, but at other times in the groups, there was clearly an acknowledgement of women’s less powerful status.

9.4.4: Discussion of Research Question 4

Whilst the four research questions, defined above, centrally focused on masculinity, and whilst it is understood and argued that masculinity is a relational concept, defined, in part, by reference to femininity, many of the young people in the focus groups consistently scrutinised women and women’s behaviour. As argued above, one interpretation is that they did so because it was conceptually problematic to focus on masculinity because men are regarded as the ‘norm’ and it is more difficult to problematise people or behaviour that is regarded as the standard. This is a key point because, in the discussions, the young people often argued that men and boys are justified, in the last analysis, in abusing women and girls if they do not act appropriately deferentially. Thus, conceptualising gender relations on the male dominance model engenders a situation in which the young people regard men as the final arbiter and thus, in any situation of conflict the man’s/boy’s decision is final. Consequently, on an experiential level, if this decision is challenged then he has justification to use violence against the woman/girl who contests his decision.

The focus on women is problematic for three further, interrelated, reasons: firstly, the focus on women relocates responsibility for men’s abusive behaviour away from men and onto women; secondly, the young people construct women as perpetrators, and men as victims; and thirdly, all the characteristics associated with women are maligned (for instance the avoidance of violence by women is inverted by the young people into women being manipulative). This is critical because, just as the young people tend to invert the woman’s behaviour to be obstructive, the young people also tend to invert the reasons for men’s abusive behaviour to be defensible. For example, the young people argue that the man’s controlling behaviour of his partner is due to his ‘insecurity’. Thus, the violence and abuse are simultaneously denied and justified. Therefore, by focusing on women, and men’s alleged victim status,
this is instructing girls 'that: women are criticised for succeeding and hence encroaching on male territory; that women are responsible for boys'/men's behaviour thus, it is up to women to ensure that boys/men do not suffer, and do not become physically violent; and that women are blamed for men's violence/abuse which removes culpability from men. It is evident that the young people are grappling with the inequity of the relationship between the masculine and the feminine, although their views are ambiguous and contradictory which is also a consequence of the ambiguities perpetrated by the social institutions which are forming their opinions such as the schools, the family and the media (Pringle and Raynor, 2001; Aveling, 2002).

This has implications for interventions in male violence and how theoretical analyses conceptualise male violence. Furthermore, this also has implications for young people, with regard to the relationships they will have as adults (Kelly et al, 1991; Kenway and Fitzclarence, 1997; Burton and Kitzinger, 1998; Holland et al 1998; Dublin Women's Aid, 1999; Mullender et al, 2002). As has been evidenced through the interviews, girls are already made to feel responsible for men/boys i.e. through their schoolwork and girls feeling 'guilty' gaining better grades than the boys. They clearly have an awareness of the relational notion of power between the masculine and the feminine but do not have, or are not encouraged to have, the skills to critique these contradictions. In general, the young people were more judgemental about women and girls and their behaviour, even though the discussions suggested that peer group acceptance was particularly important for boys and that the constructions of masculinity were fraught with pressures. This suggests that perhaps the focus should also be on how girls construct their feminine identities as much as how young men develop theirs. Indeed, if the girls had any difficulties in constructing their gender identities, it was not mentioned in the groups, even though throughout most of the discussion, it was women's behaviours that were problematised, and blamed, rather than men's. Evidently, the girls were not entirely uncritical of the boys' masculine behaviour, particularly the 'macho' posturing and swaggering. However, it could be argued that like the feminist analysis of male violence which argues that it is only the more extreme forms of male violence which are challenged (Hague and Malos, 1998), the girls appear to critique only the more extreme forms of hegemonic masculinity.
However, it is certainly the case that the young people are challenging masculine constructions and the boys are trying to negotiate alternative ways of 'being masculine'. This was certainly the case for the males who spoke of consciously acting differently to the males who displayed more traditional hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1995). In this respect, it is a positive move towards reconstructing a masculine identity that is less 'macho' but whilst it could be argued that superficial changes may be possible and are being enacted it also remains that the fundamental power of men and boys is not adequately challenged (Lundgren, 1995). This is argued because in the boyfriend/girlfriend scenario none of the young people challenged the boyfriends right to tell his girlfriend what to wear and thus his power position as the dominant partner remained unchallenged. Similarly, whilst the young people initially argued that violence was never right, they constructed situations in which the male violence was excused because the female partner had forced him into it because she was “wind[ing] him up” for example.

9.5: Conclusion

This chapter has brought together the empirical findings and the literature and has discussed these in relation to the theoretical framework of this thesis. It has discussed the central empirical findings in relation to the four research questions which guided this research project.

A key point, argued throughout this thesis, is that ultimately male violence, and how women are perceived as victims, is inextricably linked to gender constructions. Within a patriarchal framework, men are more powerful, and men are regarded as the ‘norm’. It is argued throughout this thesis that male violence and abuse are ubiquitous, are socially constructed, and that it is a constitutive of normative hegemonic masculinity: this is substantiated through the literature and the empirical findings. Therefore, if men are the ‘norm’ and male violence an intrinsic part of this then male violence is also normalised, and in society, normalised behaviour is more difficult to challenge. Therefore any analysis of male violence has to begin with, and retain, a focus on gender constructions and the central role that gender plays in male violence.
10.0: Conclusion

This thesis has argued that male violence is a significant social problem on a local, national and global scale, and is slowly beginning to be recognised as such (Dobash and Dobash, 2000). This recognition of the problem of male violence is due, primarily, to feminist activism and theorising which refused to let this problem become ignored or subsumed under other issues. Indeed, twenty-one years ago the Dobashes wrote the following extract in which they encapsulated the nature of the problem of domestic violence and clearly implicated patriarchy, or male domination, as fundamental to it:

The struggle against wife beating must be oriented both to the immediate needs of women now suffering from violence and to more fundamental changes in the position of women. We now stand at a point where we may either work toward removing the very roots of wife beating by eliminating patriarchal domination or we may work only toward limited reforms which, while providing vital assistance to women currently being beaten, will do little about the problem itself. We must take up the challenge and address the issue in its fullest form, otherwise we will commit the errors of the past. The problem lies in the domination of women. The answer lies in the struggle against it. (Dobash and Dobash, 1979: 242-3)

Some radical feminists regard male violence as the central element that maintains patriarchy, women’s subjugations and current sex differentials. The radical feminist perspective utilised in this thesis argues that the system of male domination, or patriarchy, centrally locates power with men, over women, although not all men are powerful or all women powerless. This socially constructed duality of masculine and feminine is central to the existence and perpetuation of male sexual violence. Whether the analysis presented in this thesis is accepted or rejected, it remains that for many women ‘our lives are at best constrained and at worst seriously damaged by violence and fear of violence’ (Bart and Moran, 1993a: xvi).

Itzin (2000) argues that, before any effective measures are implemented to eliminate domestic violence, there has to be a recognition that domestic violence, as substantiated by empirical evidence, is something that ‘normal, ordinary men do
routinely on a very substantial scale because they want to, because they think they have a right to, and because nothing effective is done to stop them' (Itzin, 2000: 378). This is precisely the analysis that the young people had. The implications of this are exceptionally concerning because if this behaviour is regarded as part of normative masculinity then it becomes extremely problematic to challenge it. If the young people naturalise behaviour and operate within a male domination model of gender and gender relations then it means that they cannot accept that male violence is about power and control, is socially constructed, and serves to maintain power differentials.

It has been argued that the central problem in domestic violence, and indeed all male violence against women (and children), is the issue of gender constructions and the power associated with male gender behaviour or masculinity. Gender constructions, as illustrated through the voices of the young people in the interviews, are still enmeshed in male dominance models, as supported by patriarchal ideology, and as such men and masculinity are still the 'norm'. Due to their normative status it is difficult to problematise their behaviour because: it is the 'norm' and hence not wrong; it is behaviour perpetrated by the powerful group and hence difficult for the disempowered to challenge; and it is supported by patriarchy, or the system of male dominance, on both an ideological and a structural level. It remains, therefore, that effective strategies can only be implemented if gender constructions are challenged. This also involves recognition that all male violence or abuse of power is interconnected because, structurally, it works towards maintaining the power binary between women and men. Consequently, all interventions should be more holistic and analyse not just domestic violence but heterosexuality, sexuality, interpersonal relations, all male violence against women and children, and gender constructions as part of the analysis, particularly when the intervention is targeted at young people who are forming their own gendered identities. However, in reality this is problematic because, for instance, in relation to this study and as discussed in Chapter 7, some of the schools stipulated that 'sex' could not be discussed in the groups, and as argued above, sexuality is integral to interpersonal relations and domestic violence. Therefore it may only be surface issues that are permitted to be discussed in institutional settings and the fundamental issues such as the power relations upon which domestic abuse are predicated cannot be analysed (Lundgren, 234).
The radical feminist analysis in this thesis has argued that gender is a social construction and, thus, gender behaviour is also constructed. If this is accepted, then there is no reason why these constructions cannot be challenged and for new models of masculinity and femininity and related behaviour to be developed.

Some of the more recent domestic violence interventions, and particularly the (feminist informed) Glasgow City Council/Scottish Executive strategies emphasise issues of power, control and masculinity, but they do not adequately address the underlying problematic of the construction of normative masculinity. Similarly, in England and Wales the Safety and Justice: the Governments Proposal on Domestic Violence 2003 white paper (Home Office, 2003b) which is a development of the 2002 Justice for All white paper (Home Office, 2002) is a welcomed move towards recognising domestic violence in a more holistic manner. For instance, in this document the government has three strategies for approaching domestic violence, which are prevention, protection and justice, and support (Home Office, 2003b). Furthermore, as a consequence of this, the Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Bill, went before the House of Lords on 1st December 2003 and introduces more criminal justice initiatives for dealing with domestic violence (2003c). However, arguably, whilst these measures are much needed it still remains that the fundamental causes for the existence of domestic violence are left unchallenged – such as the current constructions of normative hegemonic masculinity.

The young people in this research showed an awareness and understanding of the feminist campaigns in Glasgow, but they still refused to accept the gender power dimensions of male violence/abuse and argued that, despite all evidence to the contrary, domestic abuse is symmetrical and women are also to blame. Thus, gender, and gender relations, as currently constructed within the patriarchal framework, have to be challenged as fundamental to domestic abuse because until this is done, violence will remain part of normative masculinity. The particular radical feminist analysis of gender applied in this study, firmly locates gender constructions, masculinity and femininity, as socially constructed, and thus as capable for change. Given this analysis, part of any intervention strategy with young people must stress:
that women are not responsible for male violence;
that the abstract concept of 'masculinity' is not responsible for male violence;
that external individual structural factors are not responsible for male violence;
that individual psychopathologies cannot be responsible for all male violence; and,
that the ideologies of schools often do not challenge gender roles or power imbalances and thus may conflict with any intervention which does challenge patriarchal assumptions and values.

It must, therefore, be acknowledged that male violence, in whatever manifestation, is the responsibility of men and that current social constructions of gender, as supported by patriarchy, legitimate male violence as a constituent of normative masculinity. For intervention purposes, if men are not held accountable, and an abstract notion of 'masculinity' is regarded as the 'problem', then it is impossible to institute effective intervention strategies because it is the behaviour of men which needs to be challenged, rather than the ideological construction of 'masculinity'.

Ultimately, this thesis would argue that interventions will never be effective until gender power is fully addressed, challenged and recognised as the site upon which gendered behaviours are developed and power differentials predicated. Thus, intervention strategies will never be fully effective until they centralise power and challenge gender constructions.
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## Appendix I: Biographical Details of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Religion of School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Fiona</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Rubina</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Asian-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>non-denominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Leigh</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Nicola</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Pauline</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Bart</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Fozia</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Asian-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Amar</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Asian-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>non-denominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Shona</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Tracey</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m;g;1:15</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: Biographical Details of Respondents, continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Religion of School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[f,g8;15]</td>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f,g8;15]</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g8;15]</td>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g8;15]</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g8;15]</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f,g9;16]</td>
<td>Caitlin</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f,g9;16]</td>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f,g9;16]</td>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g9;16]</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g9;16]</td>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g9;16]</td>
<td>Dylan</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f,g10;16]</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f,g10;16]</td>
<td>Gabby</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f,g10;15]</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f,g10;15]</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f,g10;16]</td>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f,g10;15]</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f,g10;15]</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g11;16]</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g11;15]</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g11;16]</td>
<td>Daryl</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g11;16]</td>
<td>Ewan</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g11;16]</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g11;16]</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g11;16]</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g12;16]</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g12;16]</td>
<td>Choi</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Chinese-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g12;17]</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g12;17]</td>
<td>Zahid</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Asian-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g12;17]</td>
<td>Nassar</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Asian-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m,g12;16]</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f,g13;17]</td>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f,g13;16]</td>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f,g13;17]</td>
<td>Shazia</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Asian-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f,g13;16]</td>
<td>Assia</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Asian-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f,g13;16]</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>white-Scottish</td>
<td>nondenominational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**What is the Aim of This Research?**

- This study is concerned with the levels of violence in our society and in particular violence between people who know each other: the most common of which is by men towards women. This research is trying to find out what young people think about these issues and in particular what they think about gender - masculinity and femininity; interpersonal relationships - interaction between people who know each other; and the role of violence - especially by men towards women.

**What is the Point of this Research?**

- The research aims to investigate the following points:
  - Is it still true that the majority of young people find male violence towards women acceptable in certain circumstances? (ZT, 1998)
  - If so, why do they think this?
  - What do they think causes male violence?
  - Is ‘masculinity’ responsible?
  - What is ‘masculinity’?
  - Or, are men and women individually responsible?

**Who Am I Looking For?**

- Anyone aged between 15 and 19 and who is in 4th, 5th or 6th year can participate. I am looking for EVERYONE’s opinion. That means that what you think and say is valuable and your opinion is extremely important for this research project.

**How Will This Be Done?**

- Group interviews will be conducted with no more than six people in each group. These will be either single or mixed sex depending on the number of volunteers. Each volunteer will participate in one group which will last no longer than one hour. All of this is completely voluntary, confidential and anonymous.

**How Do I Get Involved?**

- First your parent/guardian has to agree to your participation and secondly YOU have to sign a consent form. There are two consent forms attached to this information sheet.

**Key Aspect**

- Too often we assume what young people want or think. Young people are the key respondents in this research and they will be consulted directly to find out their own views and opinions.

**What Will Happen to the Results?**

- The results will be used in my Ph.D. thesis. As a member of the Policy Studies department these results will hopefully be used to influence current social policy so that levels of violence will be tackled and reduced - effectively. Your opinion can make a difference. Please remember, real names will NEVER be used.

---

Melanie McCurry  
School for Policy Studies  
University of Bristol  
8 Priory Rd, Bristol, BS8 1TZ  
Tel: 0117 954 6983  
Email: M.J.McCarr@bristol.ac.uk
Young People Research
Parent/Guardian Consent Form

Before reading this form please ensure that you have read over the attached Information Sheet.

Mr Kenneth Corsar, Director of Education Services, Glasgow City Council has approved this research project and has granted permission for it to be conducted in schools within the Glasgow area.

If you are happy for your child to be involved in the research project then please do NOT fill in the form. If however you do NOT want them to participate then please sign the tear off slip and ensure that it is handed back to the teacher responsible at your child's school. If you have more than one child, who has been asked to participate, then please fill in a form for each child. No response will be interpreted as permission for your child to participate.

I __________________ do NOT want my child __________________

To participate in the young people research project.

(please write your name and your child's name on the lines)

Sign __________________
Date __________________
Appendix III: Example of Consent Form – for Glasgow City Council

Young People Research
Participant Consent Form

Before reading this form please ensure that you have read over the attached Information Sheet and have understood all the information contained in it.

Mr Kenneth Corsar, Director of Education Services, Glasgow City Council has approved this research project and has granted permission for it to be conducted in schools within the Glasgow area. And your own school has also agreed. If your parent/guardian has refused permission then you cannot participate. If they have given permission and you would like to participate then please fill in the attached tear off slip.

-------------------------------------------------------------------

I __________________________(write name)
AGE____________________
AGREE to participate in the young people research project.
I fully understand that the research is anonymous and confidential.
I understand that I can withdraw from the research AT ANY STAGE and I do not need an excuse to do so.

Sign_______________________
Date_______________________
Appendix IV: Resource List

Women's Support Project
31 Stockwell St
Glasgow G1 4RZ
Tel: 0141 552 2221
Minicom/Qwerty: 0141 552 9979
Fax: 0141 552 1876
Email: info@wsproject.demon.co.uk
Hours: 10am - 5.00pm Mon- Fri
Aims: Raise awareness about violence against women and children.
Service: Support and information for women, families and friends. Library and information service and training material.

Breakthrough for Women
30 Bell St
Glasgow G1
Tel: 0141 552 5483
Minicom/Qwerty: 0141 553 0821
Fax: 0141 552 7982
Hours: 8.45am - 4.45pm Mon- Thurs, 8.45am - 3.55 pm Fri
Aims: Provides counselling and support for women who have experienced sexual abuse.
Service: Counselling for all women who may have experienced abuse as children or adults.

SAY Women
11 South Vesalius St
Glasgow G32 7XP
Tel & Textphone: 0141 778 4777
Fax: 0141 778 5333
Hours: 10am - 4.00pm Mon- Fri
Aims: Provides safe and secure accommodation for young women aged 16-25 years who are survivors of sexual abuse, rape or sexual assault.
Service: Provides accommodation, support, information and advice.

Glasgow Women's Aid
30 Bell St
Glasgow G1 1L
Tel: 0141 553 2022
Fax: 0141 553 0592
Hours: Drop-in 9.30am - 1.00pm Mon-Fri
Phone line 9.30 - 4.30 pm Mon - Fri
Aims: Offers support, information and temporary accommodation for women.
Service: Services are free and confidential. Information on housing, children's rights, counselling and support. Provides temporary accommodation for women and children.

Men Against Sexual Abuse
44 Bathgate St
Glasgow G31 1DU
Tel: 0141 550 2048
Hours: 7pm - 9.30pm Tuesday
Aims: Information and support for men who have experienced sexual abuse.

Hemat Gryffe Women's Aid Drop In Centre
24 Willowbank St
Glasgow G3
Tel: 0141 353 0859
Fax: 0141 647 3421
Hours: 9am - 4.00pm Mon- Fri
Aims: Provides temporary accommodation for women and children who are black, Asian and Ethnic Minority.
Service: Support, information and advice on housing, benefits, immigration and nationality laws, legal issues, health and education.

"W.I.S.E Women"
120 Sydney St
Glasgow G31 1JF
Tel: 0141 550 7557
Minicom/Qwerty: 0141 550 7558
Fax: 0141 550 4443
Email: wscwmen@wellpark.co.uk
Hours: 10am - 5.00pm Mon- Fri
Aims: Provides advice, information and personal safety and self defence classes for women.
Service: To provide courses and information to women and organisations in Glasgow.

Centre for Women's Health
6 Sandyford Place
Glasgow G3 7NB
Tel: 0141 211 6700
Minicom/Qwerty: 0141 221 6703
Fax: 0141 211 6702
Email: cfwh@qcm.co.uk
Hours: 10am - 4.30pm Mon
10am - 9pm Tues
10am - 9am Wed
Aims: To improve women's health.
Service: Library and information service. Counselling, support and training.

Rape Crisis Centre
PO Box 53
Glasgow G2 1YR
Tel: 0141 331 1900
Minicom/Qwerty 0141 331 1900
Fax: 0141 331 1922
Hours: Check answering machine
Aims: Provides free and confidential support to women and girls who have been raped or sexually assaulted.
Service: Support, legal advice, information

Youth Rights Line
Scottish Child Law Centre
Tel: 0800 317 500
Aims: Free confidential advice about Youth Rights and the Law for Under 18s.

Childline
08001111

300
### Appendix V: Glossary of Colloquialisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aye</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>batter</td>
<td>beat (up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'cos</td>
<td>because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dead</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fancy</td>
<td>be attracted to (someone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go nuts</td>
<td>get very angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greeting</td>
<td>crying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jessie</td>
<td>pejorative term for a man who’s masculinity is being questioned – aligning the man to being less masculine or feminine in appearance or behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lassie/s</td>
<td>girl/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>let/letting</td>
<td>allow/allowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pals</td>
<td>friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pure</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straight</td>
<td>heterosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telly</td>
<td>television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the dancing</td>
<td>nightclub, disco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wee</td>
<td>young</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>