

Åsa Ekvall has a Master degree in Contemporary African History from Université de Paris I – Panthéon-Sorbonne and a Master degree in Peace and Conflict Research from Uppsala University. After having finished her studies Åsa worked in the field of development and later humanitarian aid for ten years in South Africa, Bosnia and Hercegovina, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Chad and Sudan/Darfur. Her work focused on, although not exclusively, women's rights and empowerment and gender-based violence. The field work made Åsa curious about how gender inequality and violence were related and she started to do a PhD on the topic with Antwerp University. A couple of years later this turned in to a joint PhD with the International Institute of Social Studies of the Erasmus University. During her PhD studies Åsa has worked as a consultant on gender issues as well as helped setting up the Dutch National Committee of UN Women where she currently works as coordinator for the Safe Streets Program. Åsa also continues to consult and can be reached through her website ekvall.nl.

GENDER INEQUALITY, HOMOPHOBIA AND VIOLENCE
The three pillars of patriarchal norms and attitudes, and their relations

ÅSA EKVALL

GENDER INEQUALITY, HOMOPHOBIA AND VIOLENCE

The three pillars of patriarchal norms
and attitudes, and their relations

ÅSA EKVALL

GENDER INEQUALITY, HOMOPHOBIA AND VIOLENCE:
THE THREE PILLARS OF PATRIARCHAL NORMS AND ATTITUDES
AND THEIR RELATIONS



© Copyright Åsa Ekvall 2019
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the author.

ISBN 978-90-6490-098-3

University of Antwerp
Faculty of Social Sciences
Department of Political Science
and
International Institute of Social Studies
of Erasmus University Rotterdam

GENDER INEQUALITY, HOMOPHOBIA AND VIOLENCE:
the three pillars of patriarchal norms and attitudes and their relations

GENDER-ONGELIJKHEID, HOMOFOBIE EN GEWELD:
de drie pijlers van patriarchale normen en attitudes en hun
onderlinge relaties

Thesis

to obtain

the degree of Doctor in de sociale wetenschappen: politieke wetenschappen
from the University of Antwerp,
and
the degree of Doctor from the Erasmus University Rotterdam

by command of the Rector Magnificus
Prof.dr. R.C.M.E. Engels
and in accordance with the decision of the Doctorate Board

The public defence shall be held on
Thursday 14 March 2019 at 16.00 hrs

to be defended by

Åsa Margareta Ekvall
born in Hallstahammar, Sweden



Doctoral Committee

Doctoral dissertation supervisors

Professor dr. P. Meier, University of Antwerp

Professor dr. A.S. Bedi, International Institute of Social Studies of Erasmus University Rotterdam

Other Members

Dr. S. Srinivasan, University of Guelph

Dr. M. Henry, London School of Economics

Professor dr. S.M. Murshed, International Institute of Social Studies of Erasmus University Rotterdam

Co-supervisor

Dr. D. Zarkov, International Institute of Social Studies of Erasmus University Rotterdam

*To Cécile, Sophie and Mischa who give me hope about the future
and
To Rutger who gives me so much love and support.*

Contents

List of Tables, Figures and Appendices.	I
Acronyms.	II
Acknowledgements	III
Abstract	IV
Samenvatting	VIII
1. Introduction	1
1.1 The starting points and the research questions	2
1.1.1 The first article - "Gender equality, attitudes to gender equality, and conflict"	3
1.1.2 The second article, "Don't be gay: homophobia, violence and conflict"	4
1.1.3 The third article, "Young men and gender trainings: What happens to attitudes to violence when attitudes to patriarchal masculinities change?"	9
1.2 The state of the academic field and theoretical approach of this research	5
1.2.1 Gender norms	7
1.2.2 Attitudes to norms	8
1.2.3 Masculinities	9
1.2.4 Heteronormativity.	10
1.2.5 Violence	10
1.3 Methodological strategies, methods of data generation, collection and analysis.	11
1.4 My original contribution.	16
1.5 Justification, scope and limitations of the study	18
1.6 Ethical and political choices and personal involvements	21
1.7 References	22
2. Gender equality and conflict.	27
2.1 Introduction	27

GENDER INEQUALITY, HOMOPHOBIA AND VIOLENCE:
THE THREE PILLARS OF PATRIARCHAL NORMS AND ATTITUDES AND THEIR RELATIONS

2.2	Theoretical links between gender equality, norms on gender equality and the use of violence	30
2.2.1	Norms on gender equality and the acceptance of violence .	31
2.2.2	Norms on gender equality and levels of gender equality . . .	36
2.3	Method and data.	40
2.4	Findings	46
2.5	Conclusion	48
2.6	References	49
3.	Don't be gay: homophobia, violence and conflict	57
3.1	Introduction	57
3.2	Patriarchal attitudes to gender and sexuality	59
3.3	Violence and patriarchal attitudes to gender inequality and homosexuality	60
3.4	Data and methods	62
3.5	Findings	64
3.5.1	Relating homosexuality to violence: mixed results	64
3.5.2	Does bringing in more variables clear the picture?	69
3.5.3	Can other data confirm tendencies?	74
3.6	Discussion and conclusion.	78
3.7	References	82
4.	Young men and gender trainings: an example of change in attitudes to gender, sexuality and violence among young male indian students	87
4.1	Introduction	87
4.2	Why working on attitudes?	89
4.3	Gender norms	90
4.4	Violence, gender and sexuality norms and attitudes	91
4.5	Gender trainings	93
4.6	Methods and data.	94
4.7	Findings	100
4.7.1	Domination over and violence against women	101
4.7.2	Heteronormativity and violence against homosexuals.	102

4.7.3	State and political violence	103
4.8	Sustainability of changes	107
4.9	Puzzles and ambiguities	109
4.10	Conclusion	111
4.11	References	112
5.	Conclusion	117
5.1	Initial questions, assumptions, studies and results	117
5.2	What does it all mean? The implications of the findings: theory, policy and practice.	126
5.2.1	Theoretical implecations	126
5.2.2	Unanswered questions and needs for further research. . . .	137
5.3	References	144
	Appendices	148
	Appendix 1	
	Questionnaire for the gender training	148

List of Tables, Figures and Appendices

Tables

Table 2.1	Correlation between the aggregated gender equality values, the Global Gender Gap Index, armed conflicts and the Global Peace Index	47
Table 3.1	Attitudes to homosexuality and violence	65
Table 3.2	Median measures for countries in function of conflict situations per 2014.	70
Table 3.3.	Significant Beta / standard error for control variables .	75
Table 3.4.	The moderating effect of human development on attitudes to homosexuality in relation to violence. .	76
Table 4.1	The answers to S1, S2 and S3 and levels of support per participant	100

Figures

Figure 2.1	Levels of gender equality and levels of violence.	30
Figure 2.2.	Norms on gender equality, levels of gender equality and levels of violence.	40
Figure 4.1	Difference in average number of patriarchal and violence approving attitudes among those answering 1 or 5	106

Appendices

Appendix 1	Questionnaire for the gender training.	118
------------	--	-----

Acronyms

CMNI	Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory
DI	Democracy Index
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GGGI	Global Gender Gap Index
GHI	Gay Happiness Index
GPI	Global Peace Index
HDI	Human Development Index
LGBT	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender
MAVA	Men Against Violence and Abuse
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NSS	National Service Scheme
UCDB	Uppsala Conflict Data Base
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
WHO	World Health Organization
WVS	World Values Survey

Acknowledgements

First I would like to thank Petra Meier, my supervisor in Antwerp, without whom this thesis would not have been made. It took me a long time to find a university and a supervisor who would accept me and my subject when I had decided to go for a PhD. Finally I met Petra and she believed in me. Without her guidance, support and knowledge I would not have made it.

Later I met Dubravka Zarkov who initiated the joint PhD with Erasmus-ISS. She also became my supervisor at the ISS. I'm most grateful for this opportunity and also for Dubravka's extensive knowledge about masculinities and violence which she shared with me, thus teaching me a lot and improving the quality of my work.

I'm also grateful to Dirk de Bièvre who has been on the Antwerp Doctoral Committee since the start and has helped me to think about methodology, especially in the beginning.

Arjun Bedi, my promotor at the ISS, has been helping me getting my statistical analyses right. He also was instrumental in getting me a grant from the ISS to do field work in Mumbai, for which I am most grateful.

I would furthermore like to thank all those who have been encouraging and helpful over the years, including Cynthia Enloe, whose encouraging words and notion of about feminist curiosity have been a guiding light for me.

I would like to thank Mischa, my bonus-son, for designing the cover.

Finally I would like to thank my husband, Rutger, for being my biggest supporter.

Abstract

This research studies how attitudes to gender (in)equality, heteronormativity and various types of violence are related to each other. Specific attention is given to the relations between patriarchal attitudes and violent conflict, next to the more often studied relations between patriarchy and violence against women and gay men. It also investigates possibilities to change patriarchal attitudes towards gender, heteronormativity and violence, making them more egalitarian. The results of the research are presented in three separate (journal) articles, each focusing on a specific theme: the first addresses relations between attitudes to gender (in)equality and violent conflict; the second addresses relations between homophobia and various types of violence, including armed conflict, and the third explores how attitudes to gender equality, homosexuality and various types of violence are related.

The first article, “Gender equality, attitudes to gender equality, and conflict”, builds on earlier research that found correlations between levels of gender equality and armed conflict by adding individuals’ attitudes to gender equality to the puzzle. The article thus looks at the relationships between attitudes to gender equality on the one hand, and the levels of gender equality in the political and socio-economic sphere, the presence or absence of (internal) armed conflict and general *levels* of violence, on the other. Data on attitudes to gender equality come from the World Values Surveys, the Global Gender Gap Index (on political and socio-economic gender equality), the Uppsala Conflict Data Base (on armed conflict) and the Global Peace Index (on general peacefulness).

The results show a significant association between *attitudes* toward gender equality and *levels* of political and socio-economic gender equality, absence or presence of armed conflict and general levels of violence. This means that in countries where the population is largely positive to gender equality there are also rather high levels of gender

equality, low levels of armed conflict and generally low levels of other types of violence. It also means that in countries where the population's attitudes are generally negative to gender equality there are low levels of gender equality, high levels of armed conflict and high general levels of violence.

The second article, "Don't be gay: homophobia, violence and conflict", builds on two bodies of research: on the relations between interpersonal violence and intolerance of homosexuality, and between different types of violence and gender inequality. This research suggests that such violence has the same roots: patriarchal norms and attitudes. Given this assumption the question here is whether intolerance of homosexuality could also be linked to other types of violence – for example armed conflict – just like gender inequality. I investigate it using a variety of sources: the World Values Survey, the Gay Happiness Index, the State Sponsored Homophobia report, the Global Peace Index, the Uppsala Conflict Data Base, the Human Development Index and the Global Gender Gap Index. The findings indicate that countries with low levels of tolerance of homosexuality tend to have high general levels of violence and high levels of armed conflict on their own territory, while countries with high levels of tolerance of homosexuality tend to have low levels of violence at home but intervene militarily abroad. These results show, on the one hand, the need to reflect on intolerance of homosexuality – and not just gender inequality – in policies addressing peace and violent conflict. On the other hand, they show a need for broader avenues of research on patriarchal attitudes, gender, sexualities and violent conflict in the context of geo-political power relations and military interventions.

The third article, "Young men and gender trainings: What happens to attitudes to violence when attitudes to patriarchal norms on masculinity change?", builds on the previous two articles by examining how attitudes to gender norms, including sexuality, and various types of violence are related to each other. In short: if attitudes to gender and

sexuality change, do attitudes to violence change in the same direction? These relationships are investigated using a quasi-experimental setting, namely a gender training. Many organizations around the world today provide gender trainings in different settings with the aim to increase gender equality and sometimes also to reduce violence against women. Increasingly these trainings are targeting men. The quasi-experiment aims to provide a small piece to the complex puzzle of how attitudes to patriarchal norms on gender, sexuality and violence are related to each other by studying a gender training for young men in Mumbai, India, performed by a local NGO. It finds that the young men who had a training on gender/masculinities and sexuality changed a number of their attitudes to gender equality, gender based violence and homosexuality from more patriarchal to more egalitarian ones. Following the training, the participants also became less approving of both violence against women and violence against homosexuals. The most important finding, however, was that there also was a positive change of attitudes towards the types of violence that were *not* discussed during the training: that is, rejection of torture as well as collective and military violence. This indicates that attitudes to gender and sexuality are related to attitudes to violence, including both state violence and interpersonal violence. However, anecdotal evidence suggests that the changes might be sustainable only for those participants whose new, non-patriarchal attitudes were supported by family and friends, showing the limits of gender trainings as method for change.

Three findings of these articles should be highlighted: first, they show interconnectedness of gender, sexuality and violence and in doing so they contribute to the deeper understanding of their relationships. Second, they indicate that *attitudes* towards gender, sexuality and violence are related to *levels* of gender equality, sexual rights and violence in societies. The levels of, and the attitudes to those phenomena have not been often compared (i.e. researchers compared, for example, levels of gender equality to levels of gendered violence, but not levels of equality to attitudes to violence, and vice versa). Finally, it

is crucial to take patriarchal norms and attitudes towards gender, sexuality and violence in a society into account when addressing violent conflict. As noted earlier in reference to the second article, the relationship between the three is complicated by geo-political dynamics. On the one hand, governments, aid agencies, NGOs and others working on preventing conflict and building peace need to focus on improving gender equality and increasing tolerance of homosexuality in order to achieve a sustainable decrease in *internal* conflict levels and an improvement in general levels of violence in societies. On the other hand, there is a need to understand relationships between gender, sexuality, military interventions and geo-political domination. Studies going in that direction will also be important for critically rethinking meanings and practices of liberal peace and democracy.

*Gender-ongelijkheid, homofobie en geweld:
de drie pijlers van patriarchale normen en attitudes en
hun onderlinge relaties*

Samenvatting

Dit onderzoek bestudeert hoe attitudes ten aanzien van gender-(on)gelijkheid, heteronormativiteit en verschillende soorten geweld met elkaar verband houden. Naast aandacht voor de reeds vaker bestudeerde relaties tussen patriarchaat en geweld tegen vrouwen en homoseksuelen, wordt specifieke aandacht besteed aan de relaties tussen patriarchale attitudes en gewelddadige conflicten. Het onderzoek bestudeert ook de mogelijkheden om patriarchale attitudes ten aanzien van gender, heteronormativiteit en geweld te veranderen, waardoor ze meer egalitair worden. De resultaten van het onderzoek worden gepresenteerd in drie afzonderlijke wetenschappelijke artikelen, elk gericht op een specifiek thema: het eerste behandelt de relaties tussen attitudes ten aanzien van gender-(on)gelijkheid en gewelddadige conflicten; het tweede bestudeert de relatie tussen homofobie en verschillende soorten geweld, waaronder gewapende conflicten; en het derde artikel onderzoekt hoe attitudes ten aanzien van gendergelijkheid, homoseksualiteit en verschillende soorten geweld met elkaar verband houden.

Het eerste artikel, "Gendergelijkheid, attitudes ten aanzien van gendergelijkheid en conflicten", bouwt voort op eerder onderzoek dat correlaties aantoonde tussen niveaus van gendergelijkheid en gewapende conflicten, meer bepaald door de attitudes van individuen over gendergelijkheid aan de puzzel toe te voegen. Het artikel kijkt dus naar de relaties tussen attitudes ten aanzien van gendergelijkheid aan de ene kant, en de niveaus van gendergelijkheid in de politieke en sociaaleconomische sfeer, de aanwezigheid of afwezigheid van (interne) gewapende conflicten en algemene geweldsniveaus, aan de andere kant. Gegevens over attitudes ten aanzien van gendergelijkheid komen uit de World

GENDER INEQUALITY, HOMOPHOBIA AND VIOLENCE:
THE THREE PILLARS OF PATRIARCHAL NORMS AND ATTITUDES AND THEIR RELATIONS

VIII

Values Surveys, de Global Gender Gap Index (politieke en sociaaleconomische gendergelijkheid), de Uppsala Conflict Data Base (gewapende conflicten) en de Global Peace Index (algemene vreedzaamheid).

De resultaten tonen een significant verband aan tussen *attitudes* ten aanzien van gendergelijkheid en *niveaus* van politieke en sociaaleconomische gendergelijkheid, afwezigheid of aanwezigheid van gewapende conflicten en algemene niveaus van geweld. Dit betekent dat in landen waar de bevolking grotendeels positief staat tegenover gendergelijkheid, er ook vrij hoge niveaus van gendergelijkheid zijn, lage niveaus van gewapende conflicten en over het algemeen lage niveaus van andere soorten geweld. Het betekent ook dat in landen waar de attitudes met betrekking tot gendergelijkheid onder de bevolking over het algemeen negatief is, er sprake is van lage niveaus van gendergelijkheid, hoge niveaus van gewapend conflict en hoge niveaus van geweld in het algemeen.

Het tweede artikel, “Wees niet homo: homofobie, geweld en conflicten”, bouwt voort op twee onderzoeksdomeinen: over de relaties tussen interpersoonlijk geweld en onverdraagzaamheid ten opzichte van homoseksualiteit, enerzijds, en tussen verschillende soorten geweld en genderongelijkheid, anderzijds. Dit onderzoek suggereert dat deze vormen van geweld allen dezelfde wortels hebben: patriarchale normen en attitudes. Gegeven deze veronderstelling is de vraag hier of intolerantie van homoseksualiteit ook gekoppeld kan worden aan andere soorten van geweld – bijvoorbeeld gewapende conflicten – analoog aan de wijze waarop dit het geval is met betrekking tot genderongelijkheid. Het onderzoek maakt gebruik van verschillende bronnen: de World Values Survey, de Gay Happiness Index, het State Sponsored Homophobia Report, de Global Peace Index, de Uppsala Conflict Data Base, de Human Development Index en de Global Gender Gap Index. De bevindingen tonen aan dat landen met een lage mate van tolerantie voor homoseksualiteit over het algemeen een hoog algemeen niveau van geweld kennen en een hoog niveau van gewapende conflicten op

hun eigen grondgebied hebben, terwijl landen met een hoge mate van tolerantie voor homoseksualiteit over het algemeen lage niveaus van geweld in eigen land kennen, maar wel militair optreden in het buitenland. Deze resultaten tonen aan de ene kant de noodzaak om na te denken over intolerantie ten opzichte van homoseksualiteit - en niet alleen intolerantie ten opzichte van genderongelijkheid - in beleid dat zich richt op vrede en gewelddadige conflicten. Anderzijds tonen ze aan dat er behoefte is aan breder georiënteerd onderzoek naar patriarchale attitudes, gender, seksualiteit en gewelddadige conflicten in de context van geopolitieke machtsverhoudingen en militaire interventies.

Het derde artikel, "Jonge mannen en gendertrainingen: wat gebeurt er met attitudes ten opzichte van geweld als de attitudes ten opzichte van patriarchale normen over mannelijkheid veranderen?", bouwt voort op de twee vorige artikelen door na te gaan hoe attitudes ten aanzien van gendernormen, waaronder seksualiteit, en verschillende soorten geweld met elkaar verband houden. Kort samengevat: veranderen houdingen ten opzichte van geweld in dezelfde richting als de houding ten opzichte van gender en seksualiteit? Deze relaties worden onderzocht in een quasi-experimentele setting, namelijk een gendertraining.

Organisaties over de hele wereld bieden tegenwoordig gendertraining in verschillende omgevingen om also de gendergelijkheid te vergroten en soms ook om geweld tegen vrouwen te doen afnemen. Steeds vaker zijn deze trainingen gericht op mannen. Het quasi-experiment heeft als doel om een klein stukje toe te voegen aan de complexe puzzel van hoe attitudes ten aanzien van patriarchale normen met betrekking tot gender, seksualiteit en geweld met elkaar verband houden door een gendertraining, verzorgd door een lokale ngo, voor jonge mannen in Mumbai, India, te bestuderen. Het onderzoek komt tot de bevinding dat de jonge mannen die een training in gender / mannelijkheid en seksualiteit hebben gekregen een aantal van hun opvattingen over gendergelijkheid, gender-gerelateerd geweld en homoseksualiteit veranderden van meer patriarchale naar meer egalitaire. Na de trai-

ning stonden de deelnemers ook minder goedkeurend tegenover zowel geweld tegen vrouwen als geweld tegen homoseksuelen. De belangrijkste bevinding was echter dat er ook een positieve verandering was in de houding ten opzichte van de soorten geweld, ook al maakten die geen onderdeel van de cursus uit. Zo wezen ze marteling, collectief evenals militair geweld af. Dit toont aan dat de attitudes ten opzichte van gender en seksualiteit gerelateerd zijn aan de attitudes ten opzichte van geweld, waaronder zowel staatsgeweld als interpersoonlijk geweld. Anekdotisch bewijs suggereert echter dat de veranderingen alleen duurzaam kunnen zijn bij die deelnemers wier nieuwe, niet-patriarchale attitudes werden ondersteund door familie en vrienden, wat weerom de grenzen van gendertrainingen als methode voor verandering aantoonde.

Drie bevindingen van deze artikelen moeten worden benadrukt: ten eerste, ze laten een onderling verband zien tussen gender, seksualiteit en geweld en dragen zo bij aan het dieper inzicht in hun onderlinge samenhang. Ten tweede geven ze aan dat de *attitudes* ten opzichte van gender, seksualiteit en geweld gerelateerd zijn aan maatschappelijke *niveaus* van gendergelijkheid, seksuele rechten en geweld. De niveaus van en de attitudes ten opzichte van deze fenomenen zijn nog niet vaak vergeleken (dat wil zeggen, onderzoekers vergeleken bijvoorbeeld *niveaus* van gendergelijkheid met niveaus van seksueel geweld, maar niet niveaus van gelijkheid met attitudes ten opzichte van geweld, en vice versa). Ten slotte is het cruciaal om patriarchale normen en attitudes ten aanzien van gender, seksualiteit en geweld in een samenleving in aanmerking te nemen bij het aanpakken van gewelddadige conflicten. Zoals eerder opgemerkt met betrekking tot het tweede artikel, wordt de relatie tussen de drie gecompliceerd door geopolitieke dynamiek. Aan de ene kant moeten regeringen, hulporganisaties, ngo's en andere actoren die werken aan het voorkomen van conflicten en het opbouwen van vrede gericht zijn op het verbeteren van gendergelijkheid en het vergroten van tolerantie voor homoseksualiteit om tot een duurzame afname van de interne conflict-niveaus en een verbetering van

de algemene niveaus van geweld in samenlevingen te komen. Anderzijds is er behoefte aan een beter begrip van de verhoudingen tussen gender, seksualiteit, militaire interventies en geopolitieke overheersing. Studies die in die richting gaan, zullen ook belangrijk zijn voor het kritisch herdenken van betekenissen en praktijken van liberale vrede en democratie.

GENDER INEQUALITY, HOMOPHOBIA AND VIOLENCE:
THE THREE PILLARS OF PATRIARCHAL NORMS AND ATTITUDES AND THEIR RELATIONS

1 Introduction

This research studies how attitudes to gender (in)equality, heteronormativity and various types of violence are related to each other. Specific attention is given to the relation between patriarchal attitudes and violent conflict, next to the more often studied relations between patriarchy and violence against women and gay men. It also investigates possibilities to change patriarchal attitudes towards gender, heteronormativity and violence, making them more egalitarian. The results of the research are presented in three separate (journal) articles, each focusing on a specific theme: the first addresses the relations between attitudes to gender (in)equality and violent conflict; the second addresses the relations between homophobia and various types of violence, including armed conflict; and the third explores how attitudes to gender equality, homosexuality and various types of violence could change.

A number of questions – stemming from my many years of work in countries in conflict and post-conflict situation – have triggered this research: How are gender inequality, oppression of women and homosexuals and violence against them related to various other forms of violence, including armed conflict? Is it really so that the countries with higher acceptance of patriarchal norms and attitudes have more armed conflict, and countries where there are armed conflicts have high levels of violence against and oppression of women and homosexuals? If this is so, would gender equality and acceptance of homosexuality result in lowering overall levels of violence, including armed conflict?

Finding answers to these questions would not only advance our theoretical understanding of causes of various forms of violence and their relation to gender inequality and heteronormativity; it would also be incredibly useful for all practitioners, policy makers and donors working to reduce levels of various forms of violence around the world.

1.1 The starting points and the research questions

The main starting point of this research is Hudson et al's (2012) assertion that high levels of violence against women in a society is the best predictor of violent conflict. The second and third best predictors of violent conflict are also indicators of gender inequality, namely unequal family law and polygyny (Hudson et al, 2012, p. 112-113). According to Hudson et al, these three indicators of gender inequality are all better predictors of violent conflict than more traditional, mainstream explanations such as economic development, GDP per capita, democratization and presence / absence of Islam. Hudson and her colleagues also found that "if a state is indifferent about enforcing laws that protect women in its society, it is less likely to be compliant with international norms to which it has committed" (2012, p. 113). So they argue that there is a clear link between oppression of women and gender inequality on the one hand, and violent conflict, on the other.

While being interested in testing this argument, I was also interested to see whether similar arguments could be made about relations between violent conflict, masculinities and heteronormativity. According to Connell (1995) men's domination over women and the gender inequality that ensue are one of the most prominent features of patriarchy, together with heteronormativity. The fact that heteronormativity, and its ensuing intolerance and oppression of homosexuals, is one of the base ingredients of patriarchy leads to the question whether intolerance of homosexuality can be linked to violent conflict in the similar way gender inequality is linked. Earlier studies on intolerance of homosexuality and violence have focused on interpersonal violence, mainly violence against homosexual men (Keiller 2010) and violence committed by men wanting to prove that they are not homosexuals (Kimmel 2008). Kimmel (2008) further argues that, within patriarchal norms, the use of violence is the preferred means to settle disputes and conflicts among men and to (re)gain respect and honor.

Thus, it seems vital to study the interconnectedness of gender, including masculinities, heteronormativity and various forms of violence if we want to fully understand how they are related to each other, and if and how these relationships might be relevant for our understanding of violent conflict.

The main question of this research is: How are gender (in)equality, heteronormativity and various forms of violence related to each other, and specifically, how are patriarchal attitudes to gender and sexuality related to violent conflict? This main question is supported by three sub-questions, each of which is addressing a specific set of relationships, and is tackled in a separate (journal) article:

1.1.1 The first article, “gender equality, attitudes to gender equality, and conflict”¹

This article asks what the relationships are between *attitudes* to gender equality, *levels* of gender equality, presence of armed conflicts, and general *levels* of peacefulness. In addressing this question, the article first re-tests the hypotheses of the earlier studies: H₁, the higher the level of political and socioeconomic gender equality in a country, the less likely it is that it will experience an intrastate armed conflict; and H₂, the higher the level of political and socioeconomic gender equality in a country, the more peaceful the country is in general. By re-testing these hypotheses with different data sets than those used in the earlier studies the validity of the results would be proved stronger. The study then moves on to examine if *attitudes* to gender equality relate to violence and conflict in the same way the *levels* of political and socioeconomic gender equality do, by testing the hypotheses H₃, the more people approve of gender equality in a country, the less likely it is that there will be an armed conflict; and H₄, the more people approve of

¹ Published in Marcia Texler Segal, Vasiliki Demos (ed.) *Gendered Perspectives on Conflict and Violence* (*Advances in Gender Research, Volume 18a*), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.273-295. 2013.

gender equality in a country, the more peaceful it will be in general. Finally, as a control, the study investigates the relationship between *levels* of political and socioeconomic gender equality and *attitudes* to gender equality, testing the hypothesis H5, the more people approve of gender equality in a country, the higher the level of political and socioeconomic equality.

Investigating how attitudes to gender equality relate to various forms of violence, including violent conflict, contributes to discussions about the need to incorporate gender analysis in mainstream research on violence and conflict. The study also contributes to research on the causal mechanisms of the relationship between gender (in)equality and violence. Finally, the study motivates further research on how to change attitudes to, and norms on, gender equality in a more egalitarian way, especially in contexts of high levels of violence. Insights into relationships between attitudes to gender equality and violence are also useful for policymakers, donors and practitioners, both those working on reducing violence and conflict and those working on increasing gender equality, showing how their work is linked.²

1.1.2 The second article, “Don’t be gay: homophobia, violence and conflict”³

This paper poses the question whether intolerance of male homosexuality can be linked to other types of violence than interpersonal violence, specifically to armed conflict. The hypotheses are: H6, societies with more acceptance of homosexuality will have less violence of any type, including less involvement in armed conflict; and H7, countries involved in violent conflicts and with high general levels of violence will also have high levels of intolerance towards homosexuality. The

² This article was written early on in my PhD trajectory which is why its data sets are older than the ones used in the more recent articles.

³ Submitted to SAGE Open.

study first examines the relations between male homosexuality and different types of violence. It then adds control variables such as gender equality, economic development, human development, democracy and general peacefulness to examine differences between countries with armed conflict on their territory; countries waging wars on others' territories, and countries not involved in any armed conflict. It then tests which among the traditional control variables has the strongest correlations with violence, in order to use the results for the last analysis which tests if human development, as control variable, has a moderating influence on attitudes to male homosexuality in relation to different types of violence.

Investigating attitudes to male homosexuality specifically, in relation to different types of violence, permits us to pursue broader avenues for research both into the causal mechanisms between patriarchal gender and sexuality norms and different types of violence, and into research aimed at reducing violence. This study is also useful for policymakers, donors and practitioners as it points out the need to include attitudes to sexuality to existing work on gender and gender equality as well as work on reducing violence.

1.1.3 The third article, "Young men and gender trainings: what happens to attitudes to violence when attitudes to patriarchal masculinities change?"⁴

This paper connects gender - including masculinities, heteronormativity and violence asking whether attitudes to specific types of violence change when attitudes to gender equality and male homosexuality change. More specifically, it investigated what happened when a group of young male students attended a gender training in India performed by a local NGO. The study measured the students' attitudes to gender

⁴ Following a request to review and resubmit a reviewed version has been submitted to NORMA, the Nordic Journal for Masculinities Studies.

equality, homosexuality and various types of violence before and after their attendance of a training on patriarchal norms, masculinities and gender equality. The objective of the study was to see if and how attitudes to gender equality and homosexuality co-vary with attitudes to different types of violence. The study contributes with yet another piece to the puzzle of gender, sexuality and violence, further disentangling the interconnectedness of gender inequality, intolerance of homosexuality and various forms of violence. Importantly, the study noted that changes in attitudes to gender and sexuality correlate with changes in attitudes to even those types of violence which were not at all addressed in the training: specifically, state based violence (torture, military violence) and collective violence. The results, however, question the efficiency of gender trainings - the current favorite tool of the international community - to produce sustainable change of norms and attitudes to gender. Thus the research is contributing to the literature on norms change and methods thereof, as well as to the literature linking male homosexuality, masculinities, gender and violence. Finally, it is also useful for policy makers and practitioners engaged in work on gender, sexuality and violence.

1.2 The state of the academic field and theoretical approach of this research

The state of the academic field and theoretical approach of this research Each of the three journal articles delves in detail into the current debates addressing relations between gender, heteronormativity, masculinity and various forms of violence, with a special attention to violent conflict. Thus here I address only the main concepts and the ways they have been employed in this research.

1.2.1 Gender norms and attitudes to norms

Norms are formal and informal rules for behavior in a society, telling us what's "right" and "normal" (Scott and Marshall, 2009). Norms are thus crucial for all human interaction (Bicchieri, 2006; Hechter and Opp, 2001; Posner, 2000). Norms on gender, thus, are what our societies and cultures tell us is "right" and "normal" behavior for men and women and what is "masculine" and "feminine" (Reeser, 2010). Norms on gender inequality, heteronormativity / homophobia and masculinities (as well as violence, the dependent variable in the three studies) influence human interaction in all societies. This research follows Whitehead's (2002) clustering of gender norms in two opposing groups: patriarchal and egalitarian. Patriarchal norms are traditional gender norms, stipulating that men should dominate women, that men have more value than women and are more fit to make decisions and exercise power than women. These patriarchal gender norms exist all over the world albeit to different extents and in different shapes and there are "both costs and benefits for conforming or not to them" (Parent and Moradi, 2009, p. 176). Not only men adhere to patriarchal norms, women do so too (Ahmad, Riaz, Barata and Stewart, 2004), which makes it both possible and important to look at society-wide norms and the levels of approving attitudes thereof.⁵

Attitudes are individual positions towards norms, ideas or behaviors (Eagly and Chaiken, 1998). They tell us if individuals approve of a norm or not, and their attitude to norms will have an influence on how they react and behave towards other people (Myers, 2008). This is why there is a focus on attitudes in my studies, with focus on attitudes towards patriarchal norms on gender and sexuality, and specifically on gender (in)equality, hegemonic masculinities and heteronormativity.⁶

⁵ See sections 2.2.1, 3.3 and 4.3.

⁶ See sections 2.1 and 4.2.

1.2.2 Gender equality

The definition of gender equality used in this research is a combination of the definitions of Htun and Weldon (2010) and UN Women (2012).

According to Htun and Weldon “Gender equality is an ideal condition in which men and women have similar opportunities to participate in politics, the economy and social activities; their roles and status are equally valued; neither suffers from gender based disadvantage or discrimination; and both are considered free autonomous beings with dignity and rights” (2010: p. 213).

UN Women has much more elaborate, and descriptive, definition: “Equality between women and men (gender equality) refer to the equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women and men and girls and boys. Equality does not mean that women and men will become the same but that women’s and men’s rights, responsibilities and opportunities will not depend on whether they are born male or female. Gender equality implies that the interests, needs and priorities of both women and men are taken into consideration, recognizing the diversity of different groups of men and women. Gender equality is not a women’s issue but should concern and fully engage men as well as women. Equality between women and men is seen both as a human rights issue and as a precondition for, and indicator of, sustainable people-centered development”(UN Women, 2012: n.p.).⁷

These two definitions are selected because combining academic and policy-based concerns with gender equality allowed me a broader perspective. For example, while the UN Women definition is more detailed it does not mention discriminations, which Htun and Weldon do. As the opposite of gender equality – gender inequality – leads to discrimination, and thus opens the path to addressing violence, it was

⁷ See sections 2.2.2, 3.3 and 4.3.

deemed important for this research. Equally important, practitioners addressing gender (in)equality often rely on the UN Women's concepts because they are practice oriented and offer the convenience of operationalization of social, economic and political indicators. As those indicators have also been recorded in the large data sets used in this research, it made methodological sense to include the UN Women definition.

1.2.3 Masculinities

Following Connell (2005) I talk about masculinities in plural. Connell's theorizing of hegemonic masculinity proposes a system of power hierarchies between different masculinities in society, with the hegemonic masculinity, offered as an ideal, at the top. Patriarchal masculinities are often hegemonic, meaning that they are seen as the ideal masculinities, something men should strive for, in a given time and space (Connell, 2005). While it is theoretically possible to imagine a society with dominant masculinity that is egalitarian, Connell's definition of hegemonic masculinity stresses that it "ideologically legitimate[s] the global subordination of women to men" (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005: p. 832). Theorizing of hegemonic masculinity also indicates that some men can dominate other men based on their social status, on the notions and practices related to their masculinity, and on how "manly" they are perceived to be, with the homosexual men at the bottom of the hierarchical ladder. Hegemonic masculinity, even though it looks different in different societies and at different times, is thus part of a normative system built upon patriarchal norms where all men should dominate all women, and some men should dominate other men, with a specific subjugation of homosexual men who are not considered "real men" (Connell, 2005).⁸

⁸ See sections 2.2.1, 3.3 and 4.3.

1.2.4 Heteronormativity

Heteronormativity and its ensuing intolerance of homosexuals is considered to be one of the pillars of patriarchal norms, the second being gender inequality and the third a prescribed use of violence (Connell, 1995; Kimmel, 2008). Homosexuality is perceived to defy the norms on “appropriate” sexual desires, leading homosexuals to be viewed as “gender deviants” (Murphy, 2006, p. 211). Connell (1995) notes that negative attitudes to homosexuality are related to underlying sexism. The need for men, including teenage boys, to show that they are “real” men and not gay has been studied by a number of scholars including Kimmel (2008), Kimmel and Mahler (2003), David and Brannon (1976) and Kah (2009). These studies indicate that the need to prove manliness - and its consequent marginalization and rejection of gay men - is rooted in the rejection of all things perceived as feminine and as threatening to the masculine gender role. Weaver et al. (2010) further argue that the normative idea of what it means to be a “real man” is in a precarious state, meaning that it needs constant revalidation and proof. A man must prove his heterosexuality all the time to be considered a “real man”. Ways to prove a heterosexual masculinity include the use of violence (Bossom and Vandello, 2011) and the harboring of anti-gay attitudes (Barron et al., 2008). Considering the links between heteronormativity, sexism and the use of violence it is important to include heteronormativity in the research on gender and violence. In this particular research my focus has been on male homosexuality, both for theoretical reasons (the link between patriarchal masculinities and heteronormativity) and the lack of data on discrimination regarding female homosexuality.⁹

1.2.5 Violence

The three studies outlined here use the concept of violence encom-

⁹ See section 3.3.

passing direct physical and sexual violence, between individuals, between groups and between states. The purpose is to show interconnectedness of different types of violence as well as to increase the number of types of violence that are studied in relation to gender and sexuality. The studies start from an assumption that most violence is based on patriarchal norms and attitudes; that patriarchal (and often hegemonic) norms prescribe, accept, or condone the use of violence to gain or re-gain power, respect and honor and as the preferred method to right a wrong (Kimmel, 2008), thus making it the third pillar of patriarchal norms addressed here, next to gender inequality and heteronormativity.¹⁰

1.3 Methodological strategies, methods of data generation, collection and analysis

Most feminist research, including research on gender norms, violence against women, patriarchal attitudes, gender inequality and various types of violence has been conducted using qualitative methods. The current research project is an attempt to make the epistemological picture fuller by using another approach: quantitative and, to a certain extent, positivist. Instead of focusing on local particularities and cultural differences in specific contexts, the aim of this study is to find common structures and tendencies.

Many international agencies and organizations have gathered large amounts of data addressing specific aspects of gender, sexuality and violence, collecting and organizing them in large data sets. Next to addressing various issues pertaining to gender, these data sets also cover topics related to attitudes to homosexuality; discrimination and violence against homosexual men; as well as political and military violence. As these data sets cover many culturally, socially, politically

¹⁰ See sections 2.2, 2.2.1, 3.4 and 4.4.

and geographically different societies, using them in this research allows for insights on relationships between gender, sexuality and violence that would not have easily resulted from qualitative methods. While these data sets provide a large amount of interesting data they also lead to epistemological problems due to their wide geographical, political and cultural spread as well as to the variety of ways the data is collected. For instance, existing data sets use different indicators and weigh them differently. The solution to this problem in this research was to use many data sets, and to use them in various ways, applying different statistical models. The assumption being that, if the results of the different analyses with the different data sets all point in the same direction, they indicate high validity of data.

Nevertheless, some methodological caution is necessary. For example, measuring peacefulness is difficult and there are many possible indicators depending on whether the starting point is the concept of “negative peace” or of “positive peace” (Galtung, 1969). “Negative peace refers to the absence of direct violence but the continuation of indirect forms of violence such as discrimination, patriarchy, poverty, and preventable disease. Positive peace envisages a situation in which these indirect harms are dealt with, allowing people to reach their potential” (Firchow and Mac Ginty, 2017, p. 8). Choosing which data sets to use is hence a matter of where one starts from and what one wants to show. The Global Peace Index measures peacefulness using indicators about violence, hence focusing on negative peace, while the Human Development Index can be said to measure positive peace. However, while the economic and social development that is measured in the Human Development Index is often taken as proxy for indicators of peace (Firchow and Mac Ginty, 2017, p. 20) it does not prove peace alone. An example is Sri Lanka, which kept relatively high Human Development Index scores throughout the conflict (Holt, 2013). This makes the Global Peace Index a somewhat more adequate measure of peacefulness although what might be an accurate Global Peace Index measure of peace for one country might not work for another. For instance, the

Global Peace Index category “Security officers & police” can show many different things. A high number of police officers might be seen as a sign of safety in (and by) some communities but may also be seen as an indicator of a repressive state by other communities. Still, the Global Peace Index, with its many subcategories, is currently considered (by many researchers and national and international agencies and organizations) the best tool in measuring levels (and patterns) of peacefulness and violence in a society.

Another problem with the data sets used in this research is that some of them overlap. The Global Peace Index uses data from the Uppsala Conflict Data Base, while the Human Development Index includes GDP/capita and the Gini Index. The other data sets do not overlap explicitly.

However there can very well be other types of overlaps. For instance, during a conflict it can be hard to distinguish homicides from civilian casualties. Countries sending troops to other countries can also get an economic boost from their participation in the conflict if they are producing arms. Countries without arms industries tend to get poorer from participating in conflicts. It is difficult to address these overlaps and as stated above, I have chosen to do so by using many different sources of data, estimating that if the results from the different data sets and analysis all point in the same direction the results are valid without taking the exact numbers in the statistical analyses’ results at face value, seeing them as indications of structures and directions. The reason why I still use the Uppsala Conflict Data Base is that the Global Peace Index not only uses the presence or absence of armed conflict but also weighs in the duration of the conflict and, in the case of external conflicts, also the role in the external conflict (primary party, supporting the primary party or part of a force operating within the frames of a United Nations Security Council Resolution). Each of these indicators gets a score from one to five and the scores are then added to make up the two Global Peace Index categories “internal conflicts

fought” and “external conflicts fought”. Countries arguably can participate in military operations sanctioned by the UN Security Council and still have their own interests to do so, while the duration of participation in a conflict might cloud the nature of their participation (number of troops and weapons, whether offensive or defensive, troops taking part in combat or not etc.). Thus, I have chosen to use the simple presence or absence of armed conflict in order to add a dimension to the conflict variables. I also chose to use the Human Development Index as well as GDP/capita and the Gini Index despite the latter two being part of the Human Development Index. This choice was made because the GDP/capita and the Gini Index are common control variables in conflict studies while the Human Development Index, having more components than the economic ones (including education and health), is not. Using both the composite variable that is the Human Development Index and the separate variables of GDP/capita and the Gini Index allows me to broaden the picture.

Using established data sets comes with challenges. Indexes like the GPI, the GGGI and the HDI are based on aggregated secondary data, often coming from national statistics authorities, which might not always be reliable. These indexes still deserve to be used as they constitute our current best way to do comparative research and investigate social structures and patterns. While we should be careful to not put too much weight on each number in the results, these numbers still allowed me to study tendencies and patterns of violence.

The data and method used in each of the three studies is presented in detail in the respective articles and I will only present the main points here.

The first article, “Gender Equality, Attitudes to Gender Equality, and Conflict”, uses data from the World Values Survey (2009), the Global Gender Gap Index (Ricardo Hausmann, Tyson, and Zahidi, 2007), the Uppsala Conflict Data Base (Harbom and Wallensteen, 2009) and the

Global Peace Index (Institute for Economics & Peace, 2012). The data is analyzed by a linear regression. The second article, “Don’t be Gay: Attitudes to Gender, Homosexuality and Violence” uses data from the World Values Survey (World Values Survey Association, 2015), the Gay Happiness Index (Planet Romeo, 2015), the State Sponsored Homophobia report (Carroll and Itaborahy, 2015), the Global Peace Index (Institute for Economics & Peace, 2014), the Uppsala Conflict Data Base (Pettersson and Wallensteen, 2015), the Human Development Index (United Nations Development Program, 2015), the Democracy Index (The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2014), the World Bank’s GDP per capita report (2014a), the Gini Index (World Bank, 2014b) and the Global Gender Gap Index (World Economic Forum, 2014). The data is analyzed both with a linear regression, a descriptive analysis and a moderating analysis.

The third article, “Young Men and Gender Trainings: What Happens to Attitudes to Violence when Attitudes to Patriarchal Masculinities Change?” used a quasi-experimental setting of a gender training for young men conducted by a non-governmental organization in India in order to see if and how changes in attitudes to norms on gender equality, homosexuality and different types of violence are related to each other. As these kinds of changes are near impossible to isolate in society, using a gender training gave me an opportunity to see how changes in attitudes to gender equality and homosexuality affected attitudes to different types of violence. The training covered patriarchal norms on masculinity and femininity, gender inequality and homophobia. Violence against women, including sexual violence, was discussed but other types of violence – such as communal and state violence – were *not* part of the training. Due to the small number of participants a different methodological approach was used in this study compared to the other two. The participants filled out a survey measuring their attitudes to gender equality, homosexuality and different types of violence before, right after and six months after the training. I developed a survey based on existing scales and surveys, such as the Confor-

mity to Masculinity Norms Inventory (Mahalik et al., 2003); norms and belief assessments by the World Health Organization (2009); the Center for Disease Control and Prevention's compendium of assessment tools (Dahlberg et al., 2005); and the Gender-Equitable Men Scale (Men and Gender Equality Policy Project, 2011). Next to the survey demographical data on the participants was also collected and short interviews were held with the participants just before the training on their motivation to participate in the training.

1.4 My original contribution

The three studies presented here aim at expanding the important theoretical discussions on gender, sexuality and violence, by testing hypotheses related to gender and sexuality to specific forms of violence, including armed conflict, that have not been much studied before. Theoretically I am pursuing the hypotheses that there are important relations between patriarchal attitudes to gender, sexuality and various types of violence, including armed conflict. While some of these relations have already been pointed to by various scholars working on gender and violence, hegemonic masculinities and violence, and sexuality – especially male homosexuality – and violence, focused attention to attitudes on gender and sexuality in relation to armed conflict has been missing. In addition, using attitudes to gender equality - instead of levels of gender equality, as previous studies have done - to study relations between gender and armed conflict as well as other forms of violence, advances our understanding of these relations and their possible causation.

Combining the three specific patriarchal norms (gender inequality, non-acceptance of homosexuality and the use of violence as the preferred means of solving disputes and conflicts and gaining and regaining respect and honor), has not been done before. Thus this research aims at contributing to the theorizing on patriarchal norms as

well as to the understanding of the mechanisms that links those norms to specific forms of violence, with the focus on violent conflict.

Methodologically, I have been using a combination of data sets and statistical models that have not been used before, establishing statistically significant relationships where previously there were only theoretical assumptions. I have also gathered new data for the third study, thus allowing for new analyses and insights into attitudinal change.

The data from the Global Gender Gap Index, the World Values Survey, the State Sponsored Homophobia Survey and the Planet Romeo have not been previously used in studies on patriarchal norms and violence as indicators of patriarchal norms on gender and sexuality. Using these new data sets and data strengthens the findings of previous research on gender (in)equality, sexuality and armed conflict (Hudson et al., 2012). New data have also lead to new findings, as they allowed a look at the relation between attitudes to gender equality and levels of gender equality as well as attitudes towards homosexual men and levels of homophobia, and their relations to violence.

The use of the Global Peace Index (GPI) to measure violence in combination with attitudes to gender and sexuality is a new approach which allowed me to study whether certain attitudes had stronger correlations with certain types of violence (among the 23 GPI sub categories).

Using the Human Development Index as one of the control variables, accompanied with more established control variables such as the Democracy Index, GDP/capita and the Gini Index is also new. It lead to the finding that low levels of human development are more strongly correlated to violence, including armed conflict, than democracy levels, thus potentially contributing to the literature on the “liberal and democratic peace” (Hegre, 2014).

While evaluations of interventions, including gender trainings, aimed at

changing attitudes to gender, have been done before, using a gender training to see how attitudes to gender, homosexuality and violence change and whether changes to some attitudes go hand in hand with changes to other attitudes, is an innovative quasi-experimental approach that allowed me to document and analyze specific changes, opening new and interesting questions about gender, sexuality and violence, as well as about gender trainings.

1.5 Justification, scope and limitations of the study

A multitude of governments, international organizations and activists work to decrease discrimination and inequalities based on gender and sexual orientation as well as to reduce violence of all kinds in their own societies as well as in others. Much of this work is based on research conducted by academics and independent researchers who constantly advance the theory and the knowledge about the mechanisms underlying inequalities based on gender and sexuality, as well as different types of violence.

My work aims at contributing to this important body of literature in that it hopes to further the understanding on how patriarchal norms on gender, homosexuality and violence, and attitudes thereof, are linked to each other, how they change, and how they relate to violent conflict. Providing some answers to those questions remains important to me as a practitioner engaged in the struggle for more justice, equality and peace in the world.

This research started in my living room, when after ten years of working in the field I decided that I wanted to test, through research, the observation that there are links between how people perceive gender (in)equality and homosexuality on the one hand, and what are the levels of violence in the conflict ridden, or post-conflict societies. I had made that observation while I working on women's empowerment and

against gender-based violence in many countries. While I eventually found universities and supervisors willing to work with me I could not obtain a paid PhD position and have thus financed this research mainly by myself, on a shoe-string budget. This has of course had an impact on the methodological approach, as it restricted me to the use of existing data sets, rather than conducting ethnographic fieldwork research. A financial backing would have allowed me to have broader and more varied methods and data. Thus the quality of the data and the epistemological limits of the data sets I used constitute an important limitation to the research.

The existing data sets did not always provide the best data needed, and – as indicated above – it was also problematic to compare them as they weighed some indicators more than others. Some data remain incomplete. There is for instance only comparative data on oppression of and violence against homosexual men in different countries, but not on homosexual women. I looked at all data sets on gender equality that I could find, choosing to use the Global Gender Gap Index (GGGI). There simply are not that many big world-wide data sets covering gender equality and none of them is perfect, but the GGGI is arguable the most used and is giving a picture of the levels of gender inequality in the indexed countries regardless of their level of socio-economic development. There are even less data sets regarding sexuality, heteronormativity and the acceptance of homosexuality, so I used all data sets I could find.

The reliance on existing data sets in the first two studies also led to a limitation in terms of methods in that only statistical analyses were used. While the statistical analyses based on the big data sets are very useful to see overall levels and trends, additional in-depth case studies could have contributed to give a more nuanced and detailed picture of the general levels and trends. Such case studies were not possible within the scope of this thesis though, mainly for financial reasons. Nevertheless, I have indicated, in the chapters, some of the differences

that matter. I noted, for example, how very different countries find themselves in the same group when acceptance of homosexuality is reduced to laws (of prohibiting homosexual relationships, or of allowing same-sex marriage, for example; see chapter 2).

As already noted, these limitations have been addressed by using many different models and data sets that had not been previously used in the type of study done here.

The last study, sponsored by the ISS, which is survey-based, has a very small number of participants, a limited time frame and is geographically and culturally limited to first year male students in the Mumbai region in India. This prevents a generalization of the findings even though its findings provide both another piece of the puzzle of patriarchal attitudes and reasons to make more extensive research on the same topic. When it comes to this study I was driven by the idea that gender trainings were important to research and that they could be crucial in providing insights in how attitudes to patriarchal norms could change in more egalitarian ways I would like to help promote by this research.

Unlike other two studies entirely based on data sets, the third study was actually done among specific demographic group (young, male students doing their first year of bachelor) and was embedded in specific socio-cultural context: contemporary, urban India. That particular context is relevant for the results of the first survey – the attitudes towards gender, sexuality and violence. However, the focus of the study was *not* on the actual attitudes, but *on the links between attitude changes*. I investigated whether change in one set of attitudes (towards gender and sexuality) leads to changes in other set of attitudes (towards violence). For that reason, neither the demographic information about participants nor the socio-cultural context within which the gender training was conducted have been investigated further for this particular research. In addition, the small number of participants

in the training and the high diversity of their demographic information would prevent me from drawing any general conclusions as to the links between the context, the demographic background and the attitudes. Nevertheless, it is certainly worth exploring those links with a larger sample of participants. But that would have to be done in some other research.

1.6 Ethical and political choices and personal involvements

I never wanted to do a PhD for the sake of doing a PhD. I wanted to investigate how patriarchal norms and attitudes and gender inequality are related to both armed conflict and other types of violence. As someone who has worked with women's rights issues in conflict and post-conflict contexts for many years I experienced a lack of scientific arguments for the work of increasing gender equality in volatile situations. Most local politicians and military leaders as well as leaders of international organizations and military forces in the places where I worked considered increased gender equality to be a "soft issue" that could be worked on once there was peace. Most of my colleagues and fellow activists, be they local or international, thought like me, that increasing gender equality was crucial to the peace processes; that peaceful societies with low levels of violence only could be attained if the whole population was treated with respect, included in the effort and represented among the decision-makers. We were often dismissed with the argument that there was no reliable evidence, and especially no "hard data" that gender equality would contribute to peace. My PhD is thus based on the hope to provide some evidence of the importance of gender and sexuality for interventions into violence and violent conflicts, and on a will to extend the knowledge on links between gender, sexuality and violence.

It is of course impossible to stay neutral when it comes to complex and

important issues such as inequalities and violence and I am perfectly aware of many of my own biases, ideals and activism. The use of a quantitative method was thus a good way for me to remain as neutral as possible as I could “let the numbers talk”. This does not mean that I have not been biased in analyzing the data, but I think that the risks of me over-interpreting information would have been much greater with a qualitative approach.

I do hope that my research will be read by other academics and inspire more research in order to understand, in more detail, the mechanisms between gender, sexuality and violence in general, and gender inequality, homophobia and violent conflict specifically. I also hope that this study will be read and used by policy-makers as well as by activists and practitioners who, by referring to this and similar research, will build a stronger argument when asking for policy changes and funding.

This PhD is based on three journal articles as explained above. The articles are thus presented here as three independent chapters each with their own reference list. They have all already been submitted to the relevant journals, and at the time of the submission of this thesis to the committee, one of the articles was already published, one was resubmitted after the comments of the reviewers had been taken into account, and the third was under initial review process.

1.7 References

- Ahmad, F., Riaz, S., Barata, P., & Stewart, D. E. (2004). Patriarchal beliefs and perceptions of abuse among South Asian immigrant women. *Violence against Women*, 10(3), 262-282.
- Barron, J. M., Struckman-Johnson, C., Quevillon, R., & Banka, S. R. (2008). Heterosexual Men's Attitudes Toward Gay Men: A Hierarchical Model Including Masculinity, Openness, and Theoretical Explanations. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 9(3), 154-166.
- Bicchieri, C. (2006). *The Grammar of Society: The Nature and Dynamics of Social*

- Norms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bossom, J. K., & Vandello, J. A. (2011). Precarious Manhood and Its Links to Action and Aggression. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(2), 82-86.
- Carroll, A., & Itaborahy, L. P. (2015). *State-Sponsored Homophobia. A World Survey of Laws: criminalisation, protection and recognition of same-sex love*. Geneva: ILGA.
- Connell, R. (1995). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connell, R., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. *Gender & Society*, 19, 829-859.
- Dahlberg, L. L., Toal, S. B., Swahn, M. H., & Behrens, C. B. (2005). *Measuring Violence-Related Attitudes, Behaviors, and Influences Among Youths: A Compendium of Assessment Tools*, 2nd ed. Atlanta, GA: Center for Disease Control and Prevention.
- David, D. S., & Brannon, R. (Eds.). (1976). *The forty-nine percent majority*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1998). Attitude Structure and Function. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fisk, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 269-322). New York: McGowan-Hill.
- Ekvall, Å. (2013). Gender equality, attitudes to gender equality and conflict. In M. Texler Segal & V. Demos (Eds.), *Gendered Perspectives on Conflict and Violence (Advances in Gender Research Vol. 18a)* (Vol. 18a, pp. 273-295). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Firchow, P., & Mac Ginty, R. (2017). Measuring Peace: Comparability, Commensurability, and Complementarity Using Bottom-Up Indicators. *International Studies Review*, 19, 6-27.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*(3), 167-191.
- Harbom, L., & Wallensteen, P. (2009). Armed Conflicts, 1946-2008. *Journal of Peace Research*, 46(4), 577-587.
- Hausmann, R., Tyson, L. D., & Zahidi, S. (2007). *The Global Gender Gap Report 2007*. Retrieved from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GenderGap_Report_2007.pdf
- Hechter, M., & Opp, K.-D. (Eds.). (2001). *Social Norms*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hegre, H. (2014). Democracy and armed conflict. *Journal of Peace Research*, 51(2), 159-172.
- Holt, S. (2013). The Limits of Formal Metrics During Conflict and Post-Conflict Transition: Exploring Opportunities for Qualitative Assessment in Sri Lanka. *Journal*

- of *Intervention and Statebuilding*, 7(4), 431-452.
- Htun, M., & Weldon, S. L. (2010). When Do Governments Promote Women's Rights? A Framework for the Comparative Analysis of Sex Equality Policy. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8(1), 207-216.
- Hudson, V. M., Ballif-Spanvill, B., Caprioli, M., & Emmett, C. F. (2012). *Sex and World Peace*. New York and Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press.
- Institute for Economics & Peace. (2012). *Global Peace Index*. Retrieved from <http://economicsandpeace.org/research/iep-indices-data/global-peace-index>
- Institute for Economics & Peace. (2014). *Global Peace Index*. Retrieved from http://visionofhumanity.org/app/uploads/2017/04/2014-Global-Peace-Index-REPORT_0-1.pdf
- Kahn, J. S. (2009). *An Introduction to Masculinities*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Keiller, S. W. (2010). Masculine Norms as Correlates of Heterosexual Men's Attitudes Toward Gay Men and Lesbian Women. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 11(1), 38-52.
- Kimmel, M. (2008). *Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Kimmel, M., & Mahler, M. (2003). Adolescent masculinity, homophobia, and violence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 46(10), 1439-1458.
- Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Ludlow, L. H., Diemer, M. A., Scott, R. P. J., Gottfried, M., & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 4, 3-25.
- Men and Gender Equality Policy Project (MGEPP). (2011). *International Men and Gender Equality Survey (IMAGES) Survey Questionnaires*. Rio de Janeiro: Promundo.
- Murphy, M. K. (2006). 'The Fire Will Not Consume Us': Exploring the Link between Homophobia and Sexism in US Feminism. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 15(3), 209-221.
- Myers, D. G. (2008). *Social Psychology*. Boston: McGraw-Hill International Edition.
- Parent, M. C., & Moradi, B. (2009). Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory and Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 10(3), 175-189.
- Pettersson, T., & Wallensteen, P. (2015). Armed conflicts, 1946-2014. *Journal of Peace Research*, 52(4), 536-550.
- Planet Romeo. (2015). *The Gay Happiness Index*. Retrieved from <https://www.planetromeo.com/en/care/gay-happiness-index/>
- Posner, E. (2000). *Law and Social Norms*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

- Reeser, T. W. (2010). *Masculinities in Theory: An Introduction*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Scott, J., & Marshall, G. (Eds.). (2009). *Oxford Dictionary of Sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- The Economist Intelligence Unit. (2014). *Democracy Index*. Retrieved from https://www.eiu.com/public/topical_report.aspx?campaignid=Democracy0115
- UN Women. (2012). *Concepts and Definitions*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/conceptsanddefinitions.htm>
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2015). *Inequality-adjusted Human Development Index*. Retrieved from <http://www.hdr.undp.org/en/composite/IHDI>
- Weaver, J. R., Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., & Burnaford, R. M. (2010). The Proof is in the Punch: Gender Differences in Perceptions of Action and Aggression as Components of Manhood. *Sex Roles*, 62(3), 241-251.
- Whitehead, S. (2002). *Men and Masculinities*. Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press.
- World Bank. (2014). GDP *per capita*. Retrieved from World Bank: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD>
- World Economic Forum. (2014). *The Global Gender Gap Report*. Retrieved from <http://reports.weforum.org/global-gender-gap-report-2014/>
- World Health Organization. (2009). *Violence prevention the evidence: Changing cultural and social norms that support violence*. Geneva: WHO.
- World Values Survey. (2009). *wvs1981_2008_v20090914*. Retrieved from: <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/>
- World Values Survey Association. (2015). *World Values Survey. Wave 6 2010-2014 Official Aggregate v.20150418*. Retrieved from: www.worldvaluessurvey.org

GENDER INEQUALITY, HOMOPHOBIA AND VIOLENCE:
THE THREE PILLARS OF PATRIARCHAL NORMS AND ATTITUDES AND THEIR RELATIONS

– 26 –

2 Gender equality and conflict¹¹

2.1 Introduction

In its “Statement on Women’s Contribution to a Culture of Peace” presented at the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, UNESCO (1995) concluded that inequality between men and women is an impediment to sustainable peace. Many national and international NGO’s share this idea that there is a correlation between the level of gender equality in a society and the risk that that society will use violence to settle conflicts. For instance, International Alert, a British based organization working on peace building states in a report that cultures which limit women’s access to resources and decision-making power, and which characterize women as inferior to men, treat women as property and accept domestic violence as norm, are more prone to repression and violent conflict in the public arena (Schmeidl and Piza-Lopez, 2002).

What has been argued for in the field for years has now also been shown by academic research. Based on the WomanStats data base (WomanStats Project, 2012), which includes over 320 variables measuring gender equality for 175 states, Hudson, Ballif-Spanvill, Caprioli and Emmett (2012) have found robust and highly significant evidence that the physical security of women (including the prevalence of domestic violence, rape, marital rape, and murder of women) is the best predictor of state security, measured through the Global Peace Index (Institute for Economics & Peace, 2012a), the States of Concern to the International Community Scale (Brinton, 2011) and the Relations with Neighboring Countries Index (Institute for Economics & Peace, 2012b),

11 This chapter is © Emerald Publishing Limited and permission has been granted for this version to appear here (<https://emeraldinsight.com/doi/full/10.1108/S1529-2126%282013%29000018A015>). Emerald does not grant permission for this chapter to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Publishing Limited.

far ahead of traditional explanatory variables such as democracy, GDP per capita and prevalence of Islam. They further found that inequalities in family law and the presence or absence of polygyny by far outperformed these traditional explanatory variables in explaining the variance of the levels of conflict. Finally, they also found that if a state is indifferent about enforcing laws that protect the women in its society it is also less likely to be compliant with international norms to which it has committed. They conclude that international security cannot be attained without gender equality, as gender equality is characterized by norms of violence that permeate the society. This is consistent with the findings of Sobek, Abouharb and Ingram (2006, in Hudson et al., 2012, p. 102) that “domestic norms centered on equality and respect for human rights reduce international conflict”.

Scholars have also found correlations between different aspects of gender equality (mainly political and economic) and the presence or absence of armed conflict, both intrastate and inter-state, human rights abuses, the likelihood of becoming involved in militarized intrastate disputes and the likelihood of using violence first during militarized interstate disputes and that an increase in gender equality lead to a decrease in conflict levels (Caprioli, 2000, 2003, 2005; Caprioli and Boyer, 2001; Fish, 2002; Caprioli and Trumbore, 2003a, 2003b, 2005, 2006a, 2006b; Sobek et al., 2006; Melander, 2005a, 2005b; Francis, 2004; Schmeidl & Piza-Lopez, 2002). Other scholars have found correlations between so-called honor cultures, which are focusing on controlling women, their bodies and sexuality and restricting their freedom of movement, on the one hand and high levels of interpersonal violence on the other (Pinker, 2011; Brown, Osterman and Barnes, 2009; Baller, Zevenbergen and Messner, 2009; Somech and Elizur, 2009; Lee, 2011; Lee and Ousey, 2011; Begikhani, 2011; Inglis and MacKeogh, 2012; Ijzerman and Cohen, 2011).

Research has also shown that gender inequality is correlated with a number of state-level indicators including indices of corruption, child

survival/mortality and malnutrition, GDP per capita, global competitiveness ranking and economic growth rates (Kaufman, 1998; Esteve-Volart, 2000; King and Mason, 2001; Hausmann, Tyson and Zahidi, 2007; World Bank, 2001). Fish (2002) further found that indicators related to the subordination of women, including literacy rate gaps and sex ratio, account for a substantial proportion of the relationship between Islam and authoritarianism. He hypothesizes that the oppression of females provides the template for other types of oppression, including authoritarianism.

The correlation between the levels of gender equality and general peacefulness and prosperity in a state thus seems fairly robust. But why is that? As seen above it is hypothesized that the norms on gender (in)equality and violence are connected. Could norms be part of the explanation? Social norms are defined as customary rules of behavior that coordinate interactions between individuals (Young, 2008). Hume was the first to call attention to the central role that norms play in the construction of social order, and it is hard to think of a form of interaction between citizens that is not governed to some degree by social norms (Posner, 2000; Hechter and Opp, 2001; Bicchieri, 2006). Thus norms also play a crucial role in both gender (in)equality and the use of violence in that these norms tell us what is “right” and “normal” and what is not.

This study will look at the relationship between the norms on gender equality on the one hand and actual, measurable levels of both political and socio-economic gender equality and peacefulness (or lack thereof) on the other. Ideally, I would also have wanted to measure the connection between norms on gender equality with norms on and attitudes toward the use of violence, but as there is no data base available with norms on violence I will here limit myself to the connection between norms on gender equality and actual levels of violence and armed conflict. Further, while a certain correlation between the level of gender equality and norms on gender equality can be assumed, this study is innovative in that it measures this correlation. Also, as the data set

used to measure gender equality in this study, the Global Gender Gap Index, has not been used in the previous studies mentioned above it will be used in an attempt to reproduce the results of these studies, testing the possible correlation between the level of gender equality on the one hand and armed conflict and peacefulness on the other.

The study first discusses the relation the literature reports between (norms on) gender equality and the use of violence. Secondly the methods and data used in this study are shortly presented, to be followed by the actual findings in a third section. Finally the study discusses these findings in the light of the importance to be attached to promoting gender equality as a means to lower the use of violence in armed intrastate violence as well as in society in general, thereby containing not only a scientific but also a societal aim.

2.2 Theoretical links between gender equality, norms on gender equality and the use of violence

As seen in the introduction there is a strong correlation between the levels of gender equality (at least the measurable political and socio-economic dimensions of gender equality) and the use of violence at all levels in society.

Figure 2.1 *Levels of gender equality and levels of violence*



The literature presented hereafter suggests that underlying norms and values promoting gender inequality are connected to both actual levels of gender equality and to the acceptance/approval and use of violence.

So what is the literature telling us?

2.2.1 Norms on gender equality and the acceptance of violence

At the heart of the matter are patriarchal values and norms on masculinity. First, patriarchal norms, that is, traditional gender role norms focusing on differences between men and women and on men's supremacy, have been found to be associated with violence. The Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI) (Mahalik, Locke, Ludlow, Diemer, Scott, Gottfried et al., 2003) has proven to be an important tool in advancing the study of masculinity. The CMNI assesses levels of conformity to masculine norms in eleven categories: Winning, Emotional Control, Risk-Taking, Violence, Dominance, Playboy, Self-Reliance, Primacy of Work, Power Over Women, Disdain for Homosexuals, and Pursuit of Status. The CMNI is grounded in Mahalik's "gender role norms model", which posits that socially dominant groups shape the gender role norms that are communicated to individuals in a society. Individuals' experiences of these gender role norms and their level of conformity to such norms are shaped by individual and group factors (e.g. personality, race/ethnicity), and there are costs and benefits for conforming and not conforming to gender role norms" (Parent and Morandi, 2009, p. 176).

Studies using the CMNI found that intimate partner abuse and the specific masculine norms of dominance, emotional control, and self-reliance are associated and that adherence to an anti-femininity norm showed both direct and indirect effects on aggression toward gay men and lesbians (Tager, Good and Brammer, 2010; Vincent, Parrott and Peterson, 2011).

Women also adhere to these norms. It has been found that higher agreement with patriarchal social norms among women predicted a decreased likelihood of identifying an abused woman as a victim of spousal abuse (Ahmad, Riaz, Barata and Steward, 2004). Furthermore, women that witness physical violence are more likely to have tolerant attitudes towards violence against women and an increasing proportion

of women in the community with tolerant attitudes is significantly positively associated with spousal sexual and emotional abuse (Uthman, Moradi and Lavoko, 2011). This corresponds to the theory of reciprocal determinism (Bandura, Wilson, Kunkel, Neale and Liebert, 1977, in Ahmad et al., 2004, p. 265) which “refers to continual interactions between environmental influences, personal factors, and behavior”. Thus women (and men) may normalize and justify the use of violence and not perceive it as abuse.

For young men, adolescence is the time for them to prove themselves to be men, and if they fail they are often thought to be homosexual. The taunt of calling a young man gay is thought to be the worst insult a young man can face. Kimmel (2008) describes the “Guy Code,” part of which entails proving one’s masculinity, and indeed, one’s heterosexuality, on a daily basis. To live up to these ideals, young men aged 16–24 must be popular, athletic, and in no way associated with anything seen as feminine. And the Guy Code encourages the use of violence to avenge any perceived slight or wrong. In this context it is not surprising to hear of school violence. Studies of school shootings tell us that almost all perpetrators have been teased and ridiculed as gay or called a “fag” (Kimmel, 2008; Kimmel and Mahler, 2003; Klein and Chancer, 2000; Kalish and Kimmel, 2010; Katz, 2006).

Furthermore, beliefs supporting the use of violence have been found to be closely associated to normative masculine activities, aggressive behavior, normative masculine attitudes and aggressive and homophobic behavior among adolescent boys. In addition, significant associations between adherence to traditional masculine beliefs and aggression toward heterosexual men and women have been reported. Research on gender roles has indicated that men who strongly adhere to traditional masculine norms are more aggressive than their less traditional counterparts (Reidy, Shirk, Sloan and Zeichner, 2009; Poteat, Kimmel and Wilchins, 2010; Cohn and Zeichner, 2006; Parrott and Zeichner, 2003; Franklin, 2000).

Another concept that is closely related to patriarchal values and masculinity is the so-called honor cultures. Following the logic of Sevrer (2005) who points out that what unites all patriarchies is the obsessive control over women's freedom, sexuality and reproduction, studies on so-called honor cultures show links between control over women's bodies, sexuality and freedom of movement and high levels of interpersonal violence (Pinker, 2011; Begikhani, 2011; Inglis and MacKeogh, 2012; Ijzerman and Cohen, 2011; Korteweg and Yurdakul, 2010).

So-called honor cultures are not only condoning and using violence against women but violence in general although it's usually not called honor-related violence when not directed against women. The many studies of the American South show that several mechanisms keep this culture in place. At the macro level, there are collective representations, social policies, and institutional practices that condone violence in response to insult or threat. These range from formal laws allowing citizens greater freedom to kill in self-defense to informal norms acted out by people and institutions, which fail to stigmatize those who kill to uphold their honor (Cohen, Nisbett, Bowdle, and Schwarz, 1996). Further there are the forces of social organization. Normally these are regarded as restraining people's violent tendencies, but tight family structures, stable communities, and strong religious institutions actually may promote certain forms of violence, as shown in attitude surveys, homicide rates, and preferences for violent entertainment and pastimes. At the micro level, norms are enforced interpersonally. That is, Southern men fear that if they do not respond to an insult, others will view them as less manly (Cohen, Vandello and Rantilla, 1998; Cohen and Nisbett, 1997).

As we have seen the normalization and acceptance of the use of violence is highly influenced by patriarchal values normalizing gender inequality. There are several other mechanisms involved as well. For instance, violence is generally considered to be against social norms. However, when someone (or his/her reputation and/or honor) has been

physically or psychologically attacked or threatened in any way, “it is often acceptable and sometimes even socially prescribed to retaliate in kind” (Feld and Felson, 2008, p. 692) and not only in extreme honor cultures.

Cultural and subculture theories of violence and aggression focus on the role of social values and norms in producing violent and aggressive behavior. The subculture of violence perspective (Wolfgang and Ferracuti, 1967) argues that “social groups exhibit high rates of violent behavior because of widespread adherence of group members to values and norms that support, legitimize, and encourage violent behavior in situations of interpersonal conflict. Such values and norms often involve an ideal of masculinity emphasizing aggression as the expression of toughness, courage, and independence” (Bernburg and Thorlindsson, 2005, p. 457).

The subculture of violence theory suggests that group adherence to values that encourage violence may influence violent behavior in two ways. First, “subcultural values may produce violent behavior through socialization; social actors internalize the values that support violence and act accordingly. Second, subcultures of violence may operate through diffuse social control; widespread commitment of group members to values that support aggression may place pressure on all members to be aggressive, regardless of personal commitment to the values” (Bernburg and Thorlindsson, 2005, p. 459). This is confirmed by research from the United States showing a connection between aggression and adherence to values and attitudes that favors violent behavior (Baron, Kennedy and Forde, 2001; Ousey and Wilcox, 2007).

Furthermore, groups take on an identity of their own in people’s minds, and the individual’s desire to be accepted in the group can override better judgment (Pinker, 2011). Individuals also have a need to promote their own group in comparison to other groups. People also often take their cues on how to behave from other people and may assume that if

no one else is doing anything it can't be that bad. Following this logic, Zimbardo (2007) states that when a group of people is given authority over another group of people it can lead to barbaric actions.

Classical sociology hypothesizes that “collective ideas contextualize human action, influencing behavior through internalization of social values as well as through the threat of social sanctions” (Parsons, 1937 in Bernburg and Thorlindsson, 2005, p. 457). Studies on genocides and other forms of mass violence confirms that one reason people adhere to group norms that endorse violence is fear (Bhavnani, 2006). Both in Rwanda, Cambodia, Guatemala and former Yugoslavia it has been documented that those who refused to participate in the killings were labeled as traitor or defectors and were often tortured and/or killed. As a result many people participated in the violence by fear of being victims of it themselves. In each instance, conformity and participation increased as a result of compulsion, with grave consequences for those who failed to comply. These norms and threats linked to ethnic violence are structurally similar to the norms on so-called honor related violence, where those who fail to comply with the community's norms are punished. Fear of being ridiculed and not considered a “real” man if not conforming to certain aggressive and violent behavior as seen above is most probably related to these phenomena as well.

Furthermore, there are studies showing that violence breeds violence. Lansford and Dodge (2008) found that cultural norms for adult corporal punishment of children are correlated to societal rates of endorsement and use of violence. In other words, societal levels of corporal punishment of children predict societal levels of violence. More corporal punishment is linked to teaching children aggression, warfare, and interpersonal violence. It is not farfetched to think that high levels of gender-based violence also influence societal levels of violence.

The way armed conflict increases gender inequalities by reinforcing traditional norms on masculinity and femininity, reducing women's

possibilities for decision-making, women's freedom of movement and increasing levels of gender-based violence, leading to the possible normalization of higher levels of violence and gender inequality in the society has been thoroughly documented both in UN reports and by NGOs working in conflict zones as well as by academics (Enloe, 2000; Rehn and Johnson Sirleaf, 2002; Lithander, 2000; Cullberg Weston, 2002; Thomasson, 2006; Goldstein, 2001). It thus seems that the causal link can go both ways, violence can impact the levels of gender equality and normalize more unequal norms which in turn can lead to more violence, creating a vicious circle. However, in this study we want to investigate if the norms on gender (in)equality affects the absence or presence of armed conflict, not what happens once the conflict has started, which is why the norms on gender equality are kept as the independent variable and the level of violence as the dependent.

2.2.2 Norms on gender equality and levels of gender equality

What is gender equality then? Different UN organs formulate their definition of gender equality differently but they are all similar to the one used by UN Women (2012): "Equality between women and men (gender equality) refers to the equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women and men and girls and boys. Equality does not mean that women and men will become the same but that women's and men's rights, responsibilities and opportunities will not depend on whether they are born male or female. Gender equality implies that the interests, needs and priorities of both women and men are taken into consideration, recognizing the diversity of different groups of women and men. Gender equality is not a women's issue but should concern and fully engage men as well as women. Equality between women and men is seen both as a human rights issue and as a precondition for, and indicator of, sustainable people-centered development." However, this definition does not mention gender-based violence which is one of the worst types of discrimination against women. In the academic world the definitions are relatively similar. Htun and Weldon (2010) defines

gender equality as “an ideal condition in which men and women have similar opportunities to participate in politics, the economy and social activities; their roles and status are equally valued; neither suffers from gender based disadvantage or discrimination; and both are considered free autonomous beings with dignity and rights.”

Patriarchal norms are closely interrelated with the concept of hegemonic masculinities which has been used to analyze relationships between men and between men and women (Messerschmidt, 2012). It is defined as the form of masculinity in a given historical and societal setting that structures and legitimates hierarchical gender relations between men and women, between masculinity and femininity, and among men.

Hegemonic masculinity theorizes masculinity as a “system of power” (Morris, 2008, p. 730), one in which various practices of masculinity exist, each differing in status. The hegemonic model of masculinity can be defined as a contextually specific pattern of gender practice that “ideologically legitimate[s] the global subordination of women to men” (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 832). While few men fully embody this set of practices, it is accepted as an ideal, and other masculinities are stratified in relation to it. Men construct masculinity differently based on their race, class, or sexual orientation (along with other factors) – making studies on masculinities intersectional - and such constructions position them differentially in the overall masculine hierarchy. “Positions within this hierarchy also differ according to the particular version of masculinity constructed. Some men, particularly white, middle-class, heterosexual men, may exercise power both over women and over other men. Other men, such as those who are disadvantaged by race or social class, may not enjoy as much power” (Morris, 2008, p. 731). Nonetheless, these disadvantaged men can still benefit from the system by “expressing masculine qualities that display overt dominance over women such as aggression, physicality, and control” (Pyke, 1996, in Morris, 2008, p. 731). Thus, men who are

marginalized in other ways can be complicit in accepting and expressing many hegemonic characteristics associated with “being a man.” Further, a clear link between socialization into stereotypical norms of hegemonic masculinity and an increased risk of experiencing violence has been documented (Hong, 2000), linking hegemonic masculinities to both gender inequality and violence.

As we can see, hegemonic masculinities are closely related to patriarchal values and also to gender inequality and violence, especially what Galtung (1969, 1990) defines as structural and cultural violence through norms and values. For example, as seen in the previous section tolerant attitudes towards violence against women is significantly correlated to the levels of spousal abuse.

So-called honor cultures are not only linked to high levels of aggression and inter-personal violence as seen in the previous section but also, and perhaps more notoriously, to control over and violence against women (Pinker, 2011; Brown et al., 2009; Baller et al., 2009; Somech and Elizur, 2009; Lee, 2011; Begikhani, 2011; Inglis and MacKeogh, 2012; Ijzerman and Cohen, 2011; Korteweg and Yurdakul, 2010). The control is mainly carried out by the men in the family, but the women also take part in this control and in the maintaining of the practice. In many cases women who do not take part in the control of the other women in the family and the perpetuating of the practice will also be subject to violence. The correction of “mistakes” through violence and sometimes even murder is crucial for this practice to survive. When the honor of a man, and by extension his whole family, is threatened, the woman perceived to be responsible for trespassing the limits of accepted behavior is punished. The punishable behavior could be interaction with unrelated men, and sometimes just rumors of contact. The control of women’s sexuality is of great importance for a man’s honor, which means that women’s behavior must be controlled for this honor to be kept intact. This means for instance, that “a woman’s possibility to have contacts outside the family and the home is very limited. The woman’s role is to stay virgin

until married off, then breed children and take care of the household. Therefore her virginity is of utmost importance to keep intact before marriage” (Kvinnoforum, 2005, p. 16). Securing the purity of the bride is one reason for the early marriages within the communities obsessed with honor. Within the community a man’s honor is an asset for him and for all his extended family. A girl’s virginity is an asset for her family that is necessary to be able to marry her off (Kvinnoforum, 2005; Sev’er and Yurdakul, 2001; van Eck, 2003; Mojab, 2004; Korteweg and Yurdakul, 2010).

So called honor cultures can be found all over the world, including the West. However, the presence of honor cultures is more common in certain parts of the world, such as India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and countries in the Middle East. The concept honor related violence includes sequestration, physical violence, forced marriage, and all forms of control of women’s bodies and behavior including murder in extreme cases. With female genital mutilation included in the definition many parts of Africa are included as honor cultures as well. Due to immigration the problem has been identified as extensive in many parts of Europe as well in the last few years (Kvinnoforum, 2005). Although many people associate so-called honor related violence including so-called honor killings with Islam they predate Islam and are not consistent with the Qur’an (Sev’er and Yurdakul, 2001). Many feminists argue that all fundamentalist religious movements are deeply patriarchal, whether they are Muslim, Christian, Jewish, Hindu or other, and “use the control of women’s bodies symbolically to assert a broad agenda of authoritarian political and cultural control” (Gill, Begikhani and Hague, 2012, p. 76; Werbner, 2007; Yuval-Davis, 2009; Barzilai, 2004).


In communities with so called honor cultures what is seen as normal or not, and what is seen as good and bad, is different for men and women. In some honor-based societies, male honor is linked to “respect, virtue, merit, social rank, caste/class, or public reputation: thus, it may be determined by achievements and courage as well as one’s family

background. By contrast, female honor is almost universally viewed as determined by a woman's sexual behavior: specifically, by their adherence to cultural demands that they remain chaste and "pure" until their marriage and faithful thereafter. Thus, while male honor can be acquired, accumulated and lost, women cannot acquire or achieve honor but only maintain or injure it through their actions" (Gill et al, 2012, p. 81).

Honor cultures, patriarchal and hierarchical in nature, are thus linked to both gender inequalities and the use of violence.

This literature therefore adds another component to Figure 2.1:

Figure 2.2 *Norms on gender equality, levels of gender equality and levels of violence*



2.3 Method and data

This article will study the relationship between the norms on gender equality on the one hand and the levels of gender equality and violence on the other. Based on the literature discussed above five hypotheses have been developed. First we will test the relationship between the level of gender equality in a country and the level of violence in an attempt to reproduce the findings accounted for in the introduction. This will also test the validity of the data bases used in the study.

- H1: The higher the level of political and socio-economic gender equality in a country, the less likely it is that it will experience an intrastate armed conflict.
- H2: The higher the level of political and socio-economic gender equality in a country, the more peaceful the country is in general.

These hypotheses will be tested using data from the Global Gender Gap Index 2008, the Uppsala Conflict Data Base 2008 and the Global Peace Index 2008.

Furthermore, we have seen that the normalization of the use of violence is being influenced by patriarchal norms and also through threats of either social or violent sanctions and punishments; the so-called sub-culture of violence approach; group dynamics and exposure to violence (reciprocal determinism). From this material I derive the following two hypotheses:

- H3: The more people approve of gender equality in a country, the less likely it is that there will be an armed conflict.
- H4: The more people approve of gender equality in a country, the more peaceful it will be in general.

These hypotheses will be investigated with data from the World Values Survey 1981-2008, the Uppsala Conflict Data Base 2008 and the Global Peace Index 2008.

Finally, patriarchal norms on gender inequality are seemingly related to control over and violence toward women which leads us to set up a control hypothesis:

- H5: The more people approve of gender equality in a country, the higher the level of political and socio-economic equality.

This hypothesis will be investigated using data from the World Values Survey 1981-2008 and the Global Gender Gap Index 2008.

The data of norms on gender equality comes from the World Values Survey (WVS) (World Values Survey, 1981-2008), data on measurable gender equality in the political, economic, educational and health spheres on the state level from the Global Gender Gap Index (GGGI) (Hausmann, Tyson and Zahidi, 2008), data on the presence or absence of armed intra-state conflict from the Uppsala Conflict Data Base (UCDB) (Harbom and Wallensteen, 2009) and data on a more inclusive and general peacefulness from the Global Peace Index (GPI) (Institute for Economics & Peace, 2012a). The article includes all countries that are both in the WVS and the GGGI.

The WVS is a worldwide network of social scientists studying changing values and their impact on social and political life. The WVS carried out representative national surveys in 97 societies containing almost 90 percent of the world's population. These surveys show pervasive changes in what people want out of life and what they believe. In order to monitor these changes, the WVS has executed five waves of surveys, starting in 1981. In this study aggregated data from the five surveys (1981-2008) will be used in order to cover as many countries and as many survey questions as possible.

The WVS has hundreds of questions or variables divided into the categories a) perceptions of life; b) environment; c) work; d) family; e) politics and society; f) religion and morale; g) national identity, and x) socio-demographics, most of which have nothing to do with gender equality. Thus the first step consisted of the establishment of a list of variables pertinent to gender equality. Then variables that were only measured in one or a few countries were eliminated from the list as the limited data would not have been significant in the analysis. A more thorough study of other variables eliminated a few more. Some variables had answers coded as "no" "yes" and "other," with a preva-

lence of “other/neither” responses in some countries. An example is the WVS variable Doz4 “If someone said that individuals should have the chance to enjoy complete sexual freedom without being restricted, would you tend to agree or disagree?” Initially one might think that a high number of people agreeing would indicate a country with a high level of gender equality. However, a cross tabulation showed that the results were greatly mixed. Sweden, a country known for high levels of sexual freedom had about half of the surveyed population disagreeing. Other Scandinavian countries had high levels of people answering “neither.” Considering the high levels of sexual education and debate around sexual abuse in the Scandinavian countries it is possible that respondents have thought that the “no restriction” meant possibility for abuse. Meanwhile several Muslim countries also scored high on the “neither,” There is a possibility that these respondents thought that sexual freedom was acceptable for men but not for women. Thus the question is too open for interpretation, with a non-negligible possibility that the replies do not mean the same thing in different countries, making it impossible to infer a value behind these opinions. This variable and others equally problematic have been removed from the list.

The value variables that have been retained are the following:

- a. Can divorce be justifiable?
- b. University is more important for a boy than for a girl.
- c. Men make better business executives than women.
- d. Men make better political leaders than women.
- e. An essential characteristic of a democracy is that women have the same rights as men.
- f. Women as single parents (this variable had the possible replies “approve,” “disapprove” and “neither” which made for data that were quite difficult to interpret, which is why it is the % disapproving of women as single mothers that is used here).

- g In times of job scarcity men have more right to a job than women (this variable is also problematic in that it has the responses “agree,” “disagree” and “neither,” which is why the % agreeing that men have more right to a job than women is used).

The GGGI is to be found in the Global Gender Gap Report, published annually by the World Economic Forum since 2006. The Index benchmarks national gender gaps (and not general achievement levels) on economic, political, education- and health-based criteria, and provides country rankings that allow for effective comparisons across regions and income groups, and over time. The variables used to measure gender gaps in the category Economic Participation and Opportunity are the ratio of female labor force participation over male; wage equality between women and men for similar work; the ratio of estimated female earned income over male; the ratio of female legislators, senior officials and managers over male and the ratio of female professional and technical workers over male. The educational attainment category is measured through the ratio of the female literacy rate over male; the female net primary level enrolment over male; the female net secondary level enrolment over male and the female gross tertiary level enrolment over male. The political empowerment category is measured by the ratio of females with seats in parliament over male; the ratio of females at ministerial level over male and the number of years of a female head of state (last 50 years) over male value. Finally, the health and survival category is measured by the variables ratio of female healthy life expectancy over male value and sex ratio at birth. As it only exists since 2006 it cannot cover the whole period of the WVS (1981-2008), which is why the end year of the WVS, 2008, has been chosen.

The UCDB is produced by the Uppsala Conflict Data Program at Uppsala University and it collects information on a large number of aspects of armed violence since 1946. Since the 1970s, the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) has recorded on-going violent conflicts. The UCDP data is one of the most accurate and well-used data-sources on global

armed conflicts and its definition of armed conflict is becoming a standard in how conflicts are systematically defined and studied. Armed conflicts are defined as a contested incompatibility that concerns government or territory or both where the use of armed force between two parties results in at least 25 battle-related deaths in a year. Of these two parties at least one has to be the government of the state. Data on armed conflicts have been published yearly in the report series *States in Armed Conflict* since 1987, in the *SIPRI Yearbook* since 1988, the *Journal of Peace Research* since 1993, and in the *Human Security Reports* since 2005. This study uses data on absence and presence of armed conflict from the years 1981 to 2008 in order to cover the same period as the WVS.

The GPI, produced by the Institute for Economics and Peace since 2007, is one of the world's leading measures of global peacefulness. It gauges on-going domestic and international conflict, safety and security in society and militarization in 153 countries by taking into account 23 separate indicators. These indicators are: perceived criminality in society; security officers & police; homicides; jailed population; access to weapons; organized conflict (internal); violent demonstrations; violent crimes; political instability; political terror; weapons imports; terrorist acts; deaths from conflict (internal); military expenditure; armed services personnel; UN peacekeeping funding; heavy weapons; weapons exports; military capability; displaced people; neighboring country relations; conflicts fought and, deaths from conflict (external). As with the GGGI the data from 2008 is used.

As the WVS variables initially were coded on different scales all were re-coded to the most prevalent scale of the WVS, 1-4, with 1 being the least approving of gender equality and 4 the most. The GGGI was not recoded and also has its lowest score as the least egalitarian and the highest as the most egalitarian. In order to get positive t-values the GPI, which initially had its lowest scores being the most peaceful, was transformed to negative (that is a score of 2.356 was transformed to -2.356

etc.), thus the highest scores became the most peaceful ones. Following the same logic, using the UCDB, every country was coded -1 for having had an armed conflict during the period and 0 for not having had one.

2.4 Findings

An initial factor analysis of the seven value variables shows parsimony, that is, they are all connected, and to such degree that only one component is extracted in the matrix. This component explains a full 68% of the total variance. This result allows us to merge, or aggregate, the seven variables into one factor, that is, a new variable, called "Aggregated gender equality values." The sampling adequacy of the factor analysis was tested with the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure and found to be within the excellent range at .787. The Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, which examines whether the matrix is different from the identity matrix, was significant at .000 indicating that the matrix does not resemble an identity matrix, further supporting the existence of one factor within the data.

In order to further test the reliability, or the internal consistency, of the aggregation of the seven value variables a Cronbach's alpha test was carried out, giving a score of .861, thus validating the choice to aggregate the data.

A bivariate correlation was carried out, using the Spearman's correlation coefficient, in order to see the relationship between the aggregated gender equality value variable, the GGGI, the UCDB and the GPI.

As can be seen in Table 2.1, all correlations are positive, strong and highly significant, confirming all five hypotheses. The only correlation that is slightly less strong than the others, albeit still significant, is between the levels of political and socio-economic gender equality (GGGI) and the levels of general peacefulness (GPI).

Table 2.1 Correlation between the aggregated gender equality values, the Global Gender Gap Index, armed conflicts and the Global Peace Index.*

Test	1	2	3	4
Aggregated gender equality values	1			
Global Gender Gap Index	.643	1		
Armed conflicts	.563	.403	1	
Global Peace Index	.420	.278	.576	1

Source: World Value Survey 1981-2008, Global Gender Gap Index 2008, States in Armed Conflict 2008, Global Peace Index 2008.

**All correlations are significant to the .001 level (two-tailed).*

This means that we have reproduced the findings of previous studies mentioned in the introduction, showing that the higher the level of political and socio-economic gender equality in a country, the less likely it is that it will experience an armed conflict and the more peaceful it is in general (hypotheses 1 and 2). Further, a possible explanatory factor of this correlation has been found in that both hypotheses 3 and 4 were confirmed, telling us that the more people approve of gender equality in a country, the less likely it is that there will be an armed conflict and the more peaceful it will be in general. Finally, the test hypothesis (H5) also turned out to be confirmed, showing a strong correlation between norms on and levels of gender equality, that is the more people approve of gender equality in a country the higher the level of political and socio-economic gender equality as measured by the GGGI.

A causal link cannot be proven for any of the five hypotheses. As indicated by the literature the relationships can go both ways. The strong and significant relationships found between our norms and values on gender equality and actual levels of gender equality, conflict and general peacefulness show that there is a need to think about prevention of violence and conflict in a new way, not reducing gender equality to “women’s issues” that can be dealt with later when the “hard” issues have been solved.

2.5 Conclusion

I wanted to see if the correlation between gender equality and the levels of violence, including armed conflict, that has been found in previous studies could be reproduced and if I could find a similar correlation for the relationship between norms on gender equality and the levels of violence. A statistical analysis of the different data sets used has both reconfirmed the previous findings by other scholars and confirmed the strong correlation between norms on gender equality and levels of violence I hypothesized. The implications of these findings are twofold.

First they promote further research into the causal mechanisms of the relationship between (norms on) gender inequality and violence. While the literature suggests the causality might go two ways, this is not confirmed and if it should be it is possible that the different directions carry different strengths. Further research on how to influence norms on gender equality is also called for, especially in contexts of high levels of violence and armed conflict.

Second, the findings are crucial for the development of policies on conflict management, peace building and sustainable development. While top-down policies and measures, such as new legislations and law enforcement can have a positive impact on both the levels of gender equality and norms on and attitudes toward gender equality it appears crucial in the light of these findings to also focus on a bottom-up approach. Making people think differently about gender relations will most certainly also change how they think about the use of violence. Governments, development agencies and NGOs working on conflict prevention and/or peace building all of whom are focusing on changing patriarchal mentalities and structures, visible in attitudes to and levels of gender equality, should achieve a much larger success than those ignoring the situation of women.

2.6 References

- Ahmad, F., Riaz, S., Barata, P. & Stewart, D. E. 2004. Patriarchal beliefs and perceptions of abuse among South Asian immigrant women. *Violence against Women*, 10 (3), 262-282.
- Baller, R. D., Zevenbergen, M. P. & Messner, S. F. 2009. The Heritage of Herding and Southern Homicide Examining the Ecological Foundations of the Code of Honor Thesis. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 46(3), 275-300.
- Bandura, A., Wilson, G. T., Kunkel, J., Neale, J. M. & Liebert, R. M. 1977. *Social learning theory*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.
- Baron, S. W., Kennedy, L. W. & Forde, D. R. 2001. Male Street Youths' Conflict: The Role of Background, Subcultural, and Situational Factors. *Justice Quarterly*, 18, 759-789.
- Barzilai, G. 2004. Culture of patriarchy in law: Violence from antiquity to modernity. *Law & Society Review*, 38(4), 867-883.
- Begikhani, N. 2011. Honour killing and strategies of prevention in Kurdistan. *Pensee*, 367, 63-73.
- Bernburg, J. G., & Thorlindsson, T. (2005). Violent values, conduct norms, and youth aggression: A multilevel study in Iceland. *Sociological Quarterly*, 46(3), 457-478.
- Bhavnnani, R. 2006. Ethnic norms and interethnic violence: Accounting for mass participation in the Rwandan genocide. *Journal of Peace Research*, 43(6), 651-669.
- Bicchieri, C. 2006. *The Grammar of Society: The Nature and Dynamics of Social Norms*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Brinton, C. 2011. *States of Concern to the International Community*. Retrieved from: <http://vmrhudson.org/socic.html>.
- Brown, R. P., Osterman, L. L. & Barnes, C. D. 2009. School Violence and the Culture of Honor. *Psychological Science*, 20(11), 1400-1405.
- Caprioli, M. 2000. *Gendered Conflict*. *Journal of Peace Research*, 37(1), 51-68.
- Caprioli, M. 2003. Gender equality and state aggression: The impact of domestic gender equality on state first use of force. *International Interactions*, 29(3), 195-214.
- Caprioli, M. 2005. Primed for violence: The role of gender inequality in predicting internal conflict. *International Studies Quarterly*, 49(2), 161-178.
- Caprioli, M. & Boyer, M. A. 2001. Gender, Violence, and International Crisis. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 45(4), 503-518.
- Caprioli, M. & Trumbore, P. F. 2003a. Ethnic discrimination and interstate violence: Testing the international impact of domestic behavior. *Journal of Peace Research*, 40(1), 5-23.

- Caprioli, M. & Trumbore, P. F. 2003b. Identifying 'rogue' states and testing their interstate conflict behavior. *European Journal of International Relations*, 9(3), 377-406.
- Caprioli, M. & Trumbore, P. F. 2005. Rhetoric versus Reality: Rogue States in Interstate Conflict. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 49(5), 770-791.
- Caprioli, M. & Trumbore, P. F. 2006a. First Use of Violent Force in Militarized Interstate Disputes, 1980-2001. *Journal of Peace Research*, 43(6), 741-749.
- Caprioli, M. & Trumbore, P. F. 2006b. Human rights rogues in interstate disputes, 1980-2001. *Journal of Peace Research*, 43(2), 131-148.
- Cohen, D., Nisbett, R., Bowdle, B. & Schwarz, N. 1996. Insult, Aggression, and the Southern Culture of Honor. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 945-960.
- Cohen, D. & Nisbett, R. E. 1997. Field experiments examining the culture of honor: The role of institutions perpetuating norms about violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(11), 1188-1199.
- Cohen, D., Vandello, J. & Rantilla, A. 1998. The Sacred and the Social: Honor and Violence in Cultural Context. In: Gilbert, P. & Andrews, B. (eds.) *Shame*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cohn, A. & Zeichner, A. 2006. Effects of masculine identity and gender role stress on aggression in men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 7, 179 – 190.
- Connell, R. & Messerschmidt, J. W. 2005. Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. *Gender & Society*, 19(6), 829-859.
- Cullberg Weston, M. 2002. *War is not over with the last bullet. Overcoming Obstacles in the Healing Process for Women in Bosnia-Herzegovina*. Stockholm: Kvinna till Kvinna.
- Enloe, C. 2000. *Maneuvers: the international politics of militarizing women's lives.*, Berkely, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Esteve-Volart, B. 2000. Sex Discrimination and Growth. *IMF Working Paper*. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund, African Department.
- Feld, S. L. & Felson, R. B. 2008. Gender norms and retaliatory violence against spouses and acquaintances. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29(5), 692-703.
- Fish, M. S. 2002. Islam and Authoritarianism. *World Politics*, 55(1), 4-37.
- Francis, D. 2004. Culture, Power Asymmetries and Gender in Conflict Transformation. In *Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation*. Berghof: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.
- Franklin, K. 2000. Antigay behaviors among young adults: Prevalence, patterns,

- and motivators in a noncriminal population. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 15, 339-362.
- Gill, A. K., Begikhani, N., & Hague, G. (2012). 'Honour'-based violence in Kurdish communities. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 35(2), 75-85.
- Goldstein, J. S. 2001. *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice-Versa.*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Harbom, L. & Wallensteen, P. 2009. Armed Conflicts, 1946—2008. *Journal of Peace Research*, 46(4), 577-587.
- Hausmann, R., Tyson, L. D. & Zahidi, S. 2007. *The Global Gender Gap Report 2007*. World Economic Forum. Retrieved from: http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GenderGap_Report_2007.pdf
- Hausmann, R., Tyson, L. D. & Zahidi, S. 2008. *The Global Gender Gap Report*. World Economic Forum. Retrieved from: http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GenderGap_Report_2008.pdf
- Hechter, M. & Opp, K.-D. (eds.) 2001. *Social Norms*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hong, L. 2000. Toward a Transformed Approach to Prevention: Breaking the Link Between Masculinity and Violence. *Journal of American College Health*, 48(6), 269.
- Htun, M. & Weldon, S. L. 2010. When Do Governments Promote Women's Rights? A Framework for the Comparative Analysis of Sex Equality Policy. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8(1), 207-216.
- Hudson, V. M., Ballif-Spanvill, B., Caprioli, M. & Emmett, C. F. 2012. *Sex and World Peace*, New York and Chichester, West Sussex, Columbia University Press.
- Ijzerman, H. & Cohen, D. 2011. Grounding cultural syndromes: Body comportment and values in honor and dignity cultures. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 41(4), 456-467.
- Inglis, T. & MacKeogh, C. 2012. The double bind: Women, honour and sexuality in contemporary Ireland. *Media Culture & Society*, 34(1), 68-82.
- Institute for Economics & Peace. 2012a. *Global Peace Index*. Retrieved from: <http://economicsandpeace.org/research/iep-indices-data/global-peace-index>
- Institute for Economics & Peace. 2012b. *Relations with Neighboring Countries Index*. Retrieved from: <http://www.visionofhumanity.org/gpi-data/#/2012/RELA/>
- Kalish, R. & Kimmel, M. 2010. Suicide by mass murder: Masculinity, aggrieved entitlement, and rampage school shootings. *Health Sociology Review*, 19(4), 451-464.

- Katz, J. 2006. *The macho paradox: Why some men hurt women and how all men can help.*, Illinois, Sourcebooks.
- Kaufmann, D. 1998. Challenges in the Next Stage of Corruption. In: Kaufmann, D. & Schloss, M. (eds.) *New Perspectives in Combating Corruption*. Washington, DC: Transparency International and the World Bank.
- Kimmel, M. 2008. Guyland: *The perilous world where boys become men.*, New York, Harper Collins.
- Kimmel, M. & Mahler, M. 2003. Adolescent masculinity, homophobia, and violence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 46(10), 1439–1458.
- King, E. M. & Mason, A. D. 2001. *Engendering Development*, Washington, D.C., World Bank.
- Klein, J. & Chancer, L. 2000. Masculinity matters: The omission of gender from high-profile school violence cases. In: Spina, S. (ed.) *Smoke and mirrors: The hidden context of violence in schools and society*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Korteweg, A. C. & Yurdakul, G. 2010. Religion, Culture and the Politization of Honour-Related Violence. A Critical Analysis of Media and Policy Debates in Western Europe and Northe America. In: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (ed.) *Gender and Development Programme*. Paper number 12.
- Kvinnoforum 2005. *Honour Related Violence: A European Resource Book and Good Practice-Based on the European Project "Prevention of Violence against Women and Girls in Patriarchal Families"*. Stockholm: Kvinnoforum/European Commission DG Social Affairs and Employment.
- Lansford, J. E. & Dodge, K. A. 2008. Cultural norms for adult corporal punishment of children and societal rates of endorsement and use of violence. *Parenting-Science and Practice*, 8(3), 257-270.
- Lee, M. R. 2011. Reconsidering Culture and Homicide. *Homicide Studies*, 15(4), 319-340.
- Lee, M. R. & Ousey, G. C. 2011. Reconsidering the Culture and Violence Connection: Strategies of Action in the Rural South. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(5), 899-929.
- Lithander, A. 2000. *Engendering the Peace Process, A Gender Approach to Dayton - and Beyond*. Stockholm: Kvinna till Kvinna.
- Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Ludlow, L. H., Diemer, M. A., Scott, R. P., Gottfried, M. & AL., E. 2003. Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 4, 3-25.
- Melander, E. 2005a. Gender equality and intrastate armed conflict. *International Studies Quarterly*, 49(4), 695-714.

- Melander, E. 2005b. Political Gender Equality and State Human Rights Abuse. *Journal of Peace Research*, 42(2), 149-166.
- Messerschmidt, J. W. 2012. Engendering Gendered Knowledge: Assessing the Academic Appropriation of Hegemonic Masculinity. *Men and Masculinities*, 15(1), 56-76.
- Mojab, S. 2004. *Violence in the Name of Honour: Theoretical and Political Challenges*, Istanbul, Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Morris, E. W. 2008. 'Rednecks', 'Rutters', and 'Rithmetic': Social Class, Masculinity, and Schooling in a Rural Context. *Gender & Society*, 22, 728-751.
- Ousey, G. C. & Wilcox, P. 2007. The interaction of antisocial propensity and life-course varying predictors of delinquent behavior: differences by method of estimation and implications for theory. *Criminology*, 45(2), 313-354.
- Parent, M. C. & Moradi, B. 2009. Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory and Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 10(3), 175-189.
- Parrott, D. J. & Zeichner, A. 2003. Effects of hypermasculinity on physical aggression against women. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 4, 70-78.
- Parsons, T. 1937. *The Structure of Social Action*. , New York: The Free Press.
- Pinker, S. 2011. *The Better Angels of Our Nature. Why Violence Has Declined.*, New York, Viking Penguin.
- Posner, E. 2000. *Law and Social Norms*, Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Poteat, V. P., Kimmel, M. S. & Wilchins, R. 2011. The Moderating Effects of Support for Violence Beliefs on Masculine Norms, Aggression, and Homophobic Behavior During Adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21(2), 434-447.
- Pyke, K. D. 1996. Class-based masculinities: The interdependence of gender, class, and interpersonal power. *Gender & Society*, 10(5), 527-549.
- Rehn, E. & Johnson Sirleaf, E. 2002. *War, Women, Peace, Progress of the World's Women*. New York: UNIFEM.
- Reidy, D. E., Shirk, S. D., Sloan, C. A. & Zeichner, A. 2009. Men Who Aggress Against Women: Effects of Feminine Gender Role Violation on Physical Aggression in Hypermasculine Men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 10(1), 1-12.
- Schmeidl, S. & Piza-Lopez, E. 2002. *Gender and Conflict Early Warning: A Framework for Action*. London: International Alert.
- Sev'er, A. 2005. In the name of the fathers: Honor killings and some examples from South-Eastern Turkey. *Women's Studies Journal*, 30(1), 129-145.

- Sev'er, A. & Yurdakul, G. 2001. Culture of honor, culture of change: A feminist analysis of honor killings in rural Turkey. *Violence against Women*, 7(9), 964-998.
- Sobek, D., Abouharb, M. R. & Ingram, C. G. 2006. The Human Rights Peace: How the Respect for Human Rights at Home Leads to Peace Abroad. *Journal of Politics*, 68(3), 519-529.
- Somech, L. Y. & Elizur, Y. 2009. Adherence to Honor Code Mediates the Prediction of Adolescent Boys' Conduct Problems by Callousness and Socioeconomic Status. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 38(5), 606-618.
- Tager, D., Good, G. E. & Brammer, S. 2010. "Walking Over 'Em": An Exploration of Relations Between Emotion Dysregulation, Masculine Norms, and Intimate Partner Abuse in a Clinical Sample of Men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 11(3), 233-239.
- Thomasson, R. 2006. *To Make Room for Changes - Peace Strategies from Women Organisations in Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Stockholm: Kvinna till Kvinna.
- UN Women 2012. *Concepts and definitions*. Retrieved from: <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/conceptsanddefinitions.htm>
- UNESCO 1995. Statement on Women's Contribution to a Culture of Peace. *Forth World Conference on Women*. Beijing.
- Uthman, O. A., Moradi, T. & Lawoko, S. 2011. Are Individual and Community Acceptance and Witnessing of Intimate Partner Violence Related to Its Occurrence? Multilevel Structural Equation Model. *Plos One*, 6(12), 1-8.
- Van Eck, C. 2003. *Purified by Blood: Honour Killings amongst Turks in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press.
- Vincent, W., Parrott, D. J. & Peterson, J. L. 2011. Effects of Traditional Gender Role Norms and Religious Fundamentalism on Self-identified Heterosexual Men's Attitudes, Anger, and Aggression Toward Gay Men and Lesbians. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 12(4), 383-400.
- Werbner, P. 2007. Veiled interventions in pure space - Honour, shame and embodied struggles among Muslims in Britain and France. *Theory Culture & Society*, 24(2), 161-+.
- Wolfgang, M. & Ferracuti, F. 1967. *The Subculture of Violence*. London, Tavistock.
- WomanStats Project. 2012. *WomanStats Database*. Retrieved from: <http://www.womanstats.org/>.
- World Bank 2001. *Engendering Development: Through Gender Equality in Rights, Resources, and Voice World Bank Policy Research Report*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- World Values Survey. 1981-2008. *WVS Five Wave Aggregated File 1981-2005*. Retrieved

from: <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/>

Young, H. P. 2008. "social norms". In: Durlauf, S. N. & Blume, L. E. (eds.) *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics. Second Edition*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Yuval-Davis, N. 2009. Intersectionality. *Feministische Studien*, 27, 51-+.

Zimbardo, P. 2007. The lucifer effect - Understanding how good people turn evil. *Psychologist*, 20, 494-495.

GENDER INEQUALITY, HOMOPHOBIA AND VIOLENCE:
THE THREE PILLARS OF PATRIARCHAL NORMS AND ATTITUDES AND THEIR RELATIONS

– 56 –

3 Don't be gay: homophobia, violence and conflict

3.1 Introduction

Feminist research has pointed out that adherence to patriarchal norms and attitudes that sustain gender inequality, in society and by individuals, correlates with violence against women and other forms of violence, including armed conflict (Beyer, 2014). The more people in a society are positive to gender equality, the less violence there is and vice versa (Ekvall, 2013). Hudson et al.'s (2012) study, the largest to date, demonstrates that gender inequality – defined as women's physical insecurity, unequal family law and polygyny – is a stronger predictor of armed conflict than traditional explanatory variables such as economic development, democratization or Islam. Melander's (2005) research also found that an increase in levels of gender equality is correlated with a decrease of levels of armed conflict.

A growing body of literature focuses on violence against homosexuals (Keiller, 2010), as well as violence committed by men wanting to prove that they are not homosexuals (Kimmel, 2008). A few studies have looked at norms on masculinity in relation to military masculinities (Belkin and Bateman, 2003; Higate, 2012) and the added vulnerability and threat to sexual minorities in times of armed conflict (Myrtilinen and Daigle, 2017). Yet there are no studies relating intolerance of homosexuality to levels of violence in the way that gender inequality has been related to levels of violence. As heteronormativity and gender inequality are the two most prominent features of patriarchy (Connell, 1995), and as gender inequality is strongly correlated to several forms of violence including armed conflict, this contribution investigates whether patriarchal attitudes to homosexuality can be linked to forms

of violence beyond individual violence against gay men, in a similar way that gender inequality and violence against women relate to various other forms of violence.

While acceptance of homosexuality is increasing in some countries, intolerance of homosexuality is also on the rise in many parts of the world (Currier, 2010; Ratele, 2014). Homosexuality can lead to life imprisonment, such as in Uganda (Thoreson, 2015) and to the death penalty, such as in Iran, Mauretania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan and Yemen as well as in some provinces of Nigeria, Somalia and the UAE (Carroll and Itaborahy, 2015). Understanding whether, and how, the sometimes violent, homophobic attitudes relate to different types of violence in contemporary societies is thus relevant, both theoretically and politically: understanding correlations between homophobia and different types of violence would broaden our understanding of violent conflicts and help policy actors in their attempts to prevent or reduce violence.

Considering the relation between gender inequality and violence and that gender inequality and intolerance of homosexuality are the two main pillars of patriarchal norms we first discuss the literature addressing gender, sexuality and violence and the relations between them. Then we address the relationship between intolerance of homosexuality and several types of violence, in four steps, using quantitative analysis. The use of quantitative analysis is an attempt to test what have so far mostly been theoretical assumptions about relationships between gender, heteronormativity and violence.

Previous studies have mainly focused on male homosexuality. This study also focus on male homosexuality, both because of the interest in patriarchal norms on masculinity and because of the absence of data on discrimination of and violence against female homosexuals.

3.2 Patriarchal attitudes to gender and sexuality

Feminist scholars argue that an incontestable relationship exists between homophobia and sexism. Such arguments are based on “the assumption that both homophobia and sexism play crucial roles in preserving patriarchal gender ideologies and maintaining the polarization of the masculine and feminine” (Murphy, 2006, p. 209). Connell’s work on hegemonic masculinities is the case in point (Connell, 1995). Hegemonic masculinities are marked by both a disdain of women and femininity, and by adhering to heteronormativity – a heterosexuality institutionalized as the normative sexuality. Homosexuality defies the conventional norms that enforce “appropriate sexual desires for men and women”, leading homosexuals – and especially homosexual men – to be viewed as “gender deviants”, indicating that notions of heterosexuality are dependent on the notions of gender (Murphy, 2006, p. 211).

Connell argued that “harboring negative views toward gay men may be related to underlying sexism” (Connell, 1995, p. 78). Around the world there are dominant ideals of what “real men” are or should be. Definitions most often include power and heterosexuality, meaning that without either power or heterosexual virility, men are not seen as “real men” (Zarkov, 2011). This compulsory heterosexuality and its accompanying intolerance of homosexuality was theorized already in 1976 by David and Brannon in their “The Blueprint for Manhood” model. Their gender-role model proposes four major masculine “themes” or benchmarks against which all men are measured (Kimmel, 2003)¹². Intolerance of gay men is an example of the “No Sissy Stuff” theme, the marginalization of gay men being rooted in the rejection of all things perceived as feminine and thus threatening to the masculine gender role (Kahn, 2009; Kimmel, 2003).

12 1) No Sissy Stuff; 2) Be a Big Wheel; 3) The Sturdy Oak and 4) Give'em Hell (Kahn 2009).

While many studies have shown correlations between strong adherence to patriarchal gender norms and attitudes and homophobia (Herz and Johansson, 2015), most of them concern male homosexuality. Weaver et al. (2009) argue that the normative idea of a “real man” is in a precarious state requiring continuous social proof and validation. A man must prove his heterosexual masculinity all the time to be seen as a “real man”. Actions proving this manhood the best include embracing danger or risk and displaying physical toughness. Bossom and Vandello (2011, p. 84) propose that cultural scripts for manhood prescribe physical aggression to demonstrate masculine status, particularly to restore threatened manhood. Another way to be “sufficiently masculine” would be to “harbor and communicate antigay attitudes” (Barron et al. 2008, p. 154). Hence homosexuality becomes a matter of ridicule and a symbol of “what not to be” as a male. Given this cultural system, “situations may arise in which one must harbor negative attitudes toward male homosexuality in order to conform to dominant patriarchal conceptualizations of masculinity” (Barron et al. 2008, p. 154). Where then does violence come into this equation?

3.3 Violence and patriarchal attitudes to gender inequality and homosexuality

When thinking about patriarchal norms and attitudes on gender and sexuality and their relationship to violence what comes first to mind is physical violence: men’s violence against women; men’s violence to prove that they are not gay and violence against homosexuals. The links between these types of violence and patriarchal norms are well researched. Research finds strong correlations between patriarchal norms on masculinity, dominance over women and men’s violence against women (Flood and Pease, 2009) showing that the more a man adheres to patriarchal norms the more likely he is to both find violence against women justified and perpetrate it himself. Women also adhere to patriarchal norms, which may lead them to not identify spousal abuse as violence, or even to condone it (Ahmad et al., 2004).

Regarding the relationship between homosexuality and violence, Kimmel (2008) shows how being called gay is thought to be the worst insult for young American men. Kimmel's work draws on studies in the USA, but homophobia and violence against homosexuals is a global phenomenon (Planet Romeo, 2015). Kimmel (2008) suggests there is a "Guy Code", a regime of peer-influenced and enforced behaviors encouraging young men to use violence as a reaction to insults, violence being the ultimate way to prove heterosexual masculinity. Other scholars have found that the fear of appearing feminine and hence not heterosexual enough is common reason for anti-gay behavior, including aggression (Kilianski, 2003; McCreary, 1994; Wilkinson, 2004). Studies of school shootings for instance show that most perpetrators have been bullied and taunted as gay (Kalish and Kimmel, 2010). Meanwhile, men who hold more patriarchal norms are more likely to be violent towards homosexuals (Stotzer and Shih, 2012). The failure to follow patriarchal norms on masculinity is the base of differentiation and hierarchy among men and of the punishment of those who do not conform (Jones, 2006, p. 453).

When searching for links between patriarchal norms and attitudes on gender inequality, intolerance of homosexuality and violence, military institutions are unavoidable. Military institutions have historically been the most ardent spaces of heteronormativity and military masculinity was until recently viewed as exclusively heterosexual (Jones, 2006). In some militaries this is changing, as the USA and European countries begin to allow openly gay men to serve. Nevertheless, in many countries around the world soldiering is still synonymous with heterosexual masculinity.

Thus, norms and attitudes to gender and sexuality are not a side issue to militaries and armed conflicts, but indispensable to their being. These norms and attitudes are also strongly correlated to interpersonal violence. This leads us to take a closer look at patriarchal attitudes to homosexuality and ask whether adhering to those attitudes can be

related to many different types of violence in similar ways as gender inequality is.

The main hypotheses informing all analyses are 1) that societies with more acceptance of homosexuality will have less violence of any type, including less involvement in armed conflict and 2) that countries involved in violent conflicts and with high general levels of violence will also have high levels of intolerance towards homosexuality.

3.4 Data and methods

To investigate the relationship between attitudes to homosexuality and violence four analyses were performed. The first examines bivariate correlations between attitudes to homosexuality and different types of violence. The second analysis relates a broader set of indicators (such as acceptance of homosexuality, gender equality, economic development, human development, democracy, peacefulness) to violent conflict, examining differences between countries i) with armed conflict on their territory, ii) waging war on others territories, iii) not involved in armed conflict. The third analysis tests which among the traditional control variables has the strongest correlations with violence, in order to use the result for the fourth analysis which tests if human development, the most important control variable, has a moderating influence on norms on homosexuality in relation to different types of violence.

All four analyses rely on existing data bases. Data on attitudes to homosexuality and gender (in)equality come from the World Values Survey (WVS) (2009-2014). A WVS survey question on homosexuality (V203: Can homosexuality be justifiable?) is used¹³.

¹³ The WVS has one more question on homosexuality, A124-09: "On this list are various groups of people. Could you please sort out any that you would not like to have as neighbors? Homosexuals." As this question only had "yes" and "no" as possible answers and the selected question had a scale it was considered a less useful variable than the selected question.

The responses were clustered (answers one to four form the category “never justifiable”, five and six are forming the group “neutral”, and seven to ten “always justifiable”) to make them comparable to the question on attitudes to gender (in)equality: V47 (If a woman earns more money than her husband, it is almost certain to cause problems) with answers scaled at “Agree”, “Neither” and “Disagree”. The question on homosexuality was asked in 58 countries, the one on gender equality in 60. The analysis was based on the percentage of respondents in each country.

Data on violence come from the 2014 Global Peace Index (GPI) (Institute for Economics & Peace, 2014). The GPI gauges domestic and international conflict, safety and security in society and militarization in 162 countries, using 23 indicators. These indicators have been grouped into five categories: 1) Interpersonal violence (perceived criminality; homicides per capita; violent crimes per capita); 2) State and societal violence (ratio of security officers and police per capita; incarceration rates and political terror; access to weapons; violent demonstrations; political instability); 3) Internal conflict (conflicts fought; intensity of conflicts; deaths from conflicts; displaced people; impact of terrorist acts); 4) Militarization (weapon import; weapon export; military expenditure as % of GDP; armed services personnel per capita; ownership of nuclear and heavy weapons); 5) External conflict (neighboring country relations; external conflicts fought; deaths from these conflicts). The higher the score, the less peaceful the country. Both aggregate and sub-scores are used. The indicator “funding of UN peacekeeping” was not used as it is not directly related to levels of violence.

The other data are retrieved from the following sources:

- countries in conflict: Uppsala Conflict Data Base (UCDB) (Pettersson & Wallensteen, 2015);
- LGBT legislation: International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association (ILGA) (Carroll and Itaborahy, 2015) 1 = same-

sex marriage exists; 2 = foreign same-sex marriages recognized but marriages not legalized in the country; 3 = same-sex civil unions accepted; 4 = same-sex relationships legal; 5 = laws restricting freedom of expression and association of LGBT people; 6 = unenforced penalty against LGBT; 7 = imprisonment of LGBT of various length; 8 = life in prison for LGBT; 9 = death penalty for LGBT;

- public behavior/violence against homosexuals: Gay Happiness Index (GHI) (Planet Romeo, 2015);
- level of gender equality: Global Gender Gap Index (GGGI) (World Economic Forum, 2014);
- GDP per capita: World Bank (2014a);
- Gini Index: World Bank (2014b);
- democracy levels: Democracy Index (DI) (The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2014);
- level of human development: inequality adjusted Human Development Index (HDI) (UNDP, 2015).

3.5 Findings

3.5.1 Relating homosexuality to violence: mixed results

The first analysis, a bivariate correlation between the percentage of population in a country thinking that homosexuality is (not) justifiable and indicators from the Global Peace Index, shows mixed results (see Table 3.1).

Table 3.1
Attitudes to homosexuality and violence

	Homo- sexuality is justifiable never	Homo- sexuality is justifiable neutral	Homo- sexuality is justifiably always
Aggregated index			
GPI 2014	,561***	-,338*	-,576***
Interpersonal violence	never		
Perception of criminality	,333*	-,153	-,383**
Homicide	,237	,011	-,255
Violent crime	,352**	-,210	-,353**
State and societal violence			
Security officers and police	,235	-,088	-,222
Incarceration rates	,053	,178	-,118
Political terror	,495***	-,259	-,531***
Access to weapons	,373**	-,301*	-,358**
Violent demonstrations	,395**	-,251	-,420**
Political instability	,757***	-,631***	-,709***
Internal conflict			
Intensity of internal conflict	,511***	-,399**	-,503***
Deaths from internal conflict	,172	-,118	-,217
Internal conflicts fought	,152	-,056	-,151
Displaced people	,131	-,030	-,127
Terrorism impact	,177	-,162	-,141
Militarization			
Weapons import	,073	,052	-,068
Weapons export	-,376**	,067	,480***
Military expenditure	,302*	-,299*	-,324*
Armed service personnel	,139	,025	-,139
Nuclear and heavy weapons	-,034	,116	-,045
External conflict			
Neighboring countries relations	,533***	-,340*	-,548***
External conflicts fought	-,107	,029	,180
Deaths from external conflict	-,032	,095	,038

p<0,05=*; p<0,01=**; p<0,001=***

The short answer to the question whether attitudes to homosexuality are linked to various types of violence is: yes and no. Results are not only mixed but also surprising. I will first present expected results – meaning those where attitudes to homosexuality are correlated to different types of violence in a way that follows theoretical assumptions discussed above, and then those that surprise.

The first expected result is that attitudes to homosexuality are correlated to levels of violence in general. Thinking that homosexuality is never justifiable is strongly correlated to high levels of violence; thinking that homosexuality is always justifiable is strongly correlated to low levels of violence and being neutral about homosexuality is correlated to low levels of violence, although not as strongly as thinking that homosexuality is always justifiable, meaning that societies with high levels of intolerance of homosexuality tend to have higher levels of violence in general and vice versa.

The second expected result concerns interpersonal violence. When many people think that homosexuality is always justified there are also low levels of violent crime and people perceive the level of criminality in their society to be low. When many people think that homosexuality is never justified there are high levels of violent crime and people perceive the level of criminality to be high. The neutral homosexuality variable is not correlated to interpersonal violence, showing the need for high levels of tolerance of homosexuality in a society in order to reduce interpersonal violence.

The third expected result is that norms on homosexuality are correlated to a number of variables in the category of state and societal related violence. Two of these variables, access to weapons and political instability, are not only correlated to (not) accepting homosexuality, but also to the neutral category, showing that accepting and sometimes even just neutral attitudes towards homosexuality are associated with lower levels of political instability and access to weapons. High levels of

intolerance of homosexuals go hand in hand with high levels of political instability and access to weapons both of which are decreasing already when the attitudes to homosexuality become neutral, decreasing even more when attitudes become accepting.

The fourth rather expected result is that attitudes to homosexuality are correlated to militarization. Military expenditure, as percentage of the GDP, correlates with all homosexuality variables. Countries with high levels of intolerance of homosexuality spend a larger percentage of their GDP on their military than countries with neutral and accepting norms on homosexuality. As democracies tend to spend a smaller percentage of their GDP (not necessarily a smaller amount) on their military than non-democracies and it is in the democracies we find the most acceptance of homosexuality this is not surprising.

That nuclear and heavy weapons are not correlated to attitudes to homosexuality is not so surprising considering that only a few countries, differing in their acceptance of homosexuality, have nuclear weapons. The same could be said for other heavy weapons (sophisticated air force, aircraft carriers, warships and combat helicopters) as only a few countries own them. In addition, some of these weapons were acquired prior to measuring levels of (in)tolerance of homosexuality (2014), and might therefore not be related.

The other results are surprising and some raise concerns. Homicide was not found to be correlated with the attitudes to homosexuality despite the other types of interpersonal violence being correlated. Why violent crime is correlated to attitudes to homosexuality and not homicide, which is a type of violent crime, is unknown. The number of security officers, police and incarceration rates is also not correlated to attitudes to homosexuality. Why it is so is unclear but it is possible that these items rather depend more on the regime type and its policies than on attitudes. Weapons import and numbers of armed service personnel are also not correlated to (in)tolerance of homosexuality. This is unexpected as military expenditure correlates with the

homosexuality variables. One possible explanation is that there are multiple ways to spend a military budget and that personnel is only a part of it. Absence of correlation regarding weapons import could be related to the fact that most countries import weapons of some kind at some stage. But it was the correlation of weapons export with norms of homosexuality that came as a surprise: a high level of weapon export goes hand in hand with the acceptance of homosexuality. While this might seem counterintuitive it is probably a result of the fact that it is the most industrialized countries that export arms, and it is also they that tend to have the highest levels of acceptance of homosexuality (and of gender equality).

Regarding the relation between internal violent conflicts and acceptance of homosexuality correlation appears only for the intensity of internal conflict. Deaths from internal conflict, number of internal conflicts, number of displaced people and impact of terrorism are not statistically relevant. Previous research shows links between hate crimes and terrorism (Mills et al., 2017); toxic masculinities and terrorism (Haider, 2016); sexism and islamophobia (Hopkins, 2016). As these different types of violence can be related to patriarchal behaviors it is possible that societies with high levels of intolerance of people who do not conform to norms on sexuality may also be less tolerant of people that differ in other ways. Such assumptions do however require further investigation.

Equally selective results come from the correlation of acceptance of homosexuality and external conflicts: only the relations with neighboring countries matter. Bad relations with neighboring countries is correlated to high levels of intolerance of homosexuality, good relations with neutral attitudes to and high levels of acceptance of homosexuality. However, external conflicts fought, and deaths from external conflicts do not show any significant correlations.

In sum, attitudes to homosexuality correlate to a variety of types of violence in the GPI although not to all. While it would be dangerous to attach too much importance to the exact numbers produced by the bivariate correlation considering the problems associated with using big aggregated data sets based on secondary data such as the GPI, the results of the analysis still show very specific tendencies. Confirming these tendencies requires the use of other data sets, to see if the data point in the same direction.

3.5.2 Does bringing in more variables clear the picture?

The second analysis combines several sets of variables. The first set pertains to the conflict situation: countries with conflicts on their own territories, countries participating in armed conflicts on other countries' territories and countries not participating in any conflicts, using the UCDB. The second set of variables is made of indicators of patriarchal norms and attitudes on homosexuality pertaining to the legal status of the same-sex relations and attitudes to homosexuality. Finally, a set of control variables for the same year, 2014, is used: attitudes to gender equality; the Gini Index; GDP per capita; the inequality adjusted HDI; the DI and the GPI.

In 2014, of the 97 countries involved in armed conflicts, 12 had conflicts on their own territories, 14 had both conflicts on their own territories and sent troops to other countries' territories, and 71 had troops only on other countries' territories. As the countries with conflict on their own territory and those with both conflict on their own territory and troops in other countries had very similar scores on the different variables they have been grouped together.

Table 3.2.*Median measures for countries in function of conflict situations per 2014*

	Countries with fighting on own territory	Countries fighting on other's territory	Countries not fighting
LGBT legislati- on score:	2) Israel. 3) Colombia. 4) Azerbaijan, DRC, Lebanon, Mali, Philippines, Thailand, Uk- raine. 5) Russia. 6) Myanmar, Syria. 7) Afgha- nistan, Algeria, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Libya, Palestine, South Sudan. 8) Paki- stan, Uganda. 9) Nigeria, Somalia, Sudan, Yemen.	1) Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK, USA. 2) Estonia. 3) Albania, Australia, Austria, Croatia, Czech Rep., Finland, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Slovenia, Luxemburg. 4) Armenia, Bahrain, Benin, BiH, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Djibouti, El Salvador, Georgia, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Latvia, Li- thuania, Macedonia, Mon- golia, Montenegro, Nepal, Niger, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Korea, Tajikistan, Turkey. 5) China. 6) Chad, Sierra Leone, Tonga. 7) Bangla- desh, Burundi, Cameroon, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Liberia, Malaysia, Senegal, Togo. 9) Mauretania, Saudi Arabia, UAE.	1) Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Uruguay. 3) Ecuador, Malta, Switzerland, Taiwan. 4) Bahamas, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Cape Verde, CAR, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Dominican Rep., East Timor, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Gabon, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Lesotho, Madagascar, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Moldova, Nicaragua, North Korea, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Rep. of Congo, São Tomé & Príncipe, Serbia, RSA, Surinam, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam. 6) Angola, Antigua, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Dominica, Guyana, Jamaica, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Oman, Papua New Guinea, St Kitts & Nevis, Samoa, Seychelles, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Trinidad & Tobago, Tuvalu, Zimbabwe. 7) Comoros, Eritrea, Grenada, Kiribati, Kuwait, Maldives, Mauritius, Morocco, St Lucia, St Vincent & The Grenadines, Solomon Islands, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Zambia. 8) Gambia, Tanzania. 9) Brunei, Iran, Qatar. n/a) Cook Island.

GENDER INEQUALITY, HOMOPHOBIA AND VIOLENCE:
THE THREE PILLARS OF PATRIARCHAL NORMS AND ATTITUDES AND THEIR RELATIONS

Median measures for countries in function of conflict situations per 2014

	Countries with fighting on own territory	Countries fighting on other's territory	Countries not fighting
LGBT legislation median ¹⁴	7	4	4
GHI: public behavior median ¹⁵	45	56	55
GHI: physical assault median median ¹⁶	45	31	40
% thinking homo exuality is LGBTnever justifiable median ¹⁷	74	65	64
% thinking that it is a problem if a woman earns more than her husband median ¹⁸	38	20	32
GGGI median ¹⁹	64	0,70	0,70
GINI median ²⁰	38	34	43
GDP/capita in USD median ²¹	2 865 485	10 482 140	5 227 945
Inequality adjusted HDI median ²²	3,82	0,71	0,53
DI median ²³	3,62	6,51	5,81
GPI median ²⁴		1,86	1,99

14 See Data and Methods section for scale. Data available for all countries except one who did not participate in any conflict.

15 Includes all forms of discrimination + violence. The higher the number the less discrimination. Data available for 77 of the 97 countries that experienced conflict of any kind and for 47 of the 95 countries not participating in any conflict.

16 The higher the number the more violence against gay men. Data available for 77 of the countries that experienced conflict of any kind and for 47 of the countries not participating.

17 World Values Survey. Data available for 35 of the 97 countries participating in armed conflict and for 21 of the countries not participating.

18 World Values Survey. Data available for 35 of the 97 countries participating in armed conflict and for 22 of the countries not participating in armed conflict.

19 Scale from 0 to 1. The higher the number the lower the gender gap. Data was available for 80 of the 97 countries participating in armed conflicts and for 62 of those not participating.

20 World Bank socio-economic inequality scale from 1 to 100. The higher the number the more inequality. Data available for 82 of the countries participating in armed conflict and for 63 of those not participating.

21 In USD. Data available for 94 of the countries participating in armed conflict and 90 of those not participating.

22 Scale 0-1, the higher the number the higher the human development. Data available for 84 countries participating in armed conflict and 67 not participating.

23 The higher the number the higher the level of democracy. Data available for 94 countries participating in armed conflict and 71 not participating.

24 The lower the number the more peaceful. Data available for 94 countries participating in armed conflict and 67 not participating.

GENDER INEQUALITY, HOMOPHOBIA AND VIOLENCE:
THE THREE PILLARS OF PATRIARCHAL NORMS AND ATTITUDES AND THEIR RELATIONS

As seen in Table 3.2 the 26 countries with conflict on their own territory scored a median of 7 on the LGBT legislation scale, meaning that they tended to have a very restrictive legislation. These countries also had a median of 45 on both the public behavior and the violence towards homosexuals scales and of 74 on the percentage of population thinking homosexuality is never justified.

The 71 countries without conflict on their own territory but sending out troops scored a median of 4 on the LGBT legislation scale. This is considerably lower than the countries with conflict on their own territory. They furthermore had a median of 56 on public behavior, 31 on violence against homosexuals and 65 on percentage thinking homosexuality is never justified. The data seem to indicate that countries with LGBT rights, lower levels of discrimination and violence against homosexuals and higher levels of acceptance of homosexuality are much more likely to intervene in conflicts abroad than having them on their own soil.

The remaining 95 countries were not participating in any armed conflict. Their median score on the LGBT legislation was 4, similar to countries only fighting on other countries' territories. These non-fighting countries score close to the countries intervening abroad on levels of discrimination and attitudes towards homosexuals but have more violence against homosexuals.

The general finding from these data is that the more discriminatory legislation against LGBT people, the more discrimination and violence against LGBT people; and the more people think that homosexuality can never be justified, the more likely this country experiences violent conflict on its own territory. Moreover, the less LGBT discriminating legislation there is; the less violence, and the fewer people thinking that homosexuality can never be justified, the more likely the country intervenes militarily abroad. Countries not involved in any armed conflict are scoring very similarly to countries intervening abroad except for

their level of violence against gay men where they score in between countries with fighting at home and countries intervening abroad.

The scores on gender inequality are similar to those on homosexuality. Countries with the highest levels of gender unequal attitudes are the ones with conflict at home and vice versa. Countries that don't participate in any conflict score in between. However, the data from the WVS cover fewer countries than the other data bases and thus have to be read with caution. Nevertheless, it is the best data set we have on attitudes to homosexuality and gender equality. Therefore, they are a good proxy to use.

To analyze these relations further additional data are used to probe specific features of the societies covered by our data. Two commonly used control variables are the Gini Index and GDP per capita. The Gini Index shows that the countries with lowest internal socio-economic inequalities are the ones sending troops abroad, while the non-fighting countries are the most unequal. The GDP per capita average shows that the richest countries send troops abroad and the poorest countries have conflict at home, while the medium rich countries are mostly non-fighting. As GDP per capita does not show the development level of a country, I add the DI and the *inequality adjusted* HDI - a composite of GDP, life expectancy, education levels and inequality levels within the country. As table 2 shows, the countries with the highest HDI and DI levels are sending troops abroad; the countries with the lowest HDI and DI levels have armed conflict at home and the non-fighting countries are in between. Finally, the aggregate GPI gives a picture of general levels of violence across society. Countries that intervene militarily abroad without having conflicts at home are the ones with the highest levels of peacefulness despite their military interventions. To obtain such a score the levels of violence in their own countries must be very low. Not surprisingly, countries that have armed conflicts at home have the lowest levels of peacefulness. Notable is that the countries that didn't experience any armed conflict in 2014 had a lower level of peacefulness

than the ones sending troops abroad. This means they have high levels of violence at home, even though they are not at war.

The pattern emerging is clear: countries with conflicts at home are among the poorest, the least democratic, with the lowest levels of human development, the lowest levels of gender equality and lowest acceptance of homosexuality and gender equality. The countries that have no conflicts at home but send out troops are among the richest, the most democratic, with the highest levels of human development, gender equality and acceptance of homosexuals and gender equality. These countries are also among those with the lowest levels of violence in their own societies. The countries that experience no conflict at home and participate in no conflict abroad have in-between average values.

These findings fit with the literature on “liberal and democratic peace” (Hegre, 2014) showing that democracies are the least likely to have conflict at home and do not wage war on each other, but do get involved in armed conflict with non-democracies. However, further linear regressions with the composite GPI as dependent variable and the above used control variables as the independent ones only partly confirm the conviction that democracy is the most important variable.

The linear regressions in Table 3 show that the strongest correlations are not between the DI and the GPI, but between the inequality adjusted DI and the GPI. In the next section I further test these results.

3.5.3 Can other data confirm tendencies?

In light of the above findings the next step was to see if patriarchal attitudes to homosexuality are interacting with the inequality adjusted HDI. As it can be argued that the interaction goes both ways - that patriarchal attitudes influence human development and that human development influences patriarchal attitudes - I investigated this moderation both ways. A regression was made in order to check if and how the

Table 3.3*Significant Beta / standard error for control variables*

	GDP/Capita	Gini	DI	HDI
Composite GPI			-,101***/,022	
Perception of criminality		,033***/,009	-,123*/,049	
Security officers				2,129**/,620
Homicide		,058***/,012		-3,935***/,795
Incarceration	-1,662E-8**/,000	,040***/,008		3,714***/,559
Access weapons		,022**/,008	-,148**/,047	-1,278*/,568
Intensity internal conflict			-,195**/,056	-1,387*/,684
Violent demonstrations	-2,051E-8***/,000		-,105*/,051	
Violent crime	-1,669E-8**/,000	,028**/,010		-1,458*/,678
Political instability			-,336***/,034	
Political terror			-,152**/,052	
Military expenditure			-,046*/,021	
Armed service personnel				,550*/,261
Weapons export	3,013E-8***/,000		-,089*/,044	
Neighboring countries relations	-1,351E-8**/,000		-,317***/,053	1,819**/,636
External conflicts fought				1,740**/,592
Weapons import	9,926E-9***/,000			

p<0,05=*; p<0,01=**; p<0,001=***

inequality adjusted HDI moderated attitudes to homosexuality (using violence against gay men as a proxy) and vice versa, in their relation to different kinds of violence (using the GPI and its 22 sub-categories). Since the violence against gay men variable and the GPI variables all are coded so that the higher the value the more violence, the HDI variable was reversed to facilitate the interpretation. The HDI and the violence against gay men variables were then multiplied to form a combined variable. 23 regressions were then made with the inequality adjusted HDI, physical assault and the combined variable as independent variables, and the different GPI variables as dependent variables (see Table 3.4; only showing GPI variables that were significantly correlated to the combined variable).

Table 3.4

The moderating effect of human development on attitudes to homosexuality in relation to violence

	B inequality adjusted HD reversed / Std. Std. error	B assault against gay men / Std. error	B inequality adjusted HDI reversed* assault against gay men / Std. error
GPI	2,890***/1,504	,023***/0,006	,023***/0,006
Perception of criminality	4,378***/1,147	,027*/0,014	,027*/0,014
Incarceration rates	3,222**/1,018	,048***/0,012	,048***/0,012
Access to weapons	7,328***/1,990	,060***/0,012	,060***/0,012
Violent demonstrations	4,674***/1,150	,035*/0,014	,035*/0,014
Political instability	6,497***/1,967	,057***/0,012	,057***/0,012
Political terror	6,750***/1,107	,045***/0,013	,045***/0,013
Terrorism impact	-16,210**/5,748	-,161**/0,069	-,161**/0,069
Neighboring countries relations	4,337**/1,376	,051**/0,017	,051**/0,017

p<0,05=*; p<0,01=**; p<0,001=***

The inequality adjusted HDI moderated the relationship between violence against homosexuals and the GPI aggregate and eight of its 22 subcategories (perception of criminality; incarceration rates; access to weapons; violent demonstrations; political instability; political terror; terrorism impact and neighboring countries relations). This means that in these nine instances (i.e. the eight listed above plus the GPI aggregate) the level of human development has an effect on how violence against homosexuals is correlated to other forms of violence and vice versa. Why not all of the GPI categories are correlated is unknown, and need further research.

Despite the inequality adjusted HDI and the levels of violence against gay men not having a moderating effect on all the GPI categories the results still show the relevance of patriarchal attitudes: when violence against gay men increases it reduces the positive influence human development has on levels of violence as measured by the GPI; when human development decreases (a higher HDI score thus as it is reversed) it not only increases levels of many types of violence on its own accord: it also enhances the negative effect that violence against gay men has on other forms of violence thus further increasing levels of violence.

The outlier here is terrorism impact that seems to have totally opposite relationships with human development and patriarchal attitudes than the other GPI variables, i.e. leading to a higher terrorism impact when human development is high and violence against gay men is low. The possible reasons for this lie in the way that the GPI classifies and collects data on terrorism as will be discussed below.

In short, these results appear to bring more questions than answers. Low levels of acceptance of homosexuality are correlated to high levels of general violence in a society, as well as to the engagement of the countries in violent conflict, but *only* in those cases where violent conflict is fought at home, thus partially confirming the two hypotheses. The hypotheses are not confirmed for countries not having wars

at home but sending troops abroad. In those cases high tolerance of homosexuality and high level of peace internally coexist with engaging in violent conflict abroad. This is contrary to earlier research indicating that higher levels of gender equality at home lead to less participation in conflicts abroad (Caprioli, 2000; Melander, 2005). This surprising and problematic result will be addressed further in the text.

3.6. Discussion and conclusion

While the correlations do not equal causations, the findings that the countries the most tolerant of homosexuality, with highest democracy and HDI levels, and with the best relation with their neighbors are also among the countries that engage in most weapons exports and wars abroad is as counter-intuitive as it is worrying. One would expect more tolerant, developed and democratic societies to be more peaceful not only internally, but also towards other countries. But according to the data, this is certainly not the case. So how are we to understand these correlations and what they mean for the starting hypothesis: that high acceptance of homosexuality will be indicative of low levels of most types of violence including armed conflict?

There are several directions we can take in interpreting the findings. One is methodological, or rather epistemological, some of which has already been addressed in the Introduction. It demands that we question the quality of data from the large data sets (UCDB, WVS, GPI, etc.) and ask how they are assembled, what kind of knowledge informs their assemblage and what kind of picture they produce. Another direction is to take the most disturbing result – that democratic, tolerant and equal societies spread violence elsewhere – as a starting point, and see what the theoretical and political implications of such findings are and what they tell us about the relationships between acceptance of homosexuality, violent conflict and the Western democracies.

Comparing the first data indicating that the homosexuality variable is not correlated to the presence of internal conflicts, but rather to their intensity, with the second data showing that most homophobia is present in countries with conflicts at home points to methodological issues. The GPI places a lot of weight on the *duration* of the conflict when measuring both intra- and inter-state conflict, and the role of the intervening country when measuring inter-state conflict. The second data set - i.e. the UCDB - only takes *participation* in armed conflict into account and thus gives us a different perspective.

Another issue with the data can be seen in the fact that the terrorism impact is not correlated to the homosexuality variables which is somewhat surprising given the large number of terrorist attacks in the Middle East and other places with low acceptance of homosexuality. We can look at how the GPI terrorist variable is calculated and in particular which attacks are counted as terrorist and which are not. Also, a factor weighed into the GPI terrorism variable is the cost of material damage due to the terrorist attack. Such costs appear to be higher in the West than in other regions, possibly giving attacks in the West a bigger weight despite being fewer in numbers as compared to other regions.

The questions about the data are thus very much questions of the conceptualization and interpretation of reality that influence decisions about the unit of measurement and the methods of data collection. Large data sets are often based on general assumptions about causes and dynamics of very different conflicts (Eck, 2012), and have been criticized for using statistical modeling that simplifies complex realities of violence (Sousa, 2014). In addition, there are big differences between countries in the same category. For instance, both the US and Western European countries are waging wars abroad. But, in general, Western European countries have higher acceptance of homosexuality and lower levels of violence than the US. Further research in the form of comparative case studies could explore in more detail how acceptance of homosexuality and levels of violence are related.

All of these limitations related to data and data sets apply to this research. But the safeguard taken in this case is, as noted earlier, the use of several different data sets and several different methods, with different dependent and independent variables. When it comes to the correlation between high acceptance of homosexuality and developed, democratic, peaceful countries sending troops abroad, all the results point in the same direction notwithstanding the choice of data or methods. And this warrants further reflections.

Already during the First Gulf War in 1991 feminists have pointed out that gender discourses have served as justification (despite not necessarily being the actual motivation) for the US war on Iraq (Farmanfarmaian, 1992). After the “humanitarian intervention” and “just war” rhetoric introduced by UK Prime Minister Blair in regard to the intervention in Bosnia in the 1990s, the US inauguration of “war on terror” in 2001 and then adoption of the UN principle of Responsibility to Protect in 2005, further questions were asked about justifications used by Western democracies to wage wars on non-Western countries and the role of gender therein (Hutchings, 2011; Zarkov, 2014). Gender equality has long been a marker that separated the West from the Rest, in Western eyes. Depicting non-Western countries through images of subjugated and violated women and despotic, patriarchal, violent men has been a steady strategy for justifying occupations and bombings (Dauphinee, 2007; again, despite not necessarily being the actual motivation for these occupations and bombings). Thus, while the research shows that gender inequality goes hand in hand with high levels of general violence in a society, and may be a predictor of violent conflict, there seems to be a need for a caveat – gender *equality* and lower levels of general violence are not predictors that a country will not engage in the conflict in general, but only offers a high probability that it will not wage war on its own territory and with its neighbors.

Something similar may be the case with patriarchal attitudes towards homosexuality. Many European countries have high level of tolerance

and legal equality for non-heteronormative sexualities. But some of them have started using norms and attitudes regarding homosexuality in their immigration policies. The Netherlands is in the forefront: prospective new citizens are given photos of gay men kissing and asked what they think about it²⁵. Expressing disagreement with same-sex behavior largely means rejection of citizenship. In addition, homonationalism is on the rise in Europe (Sörberg, 2017). Migrants, especially with a Muslim background, are not only seen as threatening achievements of women's emancipation in the West, but also of the achievements of gay struggles for legal and social equality (Dudink, 2011).

As noted, there is a growing body of research on intolerance of homosexuality in the literature on patriarchal and hegemonic norms of and attitudes to masculinity, but it is rarely related to armed conflict. Whether in academia, among policymakers, international organizations or activists, the concepts of patriarchal and hegemonic norms of and attitudes to masculinity are almost always linked to male dominance over women, violence against women and gender inequality. While these are important, we need to expand our thinking on patriarchal and hegemonic norms and attitudes to include intolerance of homosexuality, not only to improve the lives of many people, but also to better understand and address various other types of violence, their dynamics and their relationships. This research has addressed some of those issues in order to test theoretical assumptions through the existing quantitative data, and came up with mixed – and problematic – results. So far no violent intervention into another country has been justified by appealing to gay rights (as it has been by appealing to women's rights). But it is worth thinking about what these results mean for the struggles for gender equality and equality of the LGBT communities if such struggles are not cognizant of larger geo-political dynamics, and the ways these dynamics play both at home and abroad.

25 <http://workpermit.com/news/new-dutch-immigration-test-under-attack-20060406>

3.6 References

- Ahmad, F., Riaz, S., Barata, P., & Stewart, D. E. (2004). Patriarchal beliefs and perceptions of abuse among South Asian immigrant women. *Violence against Women*, 10(3), 262-282.
- Barron, J. M., Struckman-Johnson, C., Quevillon, R., & Banka, S. R. (2008). Heterosexual Men's Attitudes Toward Gay Men: A Hierarchical Model Including Masculinity, Openness, and Theoretical Explanations. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 9(3), 154-166.
- Belkin, A., & Bateman, G. (Eds.). (2003). *Don't Ask, Don't Tell: Exploring the Debates on the Gay Ban in the U.S. Military*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Beyer, A. C. (2014). *Inequality and Violence*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Bossom, J. K., & Vandello, J. A. (2011). Precarious Manhood and Its Links to Action and Aggression. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(2), 82-86.
- Caprioli, M. (2000). Gendered Conflict. *Journal of Peace Research*, 37(1), 51-68.
- Carroll, A., & Itaborahy, L. P. (2015). *State-Sponsored Homophobia. A World Survey of Laws: criminalisation, protection and recognition of same-sex love*. Geneva, Switzerland: ILGA.
- Connell, R. (1995). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Currier, A. (2010). Political Homophobia in Postcolonial Namibia. *Gender & Society*, 24(1), 110-129.
- Dauphinee, E. (2007). The Politics of the Body in Pain: Reading the Ethics of Imagery. *Security Dialogue*, 38(2), 139-155.
- David, D. S., & Brannon, R. (Eds.). (1976). *The forty-nine percent majority*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Dudink, S. P. (2011). Homosexuality, Race, and the Rhetoric of Nationalism. *History of the Present*, 1(2), 259-264.
- Eck, K. (2012). In Data We Trust? A Comparison of UCDP GED and ACLED Conflict Events Datasets. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 47(1), 124-141.
- Ekvall, Å. (2013). Gender equality, attitudes to gender equality and conflict. In M. Texler Segal & V. Demos (Eds.), *Gendered Perspectives on Conflict and Violence (Advances in Gender Research Vol. 18a)* (Vol. 18a, pp. 273-295). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Farmanfarmaian, A. (1992). Sexuality in the Gulf war: Did You Measure Up? *Genders*, 13, 1-29.

- Flood, M., & Pease, B. (2009). Factors Influencing Attitudes to Violence Against Women. *TRAUMA, VIOLENCE, & ABUSE*, 10(2), 125-142.
- Haider, S. (2016). The Shooting in Orlando, Terrorism or Toxic Masculinity (or Both?). *Men and Masculinities*, 19(5), 555-565.
- Hegre, H. (2014). Democracy and armed conflict. *Journal of Peace Research*, 51(2), 159-172.
- Herz, M., & Johansson, T. (2015). The Normativity of the Concept of Heteronormativity. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 62(8), 1009-1020.
- Higate, P. (2012). Drinking Vodka from the 'Butt-Crack': Men, masculinities and patriarchy in the private militarized security company. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 14(4), 450-469.
- Hopkins, P. (2016). Gendering Islamophobia, racism and White supremacy: Gendered violence against those who look Muslim. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 6(2), 186-189.
- Hudson, V. M., Ballif-Spanvill, B., Caprioli, M., & Emmett, C. F. (2012). *Sex and World Peace*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Hutchings, K. (2011). Gendered Humanitarianism. Reconsidering the ethics of war. In C. Sylvester (Ed.), *Experiencing war* (pp. 28-41). London, UK: Routledge.
- Institute for Economics & Peace. (2014). *Global Peace Index*. Retrieved from http://visionofhumanity.org/app/uploads/2017/04/2014-Global-Peace-Index-REPORT_0-1.pdf
- Jones, A. (2006). Straight as a Rule: Heteronormativity, Gendercide, and the Noncombatant Male. *Men and Masculinities*, 8(4), 451-469.
- Kahn, J. S. (2009). *An Introduction to Masculinities*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kalish, R., & Kimmel, M. (2010). Suicide by mass murder: Masculinity, aggrieved entitlement, and rampage school shootings. *Health Sociology Review*, 19(4), 451-464.
- Keiller, S. W. (2010). Masculine Norms as Correlates of Heterosexual Men's Attitudes Toward Gay Men and Lesbian Women. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 11(1), 38-52.
- Kilianski, S. E. (2003). Explaining heterosexual men's attitudes toward women and gay men: The theory of exclusively masculine identity. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 4(1), 37-56.
- Kimmel, M. (2008). *Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2003). Toward a pedagogy of the oppressor. In M. S. Kimmel & A. L.

- Ferber (Eds.), *Privilege: A reader* (pp. 1-10). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- McCreary, D. R. (1994). The male role and avoiding femininity. *Sex Roles*, 31, 517-530.
- Melander, E. (2005). Gender Equality and Intrastate Armed Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly*, 49(4), 695-714.
- Mills, C. E., Freilich, J. D., & Chermak, S. M. (2017). Extreme Hatred: Revisiting the Hate Crime and Terrorism Relationship to Determine Whether They Are "Close Cousins" or "Distant Relatives" *Crime & Delinquency*, 63(10), 1191-1223.
- Murphy, M. K. (2006). 'The Fire Will Not Consume Us': Exploring the Link between Homophobia and Sexism in US Feminism. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 15(3), 209-221.
- Myrtilinen, H., & Daigle, M. (2017). *When merely existing is a risk: Sexual and gender minorities in conflict, displacement and peacebuilding*. Retrieved from https://www.international-alert.org/sites/default/files/Gender_SexualAndGenderMinorities_EN_2017.pdf
- Pettersson, T., & Wallensteen, P. (2015). Armed conflicts, 1946-2014. *Journal of Peace Research*, 52(4), 536-550.
- Planet Romeo. (2015). The Gay Happiness Index. Retrieved from <https://www.planetromeo.com/en/care/gay-happiness-index/>
- Ratele, K. (2014). Hegemonic African Masculinities and Men's Heterosexual Lives: Some Uses for Homophobia. *African Studies Review*, 57(2), 115 - 130.
- Sörberg, A.-M. (2017). *Homonationalism*. Stockholm, Sweden: Leopard Förlag.
- Sousa, R. R. P. (2014). Comparing Datasets: Understanding Conceptual Differences in Quantitative Conflict Studies. In H. Hintjens & D. Zarkov (Eds.), *Conflict, Peace, Security and Development - Theories and Methodologies* (pp. 216-232). London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Stotzer, R. L., & Shih, M. (2012). The Relationship Between Masculinity and Sexual Prejudice in Factors Associated With Violence Against Gay Men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 13(2), 136-142.
- The Economist Intelligence Unit. (2014). *Democracy Index*. Retrieved from https://www.eiu.com/public/topical_report.aspx?campaignid=Democracy015
- Thoreson, R. (2015). Global homophobia: states, movements, and the politics of oppression. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 17(5), 663-665.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2015). *Inequality-adjusted Human Development Index*. Retrieved from <http://www.hdr.undp.org/en/composite/IHDI>
- Weaver, J. R., Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., & Burnaford, R. M. (2010). The Proof is in the Punch: Gender Differences in Perceptions of Action and Aggression as Components of Manhood. *Sex Roles*, 62(3), 241-251.

- World Bank. (2014a). *GDP per capita*. Retrieved from <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD>
- The World Bank. (2014b). *GINI Index*. Retrieved from <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.GINI?page=1>
- Wilkinson, W. W. (2004). Authoritarian Hegemony, Dimensions of Masculinity, and Male Antigay Attitudes. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 5(2), 121-131.
- World Economic Forum. (2014). *The Global Gender Gap Report* Retrieved from <http://reports.weforum.org/global-gender-gap-report-2014/>
- World Values Survey Association. (2015). *World Values Survey. Wave 6 2010-2014 Official Aggregate v.20150418*. Retrieved from: www.worldvaluessurvey.org
- Zarkov, D. (2011). Exposures and Invisibilities: Media, Masculinities and the Narratives of Wars in an Intersectional Perspective. In H. Lutz, M. T. Herrera Vivar, & L. Supik (Eds.), *Framing Intersectionality. Debates on a Multi-Faceted Concept in Gender Studies* (pp. 105-119). Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Zarkov, D. (2014). Ontologies of International Humanitarian and Criminal law: 'Locals' and 'Internationals' in Discourses and Practices of Justice. In D. Zarkov & G. M. (Eds.), *Narratives of Justice in and out of the Courtroom. Former Yugoslavia and Beyond* (pp. 3-22). New York, NY: Springer.

GENDER INEQUALITY, HOMOPHOBIA AND VIOLENCE:
THE THREE PILLARS OF PATRIARCHAL NORMS AND ATTITUDES AND THEIR RELATIONS

– 86 –

4 Young men and gender trainings:

An example of change in attitudes to gender, sexuality and violence among young male Indian students

4.1 Introduction

While norms are strong beliefs on what is right or wrong (Scott and Marshall, 2009) and are seen as (in)formal guidelines for accepted and expected behaviour (Feldman, 1984), how individuals and collectivities relate to norms – do they accept them or not – is a matter of attitudes. Attitudes are individual and collective positions towards norms, ideas or behaviour (Eagly and Chaiken, 1998), telling whether we approve or disapprove of something. It is thus interesting to investigate what happens when attitudes change.

According to Pease and Flood (2008, p. 557) attitudes are shaped by the social consensus within specific settings and groups. Institutions such as schools, workplaces, or churches shape their participants' attitudes through both formal policies and structures and informal norms. Therefore, to change the individuals' attitudes, the dominant norms within those settings and groups in which those individuals are situated also need to be challenged (Pease and Flood, 2008). While this study examines change in individuals' attitudes it is important to keep the societal dimension in mind.

Many studies find strong correlations between high levels of acceptance of patriarchal gender norms and tolerant or even positive attitudes to various types of violence, such as violence against women (Flood and Pease, 2009), violence between men (Jones, 2009), homophobic violence (Kimmel and Mahler, 2003) and armed conflict (Hudson et al., 2012). Many of these studies assume that there is a causal link between attitudes approving of patriarchal gender norms and attitudes approving of violence. Flood and Pease (2009) suggest that patriarchal attitudes have a fundamental and causal relationship with violence against women; that there is a consistent relationship between men's adherence to sexist and patriarchal attitudes and their use of violence against women. While causality is difficult to prove, such assumptions are further fed by research showing that countries with positive attitudes to gender equality (Ekvall, 2013) have low levels of violence.

The ambition of this study is to investigate the causal relationships between attitudes to patriarchal gender norms and attitudes to violence. The hypothesis is that a decrease in patriarchal gender norms leads to attitudes less accepting and approving of violence not only against women and homosexual men but also of other forms of violence, including state-level violence. The interaction of patriarchal norms and other influencing factors in society being very complex, it has so far been impossible to isolate changes in attitudes towards gender and violence to see if a change in the former causes a change in the latter. I therefore use a quasi-experimental setting, a training for men on masculinity by a non-governmental organization.

Over the past 10 to 15 years, interventions, mainly gender trainings, involving men and boys have become a common tool for institutions and organizations around the world striving to change patriarchal attitudes to gender and sometimes violence (mainly against women) (Jewkes Flood and Lang, 2014). The goals of many gender trainings are to challenge patriarchal, gender-biased and discriminatory behaviors, structures and socially constructed inequalities (Lyytikäinen, 2007).

As the large majority of violence in the world is perpetrated by men I chose to focus on a gender training for men to investigate if and how their attitudes to gender, sexuality and violence are related.

I start by discussing attitudes to gender and violence and subsequently move on to gender trainings. I then describe the organization that conducted the gender training studied here: Men Against Violence and Abuse (MAVA) in Mumbai, India, before moving on to the data and method. Finally I discuss the findings and how they might contribute to the field of studies on gender and violence.

4.2 Why working on attitudes?

As already noted, social norms indicate strong beliefs on what is right or wrong (Scott and Marshall, 2009) and are seen as (in)formal guidelines for accepted and expected behavior (Feldman, 1984). However, how individuals and collectivities relate to norms – accepting them or not – is a matter of attitudes. Attitudes are individual positions towards norms, ideas or behaviors (Eagly and Chaiken, 1998), showing our beliefs and feelings, approval or disapproval of ideas, actions and persons. Attitudes are an efficient way to size up the world: when we have to respond to something, the way we feel about it can guide how we react (Myers, 2008).

It thus seems reasonable to ask whether a decrease in patriarchal gender norms and attitudes leads to attitudes less accepting and approving of violence not only against women and homosexuals but also of other forms of violence, including state-level violence. It hence seems rather relevant to want to influence these patriarchal gender norms, making them more egalitarian, if one wants to reduce levels of multiple types of violence. But what do we really mean with gender norms?

4.3 Gender Norms

Norms on gender are culturally embedded ideological phenomena telling us what is “right” and “normal” behavior for men and women and what is “feminine” and “masculine” (Reeser, 2010). Whitehead (2002) clustered norms on masculinity in two groups: patriarchal and egalitarian. Patriarchal norms on masculinity involve male dominance over both women and other men (Connell, 1995) and the idea that violence is the best way to settle a conflict (Kimmel, 2008).

Connell’s concept of hegemonic masculinities helps explain how ideals of masculinity operate (Connell, 1995, 2001). She stresses relevance of both heteronormativity and gender hierarchies for relationships between men and women, as well as among men. While the concept of hegemonic masculinity can be seen as simplifying reality (Chisholm and Tidy, 2017) it is still a relevant analytical tool. The main aspects of hegemonic masculinity – power hierarchies systematically placing women and homosexuals below heterosexual men – are supported by structural and institutional arrangements of inequality and their justificatory ideologies (Connell, 2001).

Vandello et al. (2008) argue that manhood – what a “real man” should be like – is a precarious state requiring continuous social proof and validation. A man not proving himself according to the dominant norms risks to be seen as not a “real man”. Vandello et al. (2008) suggest that the cultural scripts for manhood implicitly and explicitly prescribe physical aggression to demonstrate masculine status to themselves and others, particularly when men’s social status or heterosexuality are threatened.

The hegemonic masculinity framework fails to describe and explain alternative masculinities however, i.e. the masculinities that actively distance themselves from hegemonic expectations, yet at the same time use hegemonic masculinity as the antithesis to their own stance

(Buschmeyer and Lengersdorf, 2016). These alternative masculinities overlap with the theorizing of inclusive masculinities (Anderson, 2009) that describes an increasing number of social spaces where men are free to break away from the patriarchal hypermasculinity. This again would overlap to a large extent with what others are calling egalitarian masculinities, generally referred to as opposite to patriarchal manhood. A few attempts to define such masculinities have been made though: egalitarian men negotiate their masculinities in their relationships (Schneider, 2007), thereby creating new norms thriving on mutual benefits. Egalitarian masculinities also involve emotional expressiveness, high levels of family involvement (Pyke, 1996), non-violence and absence of generalized gender roles (Rankhota, 2002). Recently a large number of studies have come out using the Gender-Equitable Men Scale²⁶, measuring men's attitudes to a multitude of things such as condom use, partner violence, sexual relationships, doing household work and much more.

There is thus evidence that attitudes to, (some aspects of) gender (in) equality are strongly associated with attitudinal support for violence against women and with actual perpetration of violence.

4.4 Violence, gender and sexuality norms and attitudes

Based on the work cited above, this study assumes that the most important features of patriarchal norms are: a) domination over women; b) heteronormativity and c) the use of violence as the preferred means to settle conflicts. These three patriarchal norms are then presumed to be linked to each other.

Domination over women has been linked to multiple forms of violence

²⁶ <https://www.c-changeprogram.org/content/gender-scales-compendium/about.html>

against women in much research (Hearn, 1998; Yodanis, 2004). High levels of and attitudes favorable to gender inequality are strongly correlated to many forms of violence (Ekvall, 2013) including armed conflict (Hudson et al., 2012). Patriarchal values on masculine toughness and honor have been found to be a driver of political violence (Bjarnegård et al., 2017). Male domination in politics correlates to armed conflict and states' violence against their own population (Caprioli, 2005; Melander, 2005). What we do not know is if and how changes in attitudes to domination over women and homosexual men co-vary with changes in attitudes to violence.

Several studies show strong correlations between homophobic norms and attitudes approving of violence against gay men (Plummer, 2001; Kimmel and Mahler, 2003). Kimmel (2008) describes the "Guy Code": the collection of attitudes, values and traits composing what it means to be a man, including constantly proving one's masculinity and heterosexuality and the rejection of anything seen as feminine. The Guy Code encourages the use of violence to avenge any perceived offense as the ultimate way for young men to prove that they are "real" men and not gay.

The use of violence as the preferred means to settle conflicts is a norm that influences violence at all levels (Flood et al., 2009; Vandello et al., 2008). At the same time, violence supportive attitudes trivialize violence and its impacts; attribute blame to victims; deny that violence has occurred and justify or excuse violence. Moreover, perpetrators of one type of violence are more likely to perpetrate other types of violence as well (Fleming et al., 2015).

While most violence in the world is perpetrated by men, many men are not violent. Nevertheless, Connell (1995, 2002) argues that most men are complicit with the gender order that privileges men over women. Therefore, even non-violent men may be seen as complicit and contributing to the culture of violence by not challenging it.

Using gender trainings for men, where input is given on masculinity, heteronormativity, patriarchal norms and attitudes, gender equality and violence against women and gay men then seems like a reasonable thing to do in order to make men start questioning and challenging patriarchal gender and sexuality order.

4.5 Gender trainings

As noted in the introduction, gender trainings are currently very common tool used by international and national organizations to change attitudes to gender and sexuality norms. While this global use of gender trainings surely means that many people have faith in them as a method for change, many authors have also argued that gender trainings present an emotional challenge, being about beliefs, values, practices, expectations and attitudes at the core of our personal identities. “Long-held assumptions are likely to be challenged, issues of power and control confronted, and a demand made to look at the world from a different perspective” (Mackay, 2003, p. 220). This makes gender trainings potentially threatening to the identity of individuals, organizations and communities and can generate a backlash, where the individual participant can become even more attached to patriarchal norms as a result of having his (or hers) whole worldview threatened. In order to facilitate changes and to prevent backlashes as far as possible efforts to address violence supportive attitudes should also provide an alternative set of norms and values centered on nonviolence, gender and sexuality equality, and social justice (Flood et al., 2009, p. 191). Moreover, interventions should address not only individual attitudes overtly accepting or condoning violence, but also attitudes related to gender and sexuality in normalizing and justifying this violence (Mackay, 2003). Mackay (2003) also argues that the process of changing attitudes should be part of a larger project to challenge and change familial, organizational, community and wider societal norms that support gendered and heteronormative power relations, including the use of violence, in order to be sustainable. Despite

their shortcomings gender trainings still represent a good opportunity to isolate and study changes in attitudes which is why one such training for young men has been sought out to be used in this study.

4.6 Method and data

*The Men Engage Network*²⁷ is a large worldwide network of non-governmental organizations working on masculinities. For this particular research I have contacted a large number of organizations in this network to identify those planning trainings on masculinity and inquired whether they would like to participate in the experiment. One such organization was Men Against Violence and Abuse (MAVA)²⁸ in Mumbai, India. MAVA conducted a training on masculinities with 25 male college students during a four-day camp, from 11th to 15th August 2016 in Devlali, India. While MAVA works on violence, this particular training focused on masculinities, not violence, and violence against women was *the only* type of violence addressed.

MAVA is an organization that did not come into being through an initiation by an international intervention. Rather, it was created by a local initiative in response to a small advertisement by journalist C.Y. Gopinath, in the “Indian Express” daily and its sister publications, in September 1991. The advertisement called for men “who feel that wives are not for battering and they could do something to stop or prevent it”²⁹. 205 men from different backgrounds responded. The initiative led to the creation of MAVA in 1993. Since then MAVA has worked on a multitude of projects: trainings; workshops; film festivals; hotlines for distressed youths wanting to discuss sexuality and relationships; different forms of community interventions, and more. They have struggled to get

²⁷ <http://menengage.org/>

²⁸ <http://www.mavaindia.org/>

²⁹ <http://www.mavaindia.org/Genesis.html>

funding and the activities are dependent on volunteer work. All methods, including the trainings, have been developed by the men at MAVA themselves in order to be context-appropriate. Thus MAVA does not fit in a neo-colonialist narrative where Western engagements, ideas, norms, and methods are forced upon non-Western organizations and communities. At the same time, the men at MAVA have read Western literature on gender, masculinities and violence and use some of it, but always put it in a local context, intersecting with caste, class, religion and education, in addition to using locally produced literature. The training used in this study was informed by the works of Connell, Kimmel, Pease and Flood, adapted to the local context as explained above. It was interactive, with discussions and various activities including films and lectures. The participants were not given handouts or reading material but took notes during the sessions.

My participation at the training, as a Western, white, and female researcher of course did not go unnoticed and many participants were interested in talking to me about a multitude of subjects during breaks and in the evenings. I had an interpreter all the time as many of the participants had little knowledge of the English language. During the training hours, however, I was sitting at the back of the room as an observer, getting the content of the discussions translated to English for me as they took place in a mix of Hindi and Marathi. My translator, who also served as my assistant, was a MAVA volunteer who had done this training himself a few years earlier. He distributed and collected the surveys for this research. This allowed me to interfere as little as possible with the participants during the actual training sessions. While my presence of course could have had an influence on the participants' answers to the survey questions, the fact that the surveys were anonymized hopefully provided some safeguards.

During the training many topics related to patriarchal norms on masculinity were raised: the difference between sex and gender; gender hierarchies as power relations; homosexuality; intersectionality between

patriarchal norms of gender, cast, education, religion and class; privilege; what “real men” should be like; transmission of gender norms through family, religion and – important in the Indian context – Bollywood films.

Violence was addressed *only* in the cases of violence against women (intimate partner violence, rape, sexual harassment, and honor killings). Other forms of violence, such as state level violence and violence against homosexuals, were *not* addressed.

The students came from 10 colleges in Mumbai, from various disciplinary backgrounds, and were part of a Volunteer for National Service Scheme (NSS) crediting students volunteering for social projects. The participants came from mixed social backgrounds: wealthy; middle-class; poor; dalit; families with long traditions of higher education and first generation graduates. All colleges begin their enrolment of NSS students in July every year. Each volunteer has to complete a minimum of 120 hours per year. Around 100-120 first year students (18-19 years old) usually enroll. The students attend an orientation session about the different projects they can participate in, MAVA being one of the options. Interested students enroll and approximately three male students per college were selected for the MAVA training in August. This selection is done through interviews, examining students’ interest in gender, willingness to reach out to others and to dedicate time and energy in MAVA’s activities. In some colleges participants were selected by professors, rather than enrolling voluntarily. In the case of MAVA gender training there were three such students.

A pre-training survey, S1, took place the evening before the training started and a post-training survey, S2, the last evening. Very short interviews about how the participants had come to attend the training were conducted during the breaks and in the evenings. Six months later, a follow-up survey, S3, took place and six of the young men from the training were interviewed.

The logic of this research was to follow the links between the change in attitudes towards gender, sexuality and violence. I measured the change by comparing the participants' attitudes to masculinity, gender equality, gay men and different types of violence before and after the training, using a matched samples design. S1 was a baseline measurement, S2 measured immediate changes in attitudes. If similar differences in attitudes to gender, sexuality and violence were found in S2 compared to S1, I considered there to be a causal relation between attitudes to masculinity and attitudes to violence. Six months after the training the participants were invited to take S3 and 17 out of 25 original participants did so. The purpose of S3 was to further analyze whether changes in some attitudes were more sustainable than in others.

As noted earlier, MAVA's training addressed attitudes to masculinity and several forms of violence against women as part of those attitudes. But the training did not address other forms of violence, such as state (military or police) violence, or communal violence. The survey however did ask questions about those types of violence, precisely because I wanted to see if changes in the patriarchal attitudes to masculinity would affect changes in attitudes towards various types of violence.

The survey collected background information on the respondents: socio-economic status; family composition; fear of 'others' and religiosity. The survey was developed relying mainly on scales and questions from existing – and thus previously tested – surveys, such as the Conformity to Masculinity Norms Inventory (Mahalik et al., 2003); norms and belief assessments by the World Health Organization (2009); the Center for Disease Control and Prevention's compendium of assessment tools (Dahlberg et al., 2005); and the Gender-Equitable Men Scale (Men and Gender Equality Policy Project, 2011). The survey consisted of 80 short, one sentence statements that were supposed to help me assess participants' attitudes to masculinity and various forms of violence. The responses were coded on a Likert scale from 1 to 5 equaling: where 1

indicates very much agree, following: agree, neutral, don't agree, and don't agree at all (indicated by 5).

Thirteen norms on masculinity and seven types of violence were investigated.³⁰ Four statements were proposed about each of them. Two were framed positively and two negatively to avoid a bias in participants' preferences. The survey was pre-tested and translated into the local language, Marathi.

Four major challenges were related to the methodology: 1) the relatively low number of participants: 25 in S1 and S2 and 17 in S3. This being an exploratory study, findings based on a small number of participants were deemed acceptable. 2) The participants' self-selection. As the study set out to see how changes in some attitudes might influence changes in other attitudes, the participants' initial level of interest in gender was not considered relevant. 3) The possibility that the participants responded in a "desirable" way. While this is a common problem to any survey, the total anonymity of the participants hopefully prevented that from happening, or minimized it. 4) The quality of the data: The selection of this training was done very carefully to make sure that it focused on norms on masculinity and sexuality, and *not* on violence itself, in order for the quasi-experimental setting to provide valid data. MAVA's training satisfied this requirement.

The data was put in a spreadsheet to get an overview of possible individual changes. While all of the data have been analyzed, only seven of the survey's 80 statements were chosen for this particular analysis, having the strongest theoretical links to the issue central to this study:

³⁰ Thirteen norms on masculinity: dominance over women; domination over subordinate and marginalized men; need for power over other men; emotional control; need for respect; need to provide for family; competitiveness; pursuit of status; self-reliance; primacy of work; virility; risk-taking; the use of violence as preferred means to settle conflicts. Seven types of violence: against women; between men; homophobic violence; violence to get respect and/or to re-establish honour; state violence against the own population; political violence; military violence.

relationships between patriarchal attitudes to masculinity and sexuality and various types of violence. These seven statements address domination over and violence against women; disdain towards and violence against homosexual men; and state/military/political violence.³¹

The goal of the experiment was to investigate: 1) whether the answers to any of the seven statements changed from patriarchal to egalitarian after the training, 2) how these changes related to each other and 3) especially whether the changes in attitudes towards women and gay men could be related to changes in attitudes towards the state/military/political violence.

In the short informal interviews with the participants conducted just before and during the training, all but three mentioned the high levels of rape and sexual assault in India as motivation to learn more about gender and masculinities. Three participants who did not bring this up as their motivation had not chosen to attend the training themselves but were sent by their professors. More than half of the participants cited the going away on a camp as a major motivation for participation as most had never been away from home and parents before. When asked if they would use their new knowledge when back from the training, all responded that they would talk to friends and family about it. Some responded that they wanted to organize events together with MAVA at their colleges. The majority of participants thus had similar levels of interest and motivation to learn about masculinities.

31 Questions on domination over women ("In general, men should control the women in their life"); violence against women ("A man has the right to correct or discipline female behaviour"); heteronormativity ("I would be furious if someone thought I was gay"); violence against homosexuals ("It is ok to beat up a gay person"); state violence against the own population ("Torture is an acceptable method to get valuable information in some cases"); political violence ("People of another political / ideological, caste, ethnic or religious affiliation deserve the violence they get"), and military violence/militarism ("a soldier is the archetype of a real man")

4.7 Findings

The answers of the three surveys and whether the ensuing changes in attitudes were supported by family and friends after the training are presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 *The answers to S1, S2 and S3 and levels of support per participant*

	In general men should control the women in their life. S1/S2/S3	A man has the right to correct or discipline female behavior. S1/S2/S3	I would be furious if someone thought I was gay. S1/S2/S3	It is ok to beat up a gay person. S1/S2/S3	people of another political / ideological, caste, ethnic or religious affiliation deserve the violence they get. S1/S2/S3	A soldier is the archetype of a real man. S1/S2/S3	Support from family and friends in sustaining changes in an egalitarian direction.	Torture is acceptable 4.1n some cases. S1/S2/S3
1	2/5/5	5/5/2	2/4/5	5/5/5	1/2/2	5/5/5	2/4/4	n/a
2	2/5/5	2/2/5	4/2/5	4/5/5	5/3/1	3/4/5	2/2/5	n/a
3	2/5/1	4/5/3	5/1/4	5/5/2	4/5/1	5/5/2	3/5/3	n/a
4	5/5/5	2/4/5	1/5/5	5/5/5	1/5/5	3/5/4	3/5/5	Family yes.
5	4/4/-	4/4/-	2/5/-	5/5/-	1/1/-	5/5/-	5/5/-	n/a
6	2/5/4	4/5/3	3/1/5	5/5/5	1/5/2	5/5/3	1/5/2	n/a
7	5/5/5	5/5/5	3/5/5	5/5/5	5/5/1	5/5/5	4/5/5	Yes. ³¹
8	4/5/3	5/2/1	3/5/2	4/5/4	1/3/1	4/5/5	3/5/1	No.
9	4/5/5	2/1/5	2/5/5	5/5/5	2/5/5	4/5/5	4/1/5	n/a
10	1/5/5	5/5/5	3/5/5	5/5/5	4/5/5	5/5/5	5/5/5	Family yes.
11	3/5/-	1/4/-	1/5/-	-/5/-	3/5/-	3/5/-	1/4/-	n/a
12	2/1/1	1/1/2	1/1/1	3/3/2	3/3/3	2/2/4	1/1/2	n/a
13	5/5/1	1/1/1	1/1/1	5/5/1	5/5/1	5/1/5	5/5/5	n/a
14	5/5/3	1/5/5	1/1/2	5/5/1	5/5/2	5/1/5	5/5/5	n/a
15	3/1/-	2/1/-	1/1/-	5/5/-	2/5/-	4/5/-	4/4/-	n/a
16	4/1/-	2/5/-	1/2/-	5/5/-	4/3/-	4/5/-	1/5/-	n/a
17	5/5/5	2/3/2	2/5/3	5/5/5	2/2/3	4/5/5	4/5/2	n/a
18	5/5/2	1/1/3	1/1/2	5/5/5	1/1/5	5/5/3	1/1/2	n/a
19	5/5/-	5/5/-	1/5/-	5/5/-	5/5/-	5/5/-	1/4/-	n/a
20	3/3/-	2/3/-	1/1/-	5/5/-	2/2/-	4/4/-	4/4/-	n/a
21	4/2/-	4/3/-	2/4/-	5/5/-	4/2/-	4/4/-	1/4/-	n/a
22	4/2/-	2/3/-	2/4/-	5/5/-	2/2/-	4/4/-	4/4/-	n/a
23	5/5/5	5/5/5	5/5/5	5/5/5	1/-/1	5/-/5	5/5/3	Yes
24	5/5/5	3/4/4	3/2/1	3/4/4	-/4/4	3/4/4	3/4/4	n/a
25	4/5/4	2/5/2	3/4/3	5/5/4	2/2/2	5/5/5	1/5/1	Yes

³² 'Yes' here means support by both family and friends.

4.7.1 Domination over and violence against women

The first statement, “In general, men should control the women in their life”, got a varied response in S1. The change from S1 to S2 shows increases in extreme positions, i.e. small number of participants taking more patriarchal attitude in S2 than in S1, i.e. agreeing more with the statement in S2 than they did in S1, although the change towards total rejection of patriarchal norms predominates³³.

The statement “A man has the right to correct or discipline female behavior” was taken as a proxy of male violence against women. Even though it does not explicitly mention violence it left open the possibility of various forms of disciplining that include violence (psychological, economic, physical, etc.). This statement initially received more responses reflecting patriarchal attitudes than the statement on men dominating women.³⁴ Nevertheless, the changes from S1 to S2 indicate a growing rejection of disciplining women, accompanying the shift towards more egalitarian norms in the statement on men’s domination over women. As Flood and Pease (2009) show, holding sexist and patriarchal norms and attitudes towards women is strongly associated with violence against women. Thus, it makes sense that a change in the attitudes to women results in a change in attitudes to ‘disciplining’ as a proxy for violence.

The other changes on these two questions are worth mentioning. Three participants changed in a more patriarchal direction on the statement on discipline. These negative changes could be a result of a backlash, i.e. feeling that their identity was under attack (Mackay, 2003), or that the method was not appropriate for these participants. Important here, however, is that the average changes of attitudes towards domination

33 Overall the changes were in the egalitarian direction. The average response changed from 3,72 in S1 to 4,16 in S2, thus a change of 0,44.

34 The average changed from 2,80 in S1 to 3,52 in S2, a change with 0,72.

of women and violence against women from S1 to S2 did go in the direction of more egalitarian attitudes for the majority of participants. In other words, while it is important to research why after a gender training some participants hold even more patriarchal attitudes, the overall directions of change in attitudes towards gender equality and violence against women was the same.

4.7.2 Heteronormativity and violence against homosexuals

The second set of statements was related to disdain of and violence against homosexual men. The statement “I would be furious if someone thought I was gay” got more patriarchal responses than the statement on controlling women, both in S1 and S2 although it became slightly more egalitarian in S2. The change in average was rather high, from 2,24 in S1 to 3,16 in S2.

Being thought of as gay was clearly perceived as much worse for the participants than not controlling women. The training changed these results even though it did not achieve the same level of egalitarian attitudes as the statements regarding women. The answers in S2 were divided towards the top and bottom of the scale, with the six neutral answers from S1 disappearing. While more than half of the participants changed in a more egalitarian direction, four changed in a more patriarchal way. In S1 three quarters of the participants held more patriarchal attitudes towards homosexuality than towards domination over women, and in S2 one third still did. To accept homosexuality was thus more difficult than accepting gender equality for the large majority of participants. This is in line with Connell’s (1995) work on hegemonic masculinities and the ways gay men disrupt the heteronormative gender order, as well as Vandello et al.’s (2008) argument that homosexual men are not seen as “real” men.

The statement “It is ok to beat up a gay person” got a strong rejection already in S1: 20 of the 25 participants strongly disagreed; nobody gave

an answer lower than 3, (“neutral”), with the average answer 4,75³⁵, thus close to the maximum 5, meaning that it is never acceptable to beat up a gay person. In S2 only two participants answered lower than 5, leading to an average of 4,88. Nobody changed in a more violent direction. Only one respondent did not change, answering 3 both times. He also answered “very much agree” in both S1 and S2 on the statement on becoming furious if thought gay and on the statement on men’s right to correct or discipline female behavior, but moved in a more patriarchal direction on the statement on men dominating women. This person thus accepts patriarchal norms on women, homosexuals and violence against women, but has ambivalent attitudes towards violence against homosexuals.

These results raise the question about relationship between homophobia and violence against gay men. Clearly, the relationship is not straight forward, because despite the relatively high levels of homophobic attitudes expressed in acceptance of the first statement in S1, the same survey shows that there was also high rejection of violence against gay men. The attitudes towards gender equality and violence against women were more aligned than the attitudes towards homosexuality. It could be that if the statement on disciplining women had been differently formulated, for instance as “It is a husband’s right to beat up a woman”, we would have had a higher discrepancy there as well. I will return to this issue later.

4.7.3 State and political violence

As the training did *not* address issues of state violence nor violence inspired by political or ideological reasons the survey offered an exceptional opportunity to see whether there was any correlation between attitudes to those types of violence and attitudes to gender equality and heteronormativity. Presence of such correlations would be of high-

35 One person did not answer this question in the S1 but did so in S2.

est importance for our understanding of the relations between gender, sexuality and violence.

A relatively “mild” statement “Torture is an acceptable method to get valuable information in some cases” was selected as a proxy for state violence and had a varied response. The average response in S1 was a rather low levels of rejection, 2,75, while the S2 score increased to 3,63 indicating an increased rejection of torture, but with half of the participants still finding torture acceptable.³⁶ Two participants changed in a way more accepting of torture, though. These two respondents also changed to more patriarchal attitudes on the statement of men’s domination over women. Almost all of the fifteen participants who responded approvingly or neutrally to the statement of torture in S1 had responded in a patriarchal or neutral way on the statement of being furious if thought of as gay, and eleven of fifteen responded in a patriarchal or neutral way to the statement on men’s right to correct and discipline women. This suggests that people thinking that torture is acceptable are also more likely to adhere to patriarchal gender and sexuality attitudes.

Regarding political violence, not many people agreed with the statement “People of another political / ideological, caste, ethnic or religious affiliation deserve the violence they get” in either S1 or S2. The already high level of rejection average increased from 4,24 to 4,33.³⁷ One person who responded “agree” in both S1 and S2 also showed patriarchal attitudes to gender and sexuality. While this person was very consistent in his replies, two others were more surprising. They fully rejected political violence in S1 but fully accepted it in S2. They had also answered approvingly on the statements about being furious if thought gay and having the right to correct and discipline women.

³⁶ One participant did not answer in S1 and another one in S2.

³⁷ One participant did not respond in S2.

The final statement addressing acceptance of military – “a soldier is the archetype of a real man”- got a very mixed response in S1 with answers averaging 2,92. In S2 the average increased to a high disapproving levels, to 4,08, thus providing a change of 1,16 – the biggest change of all the statements in the survey. This big change was quite remarkable as the topics of soldiering, militarization and state violence were not discussed during the training at all. In S2 one person changed in a more patriarchal direction though, from “disagree” to “strongly agree”. He had changed in a patriarchal direction already on the statement on correcting and disciplining women. Three people didn’t change their patriarchal attitudes at all.

Discussions about norms on masculinity during this training thus lead to changes in attitudes to various forms of violence, including the state violence and militarism. As noted, the issues of torture, political violence and soldiering had not been mentioned at all during the training, yet there was a significant change in attitudes towards rejecting torture and disapproving that soldiers are as the model of “real” men, after the training. This is hugely significant result, in line with the overall assumptions of this research about the links between gender, sexuality and violence. Duriesmith (2017) argued that patriarchal norms on masculinity are one of the causes of armed conflict and that changing these norms would have an impact on state level violence. While the causes cannot be confirmed, the survey results certainly point to the very close links.

Figure 4.1 shows how many patriarchal and violence approving attitudes were held by people who answered at the two extremes of the scale (1= strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree). We can see that those who responded “strongly agree” to the statements supporting patriarchal norms on gender, sexuality and violence had consistently responded in similar manner on more than one statement. Those who held egalitarian or violence disapproving attitudes to one statement were less likely to hold patriarchal or violence approving attitudes to other state-




Figure 4.1

Difference in average number of patriarchal and violence approving attitudes among those answering 1 or 5

ments. In S2, after the training, the number of patriarchal responses by those participants who had egalitarian answers on some statement decreased in all seven cases, regardless of whether it was a statement on gender, sexuality or violence, thus lowering the overall acceptance of patriarchal norms. These results correspond with the findings that levels of acceptance of gender equality and of homosexuality (as indicators of levels of patriarchal norms and attitudes) relate to levels of various types of violence, including state violence, ideological violence and militarization (Ekvall, 2013; Hudson et al., 2012; Hutchings, 2008).

Multiple studies in the field of masculinities state that one important patriarchal norm is that violence is the best way to settle a dispute, to gain or regain respect, and to keep dominant structures of hegemonic masculinity in place (Connell, 2002; Fleming et al, 2015; Kimmel,

2008; Reeser, 2010). Given the arguments elaborated in the introduction - that norms in general are related to structural and institutional arrangements as well as collective and individual identities, beliefs and expectations - it is reasonable to assume that attitudes accepting such patriarchal norms on violence are related to attitudes towards other spheres of life as well. This study has shown that in this controlled setting, changes in attitudes towards gender equality and homosexuality - i.e. the main focus of the training - in most cases were directly related to changes in attitudes to various types of violence, and that the direction of post-training change - in both sets of attitudes - is mostly towards egalitarianism and non-violence. While this is a very valuable insight, this study, nevertheless, also showed some surprising results needing further reflections and research.

4.8 Sustainability of changes

The last survey, S3, which took place six months after the training and involved 17 of the original 25 participants, was conducted in order to test the sustainability of the changes, and whether change in some attitudes was more sustainable than in others. Nine of the 17 respondents had either not changed at all or changed slightly in a patriarchal direction from S2 to S3. The remaining eight participants had changed in a patriarchal direction on three to six statements compared to S2. The changes of these eight participants in patriarchal direction from S1 to S2, occurred in all statements, with no overrepresentation of attitudes to a particular type of norm. There thus seems to be no difference in sustainability of changes between different types of norms and attitudes. It is rather that the changes found in some individuals are more sustainable than in the case of others.

While the results show that, in this particular group of young men, attitudes towards gender and sexuality and attitudes towards violence are related, the research also brings up important questions on how

the individual is linked to the social, and what the conditionalities and contingencies of change are.

I contacted all participants at the time of S3 but only six of them agreed to be interviewed at the time. Though very small, the sample of interviews still suggests some factors influencing sustainability. When asked if they had been supported by family and friends after the training, three of the interviewees answered that they had received positive reactions from both family and friends, two said that they had received positive reaction from the family but been laughed at by friends, and one said that he had had negative reactions both from family and friends. Four of those reporting positive reactions had very egalitarian scores and no or few changes from S2 to S3. One respondent without support had moved back to a patriarchal attitude on six statements out of seven. One person had received positive reactions from family and friends and still reverted back to more patriarchal and violence-approving norms in five out of seven statements. Interestingly, this respondent was very positive towards gender equality and the training during the interview, telling how he had tried to transmit egalitarian attitudes both at home and at school with, according to him, positive reactions. For the moment I have no explanation for this.

The sustainability of the changes in five out of six cases thus seemed to relate to what reaction participants got from family and friends. This corresponds to Risse and Sikkink's (1999) statement that people follow norms dominant in their surrounding because they want others to think well of them and to think well of themselves; the ability to think well about ourselves being influenced by the norms of the people and society around us. In this case having positive reactions and support from the family seemed crucial and even seemed to carry more weight than the reactions from peers for one of the participants.

The weight carried by the influence of different groups and institutions such as family, peers, school and media is most probably different in

different societies. Kimmel (2008) describes a different setting in the US where peer influence carries a heavy weight in forming young men's norms and attitudes to masculinity and violence. This brings us back to the question of method. Gender trainings for individuals, the current favorite tool by the international community (Lyytikäinen, 2007), is clearly not sufficient in itself to change patriarchal norms and attitudes on gender and violence on a large scale and in a sustainable way. While this is not a surprise to many feminist scholars (it would be more surprising if such fundamental changes in society could take place through such relatively small and easy interventions), it seems this message still needs to be highlighted even though the effectiveness of gender trainings was not the topic of this study. As argued by Mackay (2003) and Pease and Flood (2008) attitude change should be part of a larger project challenging and changing familial, organizational, community and wider patriarchal societal norms supporting gendered power relations, including the use of violence.

4.9 Puzzles and ambiguities

Besides confirming some of the assumptions, the survey also offered some ambiguous results and puzzles. Among them is the surprising rejection of violence against gay men – considerably higher than rejection of violence against women. This result is difficult to understand given the negative attitudes towards male homosexuality and the high levels of violence against homosexuals in parts of the world where intolerance of homosexuality also is high (Planet Romeo, 2015). What could be the reasons for this result? First, the statement on beating up gay men is very direct (compared to the statement on “disciplining” and “correcting” women) and it is possible that a less direct statement would have yielded different answers. It is also possible that a combination of such a direct question and political correctness influenced the answers. Then, as Fleming et al. (2015) argue, men perpetrate violence to gain, maintain, or avoid losing status and power. Is it possible that

gay men can be despised without being considered a threat to the other man's status and power so that there is no status to gain from beating them up? To fully understand this result further research is needed.

Another puzzle is the direction of change towards patriarchal attitudes after the training. While a majority of the participants changed their attitudes in an egalitarian direction and non-approving of violence during the training, some did not change at all and some changed in a patriarchal direction. However, only two of the twelve individuals who had a change in a more patriarchal direction on one or two statements ended up having their average change turn more patriarchal. The other ten compensated for their change to patriarchal attitudes in one statement by having changes towards egalitarian attitudes on other statements. While non-change can be explained by strong beliefs and values that the training failed to challenge, change in a more patriarchal direction is harder to explain. It could be that the training method provoked backlash in some individuals as proposed by Mackay (2003). Backlashes after violence prevention programs have been documented before (Edwards and Hinsz, 2014) making it imperative to further scrutinize and develop gender training methods.

Finally, demographic variables did not influence the attitudes in any significant way. The background information of the 25 participants was contrasted to the seven statements, but no statistically relevant patterns were found. It is important to note that the purpose of the study was to see whether and how attitudes to patriarchal gender norms and attitudes to violence are related, not to see how attitudes are linked to the social background of the participants. However, the absence of any correlation is at odds with the expectation that the participants with less educated parents; with mothers who had their first child before the age of 18; those afraid of (ethnic, religious or ideological) others; were from households where only girls did household duties and who were more religious, would have a more patriarchal outlook on life (Contre-ras and Plaza, 2010; Klingorová and Havlíček, 2015; Ridgeway, 2011). The

survey results showed that it didn't matter what social background the participants had when it came to what types of attitudes they held. While this is probably due to the very small sample size, the result also goes against stereotypes of upper-class, well-educated people being more liberal and progressive than low-educated, lower classes. This is important as social change programs are often based on the assumption that this difference exists between the classes, mostly targeting the lower classes while ignoring the middle and upper classes³⁸. While different methods probably are needed for programs targeting people with different levels of education and other social differences, the need for such programs seems equally distributed in society.

4.10 Conclusion

This study is limited in scope as it only shows us the changes in attitudes in a particular setting with a particular group of young, male college students. Nevertheless, it still furthers our understanding of attitudes to different types of violence, and in particular the links between patriarchal attitudes to gender and homosexuality and attitudes to interpersonal, collective and state violence. Further research can test whether these links and the changes established in this experiment can be confirmed elsewhere. Even without the confirmation, this research offers some important insights. Inter-personal, collective and state violence involve high human and financial costs and preoccupy policy makers and civil society actors around the globe. This study thus provides new insights into the possible links between various types of gender, sexuality and various types of violence, which might be relevant for social engagements. Thus it contributes not only to theory building but also to the practices of activists, practitioners and policy makers working on gender equality and violence prevention. Working with men

38 A lot of interventions, especially against gender-based violence, are "community based" within poorer communities; see for instance http://healthpolicyproject.com/pubs/382_GenderBasedViolence.pdf.

to change norms and attitudes on gender, sexuality and violence seems crucial. However, the question of what kind of work and what conditions yield the most sustainable results remains.

4.11 References

- Anderson, E. (2009). *Inclusive masculinity: the changing nature of masculinities*. New York: Routledge.
- Bjarnegård, E., Brounéus, K., & Melander, E. (2017). Honor and political violence: Micro-level findings from a survey in Thailand. *Journal of Peace Research*, 54(6), 748-761.
- Buschmeyer, A., & Lengersdorf, D. (2016). The differentiation of masculinity as a challenge for the concept of hegemonic masculinity. *NORMA*, 11(3), 190-207.
- Caprioli, M. (2005). Primed for violence: The role of gender inequality in predicting internal conflict. *International Studies Quarterly*, 49(2), 161-178.
- Chisholm, A., & Tidy, J. (2017). Beyond the hegemonic in the study of militaries, masculinities, and war. *Critical Military Studies*, 3(2), 99-102.
- Connell, R. (1995). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connell, R. (2001). The social organization of masculinity. In S. M. Whitehead & F. J. Barrett (Eds.), *The masculinities reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Connell, R. (2002). Masculinities, the reduction of violence and the pursuit of peace. In C. Cockburn & D. Zarkov (Eds.), *The Postwar Moment. Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping: Bosnia and the Netherlands*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Contreras, D., & Plaza, G. (2010). Cultural factors in women's labor force participation in Chile. *Feminist Economics*, 16(2), 27-46.
- Dahlberg, L. L., Toal, S. B., Swahn, M. H., & Behrens, C. B. (2005). *Measuring Violence-Related Attitudes, Behaviors, and Influences Among Youths: A Compendium of Assessment Tools*, 2nd ed. Atlanta, GA: Center for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Durie-Smith, D. (2017). *Masculinity and New War: The gendered dynamics of contemporary armed conflict*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1998). Attitude Structure and Function. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fisk, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 269-322). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Edwards, S. R., & Hinsz, V. B. (2014). A Meta-Analysis of Empirically Tested School-Based Dating Violence Prevention Programs. *SAGE Open*, 4(2), 1-8.

- Ekvall, Å. (2013). Gender equality, attitudes to gender equality and conflict. In M. Texler Segal & V. Demos (Eds.), *Gendered Perspectives on Conflict and Violence* (Advances in Gender Research Vol. 18a) (Vol. 18a, pp. 273-295). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Feldman, D. C. (1984). The development and enforcement of group norms. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(1), 47-55.
- Fleming, P. J., Gruskin, S., Rojo, F., & Dworkin, S. L. (2015). Men's violence against women and men are inter-related: Recommendations for simultaneous intervention. *Social Science & Medicine*, 146, 249-256.
- Flood, M., & Pease, B. (2009). Factors Influencing Attitudes to Violence Against Women. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 10(2), 125-142.
- Flood, M., Pease, B., Taylor, N., & Webster, K. (2009). Reshaping Attitudes toward Violence against Women. In E. Stark & E. S. Buzawa (Eds.), *Violence against Women in Families and Relationships: The Media and Cultural Attitudes* (Vol. 4, pp. 177-198). Santa Barbara, Denver, Oxford: Praeger.
- Hearn, J. (1998). *The Violences of Men*. London: SAGE.
- Hudson, V. M., Ballif-Spanvill, B., Caprioli, M., & Emmett, C. F. (2012). *Sex and World Peace*. New York and Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press.
- Hutchings, K. (2008). Making Sense of Masculinity and War. *Men and Masculinities*, 10(4), 389-404.
- Jewkes, R., Flood, M., & Lang, J. (2014). From work with men and boys to changes of social norms and reduction of inequities in gender relations: a conceptual shift in prevention of violence against women and girls. *The Lancet*, 385(9977), 1580-1589.
- Jones, A. (2009). *Gender inclusive. Essays on violence, men and feminist international relations*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kimmel, M. (2008). *Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Kimmel, M., & Mahler, M. (2003). Adolescent masculinity, homophobia, and violence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 46(10), 1439-1458.
- Klingorová, K., & Havlíček, T. (2015). Religion and gender inequality: The status of women in the societies of world religions. *Moravian Geographical Reports*, 23(2), 2-11.
- Lyytikäinen, M. (2007). *Gender training for peacekeepers: Preliminary overview of United Nations peace support operations*. Santo Domingo: UN-INSTRAW.
- Mackay, A. (2003). Training the uniforms: gender and peacekeeping operations. *Development in Practice*, 13(2&3), 217-223.

- Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Ludlow, L. H., Diemer, M. A., Scott, R. P. J., Gottfried, M., & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 4, 3-25.
- Melander, E. (2005). Gender Equality and Intrastate Armed Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly*, 49(4), 695-714.
- Men and Gender Equality Policy Project (MGEPP). (2011). *International Men and Gender Equality Survey (IMAGES) Survey Questionnaires*. Rio de Janeiro: Promundo.
- Myers, D. G. (2008). *Social Psychology*. Boston: McGraw-Hill International Edition.
- Pease, B., & Flood, M. (2008). Rethinking the Significance of Attitudes in Preventing Men's Violence Against Women. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 43(4), 547-561.
- Planet Romeo. (2015). *The Gay Happiness Index*. Retrieved from <https://www.planetromeo.com/en/care/gay-happiness-index/>
- Plummer, D. C. (2001). The quest for modern manhood: masculine stereotypes, peer culture and the social significance of homophobia. *Journal of Adolescence*, 24, 15-23.
- Pyke, K. D. (1996). Class-based masculinities: The interdependence of gender, class, and interpersonal power. *Gender & Society*, 10, 527-549.
- Rankhota, C. S. (2002). *The Construction of Egalitarian Masculinities in the Midlands of Kwazulu-Natal*. (PhD), University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg.
- Reeser, T. W. (2010). *Masculinities in Theory: An Introduction*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ridgeway, C. L. (2011). *Framed by Gender: How Gender Inequality Persists in the Modern World*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Risse, T., & Sikkink, K. (1999). The Socialization of International Human Rights Norms into Domestic Practices: Introduction. In T. Risse, S. C. Robb, & K. Sikkink (Eds.), *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change* (pp. 1-18). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schneider, A. (2007). Masculinity as a Reproduction of Traditionalism, Feminist Reaction, and Egalitarianism. In J. Powell & T. Owen (Eds.), *Reconstructing Postmodernism*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Scott, J., & Marshall, G. (Eds.). (2009). *Oxford Dictionary of Sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vandello, J. A., Cohen, D., & Ransom, S. (2008). US southern and northern differences in perceptions of norms about aggression - Mechanisms for the perpetuation of a culture of honor. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 39(2), 162-177.
- Whitehead, S. (2002). *Men and Masculinities*. Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press.

World Health Organization. (2009). *Violence prevention the evidence: Changing cultural and social norms that support violence*. Geneva: WHO.

Yodanis, C. L. (2004). Gender Inequality, Violence Against Women, and Fear : A Cross-National Test of the Feminist Theory of Violence Against Women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(6), 655-675.

GENDER INEQUALITY, HOMOPHOBIA AND VIOLENCE:
THE THREE PILLARS OF PATRIARCHAL NORMS AND ATTITUDES AND THEIR RELATIONS

– 116 –

5 Conclusion

5.1 Initial questions, assumptions, studies and results

This thesis is born out of observations from the field where, in various post-conflict and conflict settings, during more than ten years of development work, I could not help but wonder why it seemed that the more gender inequality there was in a society, the more violence there also was, and not only violence against women, but violence of all kinds, including armed conflict. This led me to want to do a PhD in order to investigate how gender and sexuality inequalities, including violence against and oppression of women and homosexuals, are related to various other forms of violence, and specifically to violent conflict. Following an assumption that patriarchal norms on gender and sexuality, and attitudes towards them, are inter-related with support of violence, I wondered if gender equality and acceptance of homosexuality would change this. Previous research had established that the level of *gender inequality* was the best predictor of armed conflict within a society, better than earlier explanatory variables such as democracy levels, economic development and presence / absence of Islam (Hudson et al., 2012). Other scholars had also established links between different aspects of gender inequality and violence against women as well as other types of violence, making the correlation robust. But where did this correlation come from? Many scholars working on the topic had hypothesized that underlying norms and attitudes towards gender (in)equality were linked to norms and attitudes towards the use of violence, as both gender norms and norms on violence are influenced by patriarchal norms. I thus decided to see if and how patriarchal norms and attitudes to gender and sexuality were related to different types of violence. This led me to three specific sub-questions that were dealt with in the three articles above.

The first question, in the article “Gender Equality, Attitudes to Gender Equality, and Conflict”, was whether the findings from earlier research, i.e. a strong correlation between *levels* of gender inequality and levels of violence, could be reproduced using different data sets than the previous studies. The underlying idea was that re-confirming this correlation with different data sets would strengthen the current findings and inspire further research. I used the Global Gender Gap Index (GGGI) (Ricardo Hausmann, Tyson and Zahidi, 2011; World Economic Forum, 2014b) instead of the WomanStat Database (WomanStats Project, 2012) to measure levels of gender inequality. And I relied on the Uppsala Conflict Data Base (UCDB) (Pettersson and Wallensteen, 2015) to control for armed conflict. The correlation turned out to be strong and statistically significant. I then analyzed the aggregated Global Peace Index (GPI) (Institute for Economics & Peace, 2014) together with the GGGI in order to specify general levels of violence, including armed conflict. The results showed that high levels of gender equality were positively correlated with low levels of general levels of violence. However, as this study only analyses the aggregated GPI, it left unanswered question about the relationship between gender equality and specific types of violence, besides armed conflict.

The outcome of this first analysis lead to my second question, dealt with in the same article, namely if *attitudes* to gender (in)equality were correlated to a) *levels* of gender (in)equality and b) levels of violence. Thus I was not relating (only) the actual *levels* of (in)equality with levels of violence, but rather *attitudes* to (in)equality with *levels* of violence.

I used the World Values Survey (WVS) (World Values Survey Association, 2015) to get data on attitudes to gender equality and continued to use the GGGI, the UCDB and the GPI. The results showed strong and significant correlations first of all between *levels* of gender equality and *attitudes* to gender equality. The more positive the attitudes, the higher the levels of gender equality were in the countries. Furthermore, attitudes to gender equality were also strongly and significantly correlated

to existence of armed conflicts (UCDB) and general levels of violence (GPI). This means that the more positive attitudes to gender equality were in a country, the less armed conflict and lower general levels of violence there were. As this study relied on data sets that were constituted fairly recently no analysis across time could be conducted. We thus do not know if an increase in levels of gender equality leads to an increase in attitudes approving of gender equality, vice versa or both.

These results, in combination with theoretical discussions on gender and violence set out in the first article, made it seem very plausible that not only actual *levels* of gender equality, but also *attitudes* towards and norms on gender equality go hand in hand with *levels* of several different types of violence. In particular it seemed that attitudes to patriarchal norms on gender - especially on masculinities - were related to levels of violence. In fact it seemed like patriarchal norms were the underlying causes of both gender inequality and various forms of violence. However, the literature had made it very clear that patriarchal norms not only concern gender and violence but also sexuality. Heteronormativity and homophobia are an important part of patriarchal and hegemonic norms on masculinity, which have become an important theme in conflict studies quite recently. But there is still a long way to go for them to become a common theme in the research on various forms of violence, save for inter-personal violence against gay men. This missing link inspired the second article and its question.

The second article, “Don’t be Gay: Homophobia, Violence and Conflict”, dealt with the question: are intolerant attitudes to homosexuality linked to levels of violence in the same way as intolerance of gender inequality is? The data on intolerance of homosexuality came from the World Values Survey (WVS), the Gay Happiness Index (GHI) (Planet Romeo, 2015) and included the data on violence against homosexuals (Carroll and Itaborahy, 2015). The data on other types of violence again came from the GPI and the UCDB. The control variables included gender equality levels (GGI); socio-economic inequality levels using the GINI

index (World Bank, 2014b); GDP/capita (World Bank, 2014a); democracy levels using the Democracy Index, (The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2014); and the inequality adjusted Human Development Index (HDI) (United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 2015).

The first analysis looked at *attitudes* to homosexuality and *levels* of violence, using the WVS and the GPI. It found that attitudes to homosexuality are strongly related to levels of general violence (aggregated GPI), meaning that societies with high intolerance of homosexuality tend to have higher levels of violence in general and vice versa. The second result is that when many people think that homosexuality is always justified there are low levels of violent crime and people perceive the level of criminality in their society to be low. When many people think that homosexuality is never justified there are high levels of violent crime and people perceive the level of criminality to be high. The third result is that attitudes to homosexuality are correlated to levels of specific forms of societal violence, namely access to weapons and political instability. Acceptance and sometimes even just neutral attitudes towards homosexuality are associated with lower levels of political instability and low access to weapons, while high levels of intolerance of homosexuality go hand in hand with high levels of political instability and high access to weapons. The fourth result is that attitudes to homosexuality are correlated to militarization, levels of military expenditure to be precise. Countries with high intolerance of homosexuality spend a larger percentage of their GDP on their military than countries with neutral and accepting attitudes to homosexuality.

These results were expected as they fall within specific theoretical discussions that rest on the conceptualization of hegemonic masculinity as heteronormative and homophobic, and as constructed through images of physical strength, wherein soldiering and military stand as specific positive symbols of “proper manhood”. Thus it is reasonable to assume that the less militarized a society is, the more scope there will be for non-hegemonic masculinities, including non-heteronormative,

non-militarized and non-violent masculinities. Thus it is not surprising that high social acceptance of homosexuality goes hand in hand with lower militarization and lower social (and inter-personal) violence. Other results were not expected. Although violent crime was correlated to attitudes to homosexuality, homicide was not despite it being a type of violent crime. Nor was the number of security officers, police, incarceration rates and weapons import.

The big surprise however was that a high level of acceptance of homosexuality is correlated to high levels of weapons export and vice versa. The highest acceptance of homosexuality, according to the data sets, is registered in most developed countries, and these are also the countries that are the biggest exporters of weapons. This finding, along a few others that will be addressed below, bring up some troubling questions and indicate directions for further research, that I will address later.

Equally surprising was the fact that attitudes to homosexuality were only slightly linked to armed conflict, both internal and external. The only variables related to armed conflict that were correlated to attitudes to homosexuality were the intensity of internal conflict and neighboring countries relations, where intolerance of homosexuality was correlated to high intensity of internal conflicts and poor neighboring countries relations and acceptance of homosexuality with low intensity and good relations. As previous research had found strong correlations between gender inequality and presence/absence of armed conflict, and as gender inequality and low acceptance of homosexuality tend to go hand in hand, this was indeed a puzzling finding.

These unexpected findings prompted a second analysis, further looking into the relationship between armed conflict and intolerance of homosexuality. This time I looked at different data sets, focusing on the UCDB and, in order to nuance the simple question of “presence/absence” of armed conflict (that is used in previous data sets), I divided all countries in the world in three groups: countries with armed conflict on their own

territory; countries participating in armed conflict on other countries' territories, and countries not participating in any armed conflict at all. Attitudes to homosexuality were measured using data on LGBT legislations (SSH); public behavior against homosexuals (GHI); physical assault against homosexuals (GHI), and intolerant attitudes toward homosexuals (WVS). In this analysis several control variables were used: attitudes toward gender equality (WVS); levels of gender equality (GGGI); levels of socio-economic inequality (GINI); GDP / capita; the inequality adjusted HDI; democracy levels (DI), and general levels of violence (GPI). The results showed that the relationship between attitudes to homosexuality and violent conflict is more complex than previous data indicated. The new analysis showed that the countries with armed conflict on their own territory are among the most intolerant when it comes to homosexuality. These countries are also among the least gender equal; the most unequal; the poorest; with the lowest levels of human development and democratization as well as the highest levels of violence. The countries sending troops to fight on other countries' territories are among the most accepting of homosexuality; among those having the highest levels of gender equality; are also among the least unequal; the richest; with the highest levels of human development and democratization and the lowest levels of violence. The countries not participating in any armed conflict had a median score in-between these first two categories. Noteworthy is that countries that did not participate in any armed conflict still had higher median levels of general violence in their own societies according to the GPI (where armed conflict is taken into account) than the countries sending troops to other countries. This means that those who send troops abroad have very low levels of violence at home.

These findings fit with the theorization on the liberal/democratic peace, suggesting that liberal democracies – which are not just among the most developed and richest, but also among the most accepting of homosexuality and gender equality - are the least likely to experience internal conflict and do not wage war on each other, but do tend to

get involved in armed conflict with non-democracies. This finding has opened a whole new set of questions that I will come to later.

A third analysis, using control variables, showed that the level of human development (HDI) is even more strongly correlated to armed conflict than the level of democratization. This led to conducting a fourth analysis in order to see if human development and acceptance of homosexuality, using violence against gay men as indicator, moderate each other in their influence on violence. The answer is yes: when violence against gay men increases it reduces the positive influence human development has on levels of violence as measured by the GPI; when human development decreases (a higher HDI score thus as it is reversed) it not only increases levels of violence on its own accord: it also enhances the negative effect that violence against gay men has on other forms of violence, thus further increasing levels of violence. This was the case for seven sub-categories of violence in the GPI: perception of criminality; incarceration rates; access to weapons; violent demonstrations; political instability; political terror, and neighboring countries relations. Why it was not the case for the other sub-categories such as homicide, internal conflicts fought or external conflicts fought needs further research. For one GPI sub-category, terrorism impact, human development and patriarchal attitudes seemed to have an opposite moderating influence than for the other sub-categories, namely leading to higher terrorism impact when human development is high and violence against gay men is low. The possible reasons for this will be discussed below.

Since attitudes to gender equality and to homosexuality are found to play a role in levels of violence the fourth question was if and how the attitudes to gender equality and homosexuality are related to attitudes to violence. They way to investigate this was to see if changes to these attitudes co-varied: if there are changes in one set of attitudes will there be changes in the other sets too? Can a change in attitudes to norms on gender and homosexuality, from patriarchal to egalitarian, be related to a change in attitudes to violence, from accepting and approving to

less so? Since causes of changes in attitudes are almost impossible to isolate in society due to the multitude of influences that can be found in a society, a gender training for young men in India was used as a quasi-experiment, for an exploratory study. The study is described in the third article, “Young Men and Gender Trainings: What Happens to Attitudes to Violence when Attitudes to Patriarchal Norms on Masculinity Change?”

The first result of this study is that when attitudes to men’s domination over women change, becoming less patriarchal and more egalitarian, the attitudes to violence against women changed as well for most of the participants, becoming less accepting. The second result is that being thought of as gay was perceived as much worse for the participants than not being able to control women. But a change in attitudes towards homosexuals, from more patriarchal to more egalitarian, did not lead to a big change in attitudes to violence against homosexuals, mainly because most of the participants fully rejected violence against homosexuals already before the training. The third result is that, despite the fact that this training on gender and patriarchal norms did *not* cover societal and state-level violence in any way, attitudes to these types of violence became less accepting after the training. This was true for the acceptance of torture; thinking that people of another political / ideological, caste, ethnic or religious affiliation “deserve the violence they get”; and the idea that a soldier is the archetype of a “real man”. The fourth finding is that those participants who held very patriarchal attitudes to one of the seven statements in the survey had responded in a similar manner to more than one statement. Those who held egalitarian or violence disapproving attitudes to one statement were less likely to hold patriarchal or violence approving attitudes to other statements. After the training the same pattern was to be found although with fewer participants holding very patriarchal and violence approving attitudes and more participants finding themselves at the other end of the spectrum, with egalitarian and violence disapproving attitudes. However, while most participants changed their attitudes in a more

egalitarian and violence disapproving way after the training some did not change at all and a few even changed in a (more) patriarchal and violence approving direction.

A question that rose after these findings was if the changes were sustainable and if changes in attitudes to some norms were more sustainable than changes in attitudes to other norms. Six months after the training a last survey was done showing that some of the participants had sustained their changes in attitudes while others had completely reverted to their pre-training attitudes. There was no difference in sustainability of changes between different types of norms and attitudes (i.e. those towards gender equality, homosexuality or violence). It is rather that the changes in one individual are more sustainable than in another. Interviews with some of the participants suggest that external factors might have influenced the level of sustainability of changes. Most of the participants who sustained their changes said that their family and friends had reacted positively to their changes, while those reverting to their pre-training attitudes mostly indicated they had had negative reactions from family and friends. Since only a few of the participants agreed to meet for an interview at the time this evidence is but anecdotal. Nevertheless it offers us a suggestion of the mechanisms needed to engineer large scales changes in social norms.

These three studies have shown in multiple ways that patriarchal norms on gender and sexuality are correlated to both *levels* of and *attitudes* toward violence of different kinds, including violent conflict. The implications of these findings will now be discussed.

5.2 What does it all mean?

The implications of the findings: theory, policy and practice

5.2.1 Theoretical implications

The analyses in the first article confirmed the hypothesis based on previous research that *levels* of gender inequality are related to many types of violence, including armed conflict and violence against women. Enloe (1987, 1993, 2007) has long made the link between patriarchal gender norms and militarism. Others have worked on the issue on gender and armed conflict, with perhaps the strongest finding made by Hudson et al. in 2012, showing that levels of gender equality, measured in women's physical insecurity, unequal family law and polygyny, are the strongest predictors of internal armed conflict, stronger than mainstream IR explanations such as democratization and GDP per capita. On an interpersonal level much work has been done linking gender inequality with violence against women, for instance by Flood and Pease (2009). The findings from my studies strongly confirm and strengthen these earlier findings on the links between gender inequality and violence against women, and between gender inequality and armed conflict and militarism. This means that we have strong reasons to base future research and theorizing on these relationships.

The first new contribution of my research to the existing body of knowledge in the field of gender is that *attitudes* to gender equality are strongly correlated to *levels* of gender equality. While the literature has suggested this link for a long time (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005), and it might seem obvious at a first glance, it had actually not been tested before the way I tested it here. The next new finding is that not only *levels of gender equality* are correlated to *levels of violence*, as shown in previous research and reconfirmed by me, but that *attitudes to gender equality* also are correlated to *levels of violence*. In countries

where the population has positive attitudes toward gender equality the levels of violence are lower than in countries where the population has negative attitudes toward gender equality. And this concerns not only armed conflict but all other types of violence. Previous research had focused on interpersonal violence, mainly violence against women and gay men, and on armed conflict. My study found that both levels of gender equality and attitudes to gender equality were correlated to many more types of social and political violence, measured through the Global Peace Index. Furthermore, my finding that people thinking torture is acceptable are likely to accept patriarchal gender and sexuality norms is strengthening Melander's (2005) arguments that high levels of political gender equality (percentage of women in parliament) leads to less human rights abuse at home. That not only *levels* of gender equality but also *attitudes* to gender equality and heteronormativity are correlated to human rights abuse, of which torture is an example, strengthen and revive this rather forgotten finding of Melander. This in turn strengthens and broadens feminist theorization around patriarchal norms on gender, sexuality and violence.

While correlation does not equal causation, this research strongly calls for a look at gender inequality and the underlying patriarchal norms and attitudes towards it, when investigating causes of violence. The third study specifically focuses on how attitudes to norms on gender equality, homosexuality and violence are related to each other and how change in these attitudes might co-vary, using a gender training for young Indian men as a quasi-experimental way to investigate this question.

The finding that a change in attitudes to gender norms also can change attitudes to militarization, and this to a rather large extent, exemplifies one of the possible direction of causality and has huge theoretical implications. It is not only in line with earlier research on gender inequality and militarization by Enloe. It also strengthens Durie-Smith's (2017) findings from studies in Sierra Leone and Sudan that patriar-

chal norms on masculinity can be causal in relation to armed conflict and that changing these norms would have an impact on state level violence. Secondly, this finding strengthens the arguments of Nayak and Suchland (2006) that the hegemonic projects of states are constituted through gender violence. They define gender violence as “the acts and practices that systematically target a person, group or community in order to dictate what “men” and “women” are supposed to be and to discipline marginalized communities or any other perceived threats to dominant political structures and practices” (Nayak and Suchland, 2006, p. 469). Nayak and Suchland understand hegemonic projects to be constituted through systematic power hierarchies and exclusions. The findings of my studies suggest that in states where a large number of people oppose gender equality it would be easier to create power relationships that privilege certain ways of knowing, being and acting that give voice to only certain people’s experiences and agendas (divided by ethnic, religious etc fault-lines), than in states where many people are in favor of gender equality. The hegemonic projects of states include nationalism, militarism and globalization which feed on and “provide continuity to the principle of patriarchy and privilege, especially during times of threat and conflict” (Chenoy, 2004, p. 27). This kind of politics has a structural impact on society because it is dependent on traditional gender roles and “places people in binary categories like “with us” or “against us”, “civilized” and “uncivilized”, “warriors” or “weaklings”. The militarist discourse marginalizes opposition, diversity and difference, and with this the value of force as part of power is privileged, and militant nationalism exaggerated” (Chenoy, 2004, p. 27). With this in mind, the findings showing that when attitudes to gender equality became more egalitarian attitudes to the military can become less accepting, suggests that gender equality can also influence and reduce acceptance of the militarization of daily life, for instance when “states promote and develop military apparatuses as the solution for stability, security and development” (Nayak and Suchland, 2006, p. 471). More people approving of gender equality and less people thinking that an ideal of a “real man” is a soldier, thus, affects how gender is used to

legitimize the operations of hegemonic projects, for instance the use of “gendered conceptions” of protecting women and children (at home and abroad) to “promote military operations or the gender hierarchy that grounds, enables or cements the separation of public and private spheres” (Peterson and Runyan, 1998 in Nayak and Suchland, 2006, p. 471). Attitudes to gender and especially masculinity, thinking – or not – that a prototype of the “real man” is a soldier, always imagined as heterosexual, are linked to approval of military activities. International security then cannot be understood without thinking about gender and sexuality, and the many ways they influence behavior, access, opportunities and power relations.

The finding from the third study – that the students considered that being thought of as gay was worse than not being able to control the women in their lives – is in line with some masculinities studies theories, where homosexual masculinities are perceived to be the lowest on the hierarchical ladder of masculinities (Connell, 1995; Kimmel, 2008). This finding, while not being new, still strengthens the need to look at gender equality and heteronormativity together and to incorporate heteronormativity and homophobia in feminist theorizing to a much larger extent when analyzing a variety of power relations, as it would help highlighting the complexities of the social dynamics.

Linking attitudes to homosexuality as well as violence against gay men to a variety of types of violence, including armed conflict, through the use of the large data sets, is an important innovative aspect of this research that has yielded some valuable, albeit mixed, findings. First of all, different data sets produce different results, indicating the need for understanding epistemological limitations of large data sets. But next to this, it is clear that some correlations are there, even if, for the time being, we cannot explain them. So, for example, attitudes to homosexuality analyzed in the second study correlate to the aggregated Global Peace Index in a similar way as attitudes to gender equality analyzed in the first study. This indicates that there is a close relationship between

patriarchal norms on gender and patriarchal norms on sexuality. However, the first study on attitudes to gender equality only uses the aggregated GPI while the second study on attitudes to homosexuality looks at both the aggregate value of GPI and the 23 sub-categories of the GPI. It is therefore impossible to compare the exact relationships between attitudes to gender equality and attitudes to homosexuality. In addition, the analysis using the GPI and its sub-categories as dependent variable did not show a correlation between attitudes to homosexuality and armed conflict, while the analysis using the UCDB clearly did so. All of this point to the issues around how indicators are defined and weighted in the big data sets, which will be discussed further down.

Despite all of this, my studies clearly show that societies with high levels of intolerance of homosexuality tend to have higher levels of many types of violence (not only violence against gay men!) while societies with low levels of intolerance of homosexuality tend to have low levels of the same types of violence. Again, while correlation does not mean causation, it does show a need to look at levels of (non)acceptance of homosexuality when investigating various types of violence. In addition, these findings point to the necessity of analyzing violent conflict through the prism of the concept of heteronormativity. While the results here are mixed, as some variables seem to be correlated while others not, those that are send us a strong signal that there is a relation worth analyzing. Much more research is needed however in order to understand links between specific types of violence and attitudes towards male homosexuality, as well as heteronormativity in general.

The finding that the countries with the lowest levels of tolerance of homosexuality and gender equality are also the poorest, the least democratic, with the lowest levels of human development and those that have armed conflict on their own territory, is in line with the findings of other scholars. However, the finding that it is the countries with the highest levels of tolerance of homosexuality and gender equality,

the richest, the most democratic and with the highest levels of human development who send troops to fight on other countries' territories, thus exporting violence, led to more questions than answers. I already noted that this finding is in line with the literature on liberal/democratic peace (Hegre, 2014) showing that democracies don't wage war on each other while still entering military conflicts with non-democracies. Nevertheless, this finding adds important dimensions to understanding how the liberal/democratic peace is conceptualized. Gender has clearly become one of the indicators of peace, democracy and progress of countries around the world – as the data sets I used in this research show. Gender equality has become a by-word of democracy and human rights. And, not surprisingly, gender issues have been called upon to justify international military interventions, from the war in Iraq to the fight against ISIS. But it is a troubling finding that liberal democracies uphold gender equality and acceptance of homosexuality at home, while sending weapons and troops abroad. In order to understand these findings better we need to look more closely at liberal democracies and their – heavily intertwined – socio-political and economic order. First of all, today's liberal democracies developed very much because of colonialism and the exploitation of others (Jahn, 1999). The use of force or coercive power is thus inherent in liberalism and has played a role in creating the problems to which they supposedly offer solutions (Jahn, 2012a). The dominant belief among (Western) liberal democracies is that non-liberal countries *have* to become liberal market democracies in order for them to ensure the values of equality and human rights seen as core values among liberals (Jahn, 2012a; 2018). The fact that liberal states go to war with non-liberal states is thus seen as being due to the backwardness and resistance of states in which people “are forced to live in unrepresentative political systems” (Fukuyama, 1989, p.15). It is also argued that the “political survival of liberal democracies, precisely because they have become democracies, requires the constant reproduction of the economic foundations of that regime – that is, of economic growth and benefits to its own population – liberal democracies cannot help but engage in international power politics

with the aim to shape the international economic and political order in their favor.” (Jahn, 2012b, p. 704). Such power politics then includes the use of force.

One can therefore say that for liberal democracies the goal – a liberal world order (presumably including human rights and equality for all, thus including gender equality and acceptance of non-heteronormative sexualities) justifies the means to attain it. While one can argue at length that a liberal world order would not provide equality for all (Jahn, 2012a) the current world order is changing and many liberal states become less and less so with protectionism and anti-multilateralism on the rise (Jahn, 2018) with wide-ranging consequences for foreign policy. Not all military interventions abroad are overtly labeled invasions or war waging. What has been labeled “humanitarian interventions” counts for many countries’ sending of troops abroad. The term humanitarian intervention provides legitimacy for interventions that until recently would have been seen as illegal, because the liberal world order is supposed to respect the sovereignty and the right of non-intervention. It can thus be used to hide the political nature of these interventions and also to hinder the search for solutions to concrete “humanitarian” problems by delegitimizing potential political solutions (de Waal, 2007; Jahn, 2012c). The current world order, including the use of force by liberal democracies towards non-liberal states, is firmly entrenched. It is possible that it is so entrenched that egalitarian norms and attitudes at home are not able to influence it to any great extent while they are still able to influence levels of violence at the domestic level. This finding still needs further research in order to find out how norms and attitudes that encourage non-violence at home do not encourage a non-violent foreign policy.

Moreover, the finding that it is the human development level rather than the democracy level that correlates the most with different types of violence also questions the liberal peace theory in that it indicates that more than formal democracy is needed to lower levels of violence in a

society. High levels of education, long life expectancies (i.e. health) and low levels of inequality, i.e. human development according to the UNDP definition, must thus also be taken into account when understanding societies that are peaceful at home but might wage war with other countries. That the inequality adjusted human development index and the levels of violence against homosexual men moderate each others' relationship with the Global Peace Index and several of its sub-categories further shows the need to look at patriarchal norms on sexuality when studying violence. This is not really surprising as intolerance of homosexuality and gender inequality tend to go hand in hand, while gender inequality has been shown to have an impact on educational levels, health and other societal inequalities.

The finding that the change in attitude to one patriarchal norm corresponds with change in attitudes to other patriarchal norms is in line with feminist theorizing of patriarchal and hegemonic norms, though linking them together in a new way. It builds a strong case for the need to not see different patriarchal norms - on gender, sexuality and violence - as separate phenomena. It also strengthens the theorizing of the interconnectedness between three pillars of patriarchal and hegemonic norms: domination over women, heteronormativity and the use of violence as preferred means to settle conflicts and disputes and to gain or regain respect and honor (Connell, 1995). Thus, that patriarchal attitudes include attitudes approving of many different types of violence cannot be stressed enough.

Finally, my research shows the usefulness of the, slightly unfashionable, concept of patriarchy and patriarchal norms and of the, much criticized, concept of hegemonic masculinities. Patriarchal, hegemonic norms on masculinity influence the vast majority of cultures around the world. Without using the concept of patriarchy as an overarching system, influencing all spheres of lives, it is hard to understand how we can interlink gender, sexuality and violence. Today many see the concept of patriarchy as old-fashioned and overly politicized and it is

rather rare to see it used in the feminist conflict and security studies, except in the works of Cynthia Enloe. This is a shame as refraining from using the concept of patriarchy to analyze gender norms, sexuality and violence leads to the puzzle lacking the crucial bits that show their inter-relatedness. The use of Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinities in connection to patriarchal norms further helps clearing the picture of the interrelationships of gender, sexuality and violence. While the concept has been criticized (and reformulated by Connell and Messerschmidt in 2005) it remains a very useful tool and is being used by many feminist scholars, including in the fields of conflict and security studies and in the IR. Using the concept of hegemonic masculinities without combining it with the concept of patriarchal norms does make it less powerful though. While it is possible to imagine a social and cultural change leading to masculinities no longer being patriarchal but egalitarian and empathic, it is definitely not the case today and it is important to point out that today's hegemonic masculinities are very much patriarchal. Thus, both concepts have been very useful in this research.

To conclude, patriarchal, and hegemonic, norms are here understood to be based on three pillars: men's domination over women; heteronormativity; and the use of violence as preferred means to settle a dispute and to (re)gain power, respect and honor. These three pillars interact with each other: when there is a change in attitudes to and levels of gender equality and acceptance of homosexuals there is also a change in attitudes to and levels of different kinds of violence (at home, in society and at state levels).

In this respect it is also important to examine gender inequality and homophobia together as gender equality alone is not enough for understanding the interconnectedness between patriarchal norms and levels of violence.

The large outlier here is interstate armed conflict. How the same values, norms and mechanisms that encourage non-violence at home

can co-exist with an export of violence to other countries is still very much unclear even though the nature of liberal democracies and the world order they pursue provide some explanation as seen above. This finding challenges earlier studies that political gender equality leads to less inter-state conflicts (Caprioli, 2000). These contradictory findings dispute the previous theories around the international peace promoting aspects of gender equality.

In connection to this troubling finding - that the more gender and sexuality equal countries are, the more they export violence - it is good to consider Kelly's (2000) notification that the industrialized Western countries (here meaning Europe and North America) understand peace as something that happens at home, even if there is "wartime" (with the help of their troops) elsewhere.

Moreover, the finding that the "democratic peace" seems to be more of a "human development peace" shows a need to rethink theorizing around democracy and peace. Also, as the Human Development Index and violence against gay men enforce each other on the violence variables there is a need to link patriarchal norms with human development.

A theoretical/methodological issue in relation to the "democratic peace" is that considering the findings linking high democracy levels to gender equality, tolerance of homosexuals and high levels of domestic peace it might be time to rethink how we define and measure democracy. According to Inglehart and Welzel (2005) gender equality is crucial to the quality of democracy as democracy aims at empowering people as if societies were made through a social contract between equals. Could a country really be considered democratic if different categories of citizens (male/female, heterosexual/homosexual etc.) do not have the same possibilities? Moreover, Bjarnegård and Melander (2011) have found that democracy only has an impact on levels of civil conflict if they have a minimum level of gender equality, further linking democ-

racy with gender equality. Furthermore, as today's liberal democracies are linked to a very specific, liberal capitalist economic system (Jahn, 2012b) it would be interesting to disentangle democracy from the liberal economic system to see how egalitarian norms could operate politically with different types of economic systems and what consequences that might have for foreign policy.

Re-defining democracy would have to lead to re-designing the democracy indexes and measurements, to include the *levels* of equality of all the citizens, regardless of gender, sexual orientation (and possibly other factors). As my research has shown that not only levels, but also *attitudes* to gender, sexuality and violence – and their relations – are relevant, it is worth thinking whether those attitudes should also be taken into account when theorizing and measuring democracy. This brings up another set of theoretical/methodological issues: the difference between law/official policy and practice. A country might have laws requiring all children, including girls, to go to school while a large part of its population disapproves of girls being educated. A country might also have laws saying that homosexuals should not be discriminated against while a large part of its population disapproves of homosexuals. The misogyny, sexism and homophobia that accompany populism in some of the liberal democracies of the West today is a case in point. Looking at both attitudes and actual levels of equality and acceptance thus gives us complementary information, necessary to better understand the mechanisms of patriarchal norms and the interconnectedness of its three pillars.

The use of large, existing data sets, indexes and scales has provided interesting results. However, as discussed in the introduction, these data sets are limited through the ways they were assembled, and their variables defined. There is also a lot of data one wishes to have but doesn't. The existing data are also not always comparable, different data sets giving similar indicators a different weight, and selecting indicators for similar variables in very different ways. There is thus great

need to look closer at how big data sets are assembled when using them. I found that a way to overcome the problem with these differences is to use several data sets and several methods for the same study. If several analyses based on different data sets point in the same direction we can feel confident that we are on the right track.

5.2.2 Unanswered questions and needs for further research

Some results did not confirm the hypotheses and assumptions and some even contradicted them. To start with, a causal link between patriarchal norms on gender and homosexuality, on the one hand, and violence, on the other hand, has not been proved statistically, although strong correlations are found. However, theoretical assumptions, a number of previous studies, and my findings taken together do make a causal link very probable. It is very difficult to prove causal links for complex phenomena in social sciences and those who, for different reasons, do not want to consider patriarchal norms in relation to violence will be quick to point out the lack of a definitive proof. This lack of proof should not be a deterrent though, as theorizing and evidence very strongly point in the same direction.

The direction of causality is also not proven; it can be argued that the relationship between attitudes to gender and sexuality, on the one hand, and attitudes to violence, on the other hand, goes both ways. However, there is no proof that low levels of violence would automatically lead to high levels of gender equality and acceptance of homosexuals, certainly not on their own, as both the women's movement and the LGBT movement have worked hard for a very long time to advance equality and acceptance. One could of course argue that the work of these movements was made possible due to the already existing relatively low levels of violence in the societies it took place in. Further research, for instance in the form of case studies able to look into specific relations more deeply, could investigate whether there are exceptions to the assumed causal direction of these relationships.

The aggregated GPI correlated with attitudes to homosexuality in only ten of the 22³⁹ sub-categories (UN peacekeeping funding excluded). Why this was not the case for the other sub-categories needs further research. It could be that some types of violence depend on specific underlying mechanisms and societal structures more than others. It could also be related to the ways the data on these categories were defined and weighed. For instance, why “homicide” – a type of violent crime – did not correlate with attitudes to homosexuality while the category “violent crime” did, could very well be due to definitions and weighing of indicators. That the number of security officers and police as well as incarceration rates did not correlate to attitudes to homosexuality might be due to the type of governance in the country. For instance, authoritarian regimes might enforce policies that do not necessarily reflect the attitudes of the general population. Moreover, while military expenditure did correlate with attitudes to homosexuality there are clearly many different ways of spending a budget, here shown by the fact that there was no correlation with numbers of armed service personnel, weapons import and nuclear and heavy weapons. Also, most countries around the world do import weapons of some kind which could explain the absence of correlation for this sub-category. Moreover nuclear and heavy weapons (sophisticated air force, warships, aircraft carriers and combat helicopters) are only owned by relatively few countries in the world, countries with very different types of regime, and some of these weapons were acquired a rather long time ago, prior to the measuring of attitudes to homosexuality (2014) and are therefore difficult to relate and analyze.

39 These 10 are: Perception of criminality; violent crime; political terror; access to weapons; violent demonstrations; political instability; intensity of internal conflict; weapons export; military expenditure and neighbouring countries relations. Others are: homicide; number of security officers and police; incarceration rates; deaths from internal conflict; internal conflicts fought; displaced people; terrorism impact; weapons import; armed service personnel; nuclear and heavy weapons; external conflicts fought and deaths from external conflicts

Why only the intensity of internal armed conflict was correlated to attitudes to homosexuality and not numbers of internal conflict and the number of dead and displaced people when using the GPI is quite puzzling since the correlation between internal conflict and attitudes to homosexuality turned out to be strong when using the UCDB. The same goes for external conflict where only neighboring countries relations were correlating in the GPI while the correlation between attitudes to homosexuality and external conflict were very strong using the UCDB. This probably has to do with the way the GPI defines and measures its indicators while the UCDB is very straight forward, just measuring absence and presence of internal and external armed conflict (if a country was sending troops abroad within the frames of, for instance, NATO or the UN, it is counted as participating in external conflict). This means that one has to be very careful when selecting data sets and to be very aware of the fact that an indicator/category that appears to be the same can have very different definitions in different data sets. It would be useful to further try to disentangle these complex relationships through for instance in-depth case studies.

The fact that the most equal and accepting societies are the ones sending troops abroad has already been addressed in the previous section. However, the finding that the countries who did not participate in any armed conflict, be it internal or external, found themselves in between the countries with internal conflict and the countries with external conflict on all measurements regarding homosexuality, gender equality, democracy, wealth and human development while still having rather high levels of violence in their societies further adds to the puzzle. Not having the lowest measures on these variables seems to protect them from internal conflict while not having the highest measures still seems to ensure that they have rather high levels of other types of societal violence. It would be interesting to develop this further, to see if there are breaking points and where the breaking points are, how accepting and equal a society has to be in order to be protected from internal armed conflict, and how accepting and equal it has to be to achieve low

levels of societal violence? Such research would contribute an important piece to our understanding of these mechanisms.

When it comes to the moderating effect of human development on attitudes to homosexuality in relation to violence only the aggregated GPI and eight sub-categories were correlated.⁴⁰ Why the other sub-categories did not show any moderating effect is not clear although part of the explanation could be the ways the categories are defined and measured. For one GPI sub-category though - terrorism impact - human development and patriarchal attitudes seemed to have an opposite moderating influence than for the other sub-categories, namely leading to higher terrorism impact when human development is high and violence against gay men is low. Terrorism impact was furthermore not correlated to attitudes to homosexuality. These findings do not seem to make sense given the large number of terrorist attacks in the Middle East and other places with very low acceptance of homosexuality. This likely depends on how the GPI defines a terrorist attack – which attacks counts or not. Moreover, one of the indicators weighed into the terrorism variable is the financial cost of material damage due to the attack, costs that may be higher in Western countries than in other regions despite terrorist attacks being fewer in numbers in the West than in other regions, thus contributing to a possibly skewed result. It would be interesting to make further research on terrorist attacks and attitudes to homosexuality and gender equality, using only the numbers of terrorist attacks in order to clarify the relationship.

The third study showed that attitudes to violence against homosexuals are not always on par with levels of homophobia, and this relationship seems to be different in different countries (Planet Romeo, 2015). This is a new and puzzling insight as previous research on homophobia has tended to link levels of violence against homosexuals with levels of

⁴⁰ These are: perception of criminality; incarceration rates; access to weapons; violent demonstrations; political instability, political terror, terrorism impact and neighbouring countries relations

homophobia (Kimmel and Mahler, 2003). These differences in approval of violence against homosexuals make it difficult to generalize the findings, so further research is needed to see what makes homophobic people in one setting approve of violence against homosexuals, and homophobic people in another setting disapprove it. Such research could help identify the mechanisms behind violence against homosexuals. Furthermore, the finding that attitudes to violence against homosexuals are not corresponding to attitudes to violence against women also merits further research in order to unpack the relationships between homophobia, sexism and violence against homosexuals and women.

The third study also shows that a gender training can lead to changes of attitudes in an egalitarian direction, but also to a lack of change, and sometimes to change in a patriarchal direction (backlash). This confirms earlier work on gender trainings (Lyytikäinen, 2007; Mackay, 2003). While non-change can be explained by strong beliefs and values that the training failed to challenge, change in a more patriarchal direction is harder to explain. It could be that the training method provoked backlash in some individuals as proposed by Mackay (2003). If so, gender training methods definitely need further scrutiny. Also, further research could investigate why certain persons experience a backlash when others don't, what the triggers are. That would be an important contribution to our understanding on how norms and attitudes change.

The findings that patriarchal norms include attitudes approving of violence is strengthening theorizing of the three pillars of patriarchal and hegemonic norms: domination over women, heteronormativity, use of violence as preferred means to settle a dispute and to (re)gain respect and honor (Connell, 1995). This should also lead to new research linking these three pillars and understanding their relationships. This approach could be useful in the study of many forms of violence, from interpersonal violence to armed conflict. Using these patriarchal hegemonic norms as analytical framework when investigating

different forms of international relations would also lead to a clearer understanding of the global interactions and their consequences, for instance foreign policies, arms trade, military interventions but also decisions to locate and relocate productions of consumer goods and products to certain locations rather than others. Furthermore, if we are using gender inequality as a justification to intervene militarily abroad, what does that say about our understanding on how gender equality is achieved? Is it about putting as many women as men at all levels of systems, organizations and institutions that are created based on patriarchal norms (the infamous “add women and stir” approach), or is it about changing these systems, organizations and institutions, making new ones, based on egalitarian norms? Can violence at a macro level (i.e. armed conflict) succeed in installing gender equality? And while there have not yet been any interventions using gay rights as justification, could it happen? The countries intervening abroad are not always similar in their levels of gender equality and acceptance of homosexuality. The difference is big between the US and Western Europe, with the Western European countries being more accepting of both gender equality and homosexuality than the US. There is also a great difference between countries contributing troops to the UN peacekeeping forces. Their levels of violence at home and participation in violence abroad are also different. Would that mean that Western European countries could be quicker to use the protection of homosexuals as justification for military interventions than the US? Comparative case studies could help exploring these relations.

That the demographic variables were not significant in the study on changing attitudes in India was probably related to the fact that it was such a small sample. However, it is worth noting that patriarchal norms can be found at all levels in society, albeit probably in different shapes, and more research is needed to understand what makes some communities and societies more patriarchal than others, and how different factors such as education, religiosity, cast, class etc. affect patriarchal norms. It is also worth noting that the purpose of this study was not to

investigate patriarchal norms in India but to see if attitudes to norms on gender equality, homosexuality and violence co-vary. These co-variances – while confirmed – certainly need further research.

At the end, my research on gender (in)equality and violence, while resting on, as well as strengthening earlier work, goes further than these earlier studies in that it links gender inequality and its underlying patriarchal norms and attitudes to various types of violence, not just violence against women. It also goes further in that it combines the findings on gender equality, violence and heteronormativity, indicating that there is the need for a holistic approach to both research of and interventions into norms on gender, sexuality and violence, as they are interconnected. There is a need to break down academic and practitioner silos that are treating these topics separately. While feminist studies do connect gender norms and violence, including armed conflict and militarization, the links between sexuality and violence (other than violence against LGBTQI people) are rather rarely studied, and research addressing both gender and sexuality with violence are all too rare. Moreover, mainstream political science, IR and conflict studies are still largely resistant to addressing patriarchal norms as an explanatory factor when analyzing violence and conflict. My research then provides an additional argument for the inclusion of patriarchal norms in more mainstream studies.

5.3 References

- Bjarnegård, E., & Melander, E. (2011). Disentangling gender, peace and democratization: the negative effects of militarized masculinities. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 20(2), 139-154.
- Caprioli, M. (2000). Gendered Conflict. *Journal of Peace Research*, 37(1), 51-68.
- Carroll, A., & Itaborahy, L. P. (2015). *State-Sponsored Homophobia. A World Survey of Laws: criminalisation, protection and recognition of same-sex love*. Geneva: ILGA.
- Chenoy, A. M. (2004). Gender and International Politics: The Intersections of Patriarchy and Militarisation. *India Journal of Gender Studies*, 11(1), 27-42.
- Connell, R. (1995). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connell, R., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. *Gender & Society*, 19, 829-859.
- De Waal, A. (2007). No such thing as humanitarian intervention. Why we need to rethink the 'responsibility to protect' in wartime. *Harvard International Review*. Retrieved from <http://hir.harvard.edu/article/?a=1482>
- Durriesmith, D. (2017). *Masculinity and New War: The gendered dynamics of contemporary armed conflict*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Enloe, C. (1987). Feminists Thinking About War, Militarism, and Peace. In B. B. Bess, and Mayra Marx Ferree (Ed.), *Analyzing Gender: A Handbook of Social Science Research*. Newbury Park, California: Sage.
- Enloe, C. (1993). *The Morning After. Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War*. Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Enloe, C. (2007). *Globalization & Militarism. Feminists Make the Link*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto and Plymouth (UK): Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Flood, M., & Pease, B. (2009). Factors influencing attitudes to violence against women. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 10(2), 125-142.
- Fukuyama, F. (1989). The End of History? *The National Interest*, 2, 15.
- Hausmann, R., Tyson, L. D., & Zahidi, S. (2011). *The Global Gender Gap Report 2011*. Retrieved from: <http://reports.weforum.org/global-gender-gap-2011/>
- Hechter, M., & Opp, K.-D. (Eds.). (2001). *Social Norms*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hegre, H. (2014). Democracy and armed conflict. *Journal of Peace Research*, 51(2), 159-172.

- Hudson, V. M., Ballif-Spanvill, B., Caprioli, M., & Emmett, C. F. (2012). *Sex and World Peace*. New York and Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press.
- Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy. The Human Development Sequence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Institute for Economics & Peace. (2014). *Global Peace Index*. Retrieved from <http://visionofhumanity.org/reports/page/3/>
- Jahn, B. (1999). IR and the State of Nature: The Cultural Origins of a Ruling Ideology. *Review of International Studies*, 25(3), 411-434.
- Jahn, B. (2012a). Critique in a time of liberal world order. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 15(2), 145-157.
- Jahn, B. (2012b). Rethinking democracy promotion. *Review of International Studies*, 38(4), 685-705.
- Jahn, B. (2012c). Humanitarian intervention - What s in a name. *International Politics*, 49(1), 36-58.
- Jahn, B. (2018). Liberal internationalism: historical trajectory and current prospects. *International Affairs*, 94(1), 43-61.
- Kelly, L. (2000). Wars Against Women: Sexual Violence, Sexual Politics and the Militarised State In S. Jacobs, R. Jacobson, & J. Marchbank (Eds.), *States of Conflict: Gender, Violence and Resistance*. London, New York: Zed Books.
- Kimmel, M. (2008). Guyland: *The perilous world where boys become men*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Kimmel, M., & Mahler, M. (2003). Adolescent masculinity, homophobia, and violence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 46(10), 1439-1458.
- Lyttikäinen, M. (2007). *Gender training for peacekeepers: Preliminary overview of United Nations peace support operations*. Santo Domingo: UN-INSTRAW.
- Mackay, A. (2003). Training the uniforms: gender and peacekeeping operations. *Development in Practice*, 13(2&3), 217-223.
- Melander, E. (2005). Political Gender Equality and State Human Rights Abuse. *Journal of Peace Research*, 42(2), 149-166.
- Nayak, M. (2006). Orientalism and "saving" US state identity after 9/11. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 8, 42-61.
- Nayak, M., & Suchland, J. (2006). Gender Violence And Hegemonic Projects. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 8(4), 467-485.
- Peterson, V. S., & Runyan, A. S. (1998). *Global Gender Issues*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Pettersson, T., & Wallensteen, P. (2015). Armed conflicts, 1946–2014. *Journal of Peace Research*, 52(4), 536–550.
- Planet Romeo. (2015). The Gay Happiness Index. Retrieved from <https://www.planetromeo.com/en/care/gay-happiness-index/>
- The Economist Intelligence Unit. (2014). *Democracy Index*. Retrieved from https://www.eiu.com/public/topical_report.aspx?campaignid=Democracy0115
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2015). *Inequality-adjusted Human Development Index*. Retrieved from <http://www.hdr.undp.org/en/composite/IHDI>
- WomanStats Project. (2012). WomanStats Database. Retrieved from <http://www.womanstats.org/>
- World Bank. (2014a). *GDP per capita*. Retrieved from World Bank: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD>
- World Bank. (2014b). *GINI Index*. Retrieved from <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.GINI?page=1>
- World Economic Forum. (2014). *The Global Gender Gap Report*. Retrieved from <http://reports.weforum.org/global-gender-gap-report-2014/>
- World Health Organization (WHO). (2009). *Violence prevention the evidence: Changing cultural and social norms that support violence*. Geneva: WHO.
- World Values Survey Association. (2015). World Values Survey. Wave 6 2010–2014 *Official Aggregate v.20150418*. Retrieved from: www.worldvaluessurvey.org

GENDER INEQUALITY, HOMOPHOBIA AND VIOLENCE:
THE THREE PILLARS OF PATRIARCHAL NORMS AND ATTITUDES AND THEIR RELATIONS

– 147 –

Appendices

Appendix 1 Questionnaire for the gender training

Questionnaire ID No:

In general, men should control the women in their life.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I think men are better decision makers than women.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I think women can be just as good politicians as men.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I would want to make important decision together with my wife.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I would be furious if someone thought I was gay.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Gay people should be able to live their lives as they wish.

1 <i>I strongly agree</i>	2	3	4	5 <i>I strongly disagree</i>
-------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	--

Gay men are actually not real men.

1 <i>I strongly agree</i>	2	3	4	5 <i>I strongly disagree</i>
-------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	--

I would not mind if a friend told me he was gay.

1 <i>I strongly agree</i>	2	3	4	5 <i>I strongly disagree</i>
-------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	--

In general, I must get my way when arguing with other men.

1 <i>I strongly agree</i>	2	3	4	5 <i>I strongly disagree</i>
-------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	--

Being stronger than other men is important to me.

1 <i>I strongly agree</i>	2	3	4	5 <i>I strongly disagree</i>
-------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	--

I don't feel a need to be in charge of other guys around me around me.

1 <i>I strongly agree</i>	2	3	4	5 <i>I strongly disagree</i>
-------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	--

I don't strive to always make decisions for other guys around me.

1 <i>I strongly agree</i>	2	3	4	5 <i>I strongly disagree</i>
-------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	--

I tend to keep my feelings to myself.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I like to talk about my feelings.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I have difficulties telling others I care about them.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I often express my feelings to my close ones.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

It's important for a man to have high status.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

How other members in my family behave, including the women, does not affect my honour.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Being seen as a man of honour by others is very important to me.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I don't really care what others think of me.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Proper men provide for their family economically.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Making money is part of my idea of being a real man.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

It would be no problem if a woman earns more than her husband.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Husband's and wife's contributions to the family's economy are equally im-portant.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

In general I will do anything to win.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Winning is not so important.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Competing with others is not a good way to succeed.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

It feels good to be important.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I strive to be more successful than others.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I don't care if people around me earn more money than I do.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I don't think it's important that my clothes, watch, phone, car and other things are expensive and luxurious.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I hate asking for help.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I have no problem admitting that I don't manage to do something on my own.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

It's important for men to be able to do things on their own, rather than to ask for help.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Cooperation should be important part of both private and professional life.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

My work is the most important part of my life.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Finding time to relax is difficult for me.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

It is more important for a man to work and earn money than to spend time with the family.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Only paid work is worthy of a man.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

If I could, I would frequently change sexual partners.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I admire men who have many mistresses.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I think it's wrong to cheat on your wife.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I frequently put myself in risky situations.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I like to do things that are safe.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I admire people who take risks.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I think it's stupid to take risks.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Sometimes violent action is necessary.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Violence should never be used.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Some situations can only be solved by violence.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Violence should only be used as a last resort, when everything else fails.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

A man has the right to correct or discipline female behaviour.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Sex is a man's right in marriage so it's ok for him to force himself on his wife even if she doesn't want to.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Physical violence in an intimate relationship is never ok.

1	2	3	4	5
I strongly agree				I strongly disagree

Violence in the home should be reported to authorities.

1	2	3	4	5
I strongly agree				I strongly disagree

It makes you feel big and tough when you push someone around.

1	2	3	4	5
I strongly agree				I strongly disagree

There are better ways of solving problems than fighting.

1	2	3	4	5
I strongly agree				I strongly disagree

It is ok for me to hit someone to get them to do what I want.

1	2	3	4	5
I strongly agree				I strongly disagree

It is not ok to hit someone even if you go crazy with anger.

1	2	3	4	5
I strongly agree				I strongly disagree

I would hit someone who would tease me suggesting I were gay.

1	2	3	4	5
I strongly agree				I strongly disagree

It is ok to beat up a gay person.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

If my friends would beat someone who they think is gay I would try to stop them.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

It is not justifiable to beat up a gay person for being gay.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

I would not be violent against the women in my family even if they do something I consider dishonoring.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Violence is not a way to gain respect.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

The police should be allowed to use violence to suppress demonstration, even if these demonstrations are peaceful

1	2	3	4	5
<i>I strongly agree</i>				<i>I strongly disagree</i>

Torture is an acceptable method to get valuable information in some cases.

1 <i>I strongly agree</i>	2	3	4	5 <i>I strongly disagree</i>
------------------------------	---	---	---	---------------------------------

The state should never be allowed to abuse human rights.

1 <i>I strongly agree</i>	2	3	4	5 <i>I strongly disagree</i>
------------------------------	---	---	---	---------------------------------

It is ok to use kill people who have different political/ideological, ethnic, caste or religious background.

1 <i>I strongly agree</i>	2	3	4	5 <i>I strongly disagree</i>
------------------------------	---	---	---	---------------------------------

I would never use violence for political/ideological or religious reasons.

1 <i>I strongly agree</i>	2	3	4	5 <i>I strongly disagree</i>
------------------------------	---	---	---	---------------------------------

People of another political/ideological, caste, ethnic or religious affiliation deserve the violence they get.

1 <i>I strongly agree</i>	2	3	4	5 <i>I strongly disagree</i>
------------------------------	---	---	---	---------------------------------

No political/ideological or religious conflicts should ever be solved by violence.

1 <i>I strongly agree</i>	2	3	4	5 <i>I strongly disagree</i>
------------------------------	---	---	---	---------------------------------

A soldier is the archetype of a real man.

1 <i>I strongly agree</i>	2	3	4	5 <i>I strongly disagree</i>
-------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	--

Military violence should only be used as a defense, if we are attacked first.

1 <i>I strongly agree</i>	2	3	4	5 <i>I strongly disagree</i>
-------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	--

We should have more weapons than our enemies.

1 <i>I strongly agree</i>	2	3	4	5 <i>I strongly disagree</i>
-------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	--

Conflict should be solved through mediation and negotiation, not by military means.

1 <i>I strongly agree</i>	2	3	4	5 <i>I strongly disagree</i>
-------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	--

