

VIOLENCE REGIMES: CONCEPTUALISATIONS, CONTESTATIONS, CHALLENGES

Örebro University 17th October 2019, 09:00-16:30 Followed by drinks reception and networking at 17:00 Östra Mark Ö201

The purpose of the workshop is to bring together and enhance networking amongst violence research and researchers from multiple disciplines; and to present ongoing research projects engaged with violence research in the Nordic Region.

PROGRAMME	
09:00-10:00	Welcome, introduction, and introductions, with fika <i>Sofia Strid</i>
10:00-10:30	Violence regimes: Conceptualising, measuring and re-thinking the position of violence Jeff Hearn, Sofia Strid, Anne Humbert, Dag Balkmar, and Marine Delaunay Presented by Jeff Hearn, Örebro University, Sweden
10:30-11:00	On violence policy and "women friendly" welfare regimes Dag Balkmar, Marine Delaunay, Sofia Strid, Jeff Hearn, Anne Humbert Presented by Dag Balkmar, Örebro University, Sweden
11:00-11:30	How is political violence gendered? Motives, forms and impacts <i>Elin Bjarnegård, Uppsala University, Sweden</i>
11:30-12:00	Discussion
12:00-13:00	Lunch at Östra mark
13:00-13:30	Conceptualizing and measuring online violence Matthew Hall, Arden University, UK
13:30-14:00	Measuring violence – mainstreaming gender: the importance of 'harm' vs 'fear'. Margunn Björnholt, Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies
14:00-14:30	Intimate partner violence and the Nordic paradox Anna-Karin Ivert, Malmö University & Maria Wemrell, Lund University, Sweden
14:30-15:00	Undoing the Nordic paradox Anne Laure Humbert and colleagues, Oxford Brookes University, UK
15:00-15:30	Discussion, with coffee
15:30-16:30	Summary of the day and moving on
17:00-17:45	Drinks reception and networking, Östra mark



ABSTRACTS

1. Violence regimes: Conceptualising, measuring and re-thinking the position of violence

Jeff Hearn, Sofia Strid, Anne Laure Humbert, Dag Balkmar, and Marine Delaunay

What happens when we focus primarily on violence as a central question — either within the gender regime approach or by making violence regime an approach in itself? The paper first interrogates gender regimes theoretically and empirically through a focus on violence, and then develops violence regimes as a fruitful approach, conceptualizing violence as inequality in its own right, and a means to deepen analysis of gender relations, gender domination, and policy.

2. On violence policy and "women friendly" welfare regimes

Dag Balkmar, Marine Delaunay, Sofia Strid, Jeff Hearn, and Anne Laure Humbert

The purpose of this paper is to critically interrogate the concepts of gender violence regime and violence regime, and how societal welfare state regimes and gender regimes translate, or do not translate, into gender violence regimes or violence regimes. Taking violence as the point of departure, this paper addresses violence as problem with many contested meanings and politics. Welfare state regime research (Esping-Andersen 1990, 1992), including that on gender welfare regimes (e.g. Lewis 1992; Sainsbury 1999), has generated different frames, for understanding the problem of violence. It is argued that some welfare regimes are more women-friendly than others. However, empirical bases for these conclusions often exclude violence; welfare state regime research has thereby overlooked one of the most substantial, deep-rooted causes and consequences of gendered inequalities. The question is, is assumptions of women-friendliness turned upside down when gender-based violence is taken into account?

3. How is political violence gendered? Disentangling motives, forms, and impacts

Gabrielle Bardall, Elin Bjarnegård and Jennifer M Piscopo

How is political violence gendered? We connect the traditional political violence literature's emphasis on categorizing attacks to the gender and politics literature's analysis of the barriers to women's political participation. Our framework separates gendered political violence into three elements. Gendered motives appear when perpetrators use violence to preserve hegemonic men's control of politics. Gendered forms emphasize how gender roles and tropes differentially shape men's and women's experiences of violence. Gendered impacts capture the subjective meaning-making processes that occur as different audiences react to political violence. This approach offers researchers and policymakers greater analytic precision regarding how political violence is gendered.

4. Issues conceptualizing/measuring online violence

Matthew Hall, Arden University, UK

The growth, and popularity, of the Internet is unprecedented. The International Telecommunication Union estimates that over 55% of the world's population has access to the World Wide Web. The rise of Internet usage has coincided with a rise in the number of online abuses and violations, which include so-called revenge pornography, sexual happy slapping, spycamming, harassment, cyberstalking, sextortion, deepfakes, and sexist hate speech to name just a few. The negative impact on its victims/survivors is significant and profound in terms of physical and psychological health and well-being with victims/survivors reporting experiencing various problems including humiliation, shame and



embarrassment with intimate partners, family, friends, work colleagues and in public; sexual shame and sexual problems; body image issues; education and employment disruptions; concerns for personal safety; becoming paranoid and hyper-vigilant and having trust issues. In this talk I explore who measures some of these phenomena and the frameworks in doing so, and some of the conceptual issues and challenges, such as intentionality, terminologies and definitions, victim/survivor and public perceptions and reporting, and the Dark Web.

5. Measuring violence – mainstreaming gender: the importance of 'harm' vs 'fear'. *Margunn Björnholt and Ole Kristian Hjemdal*

This article contributes to the methodological debate on how to define and measure violence in order to more effectively capture gendered patterns of exposure to violence in survey studies. The authors take as their starting point Walby and Towers' proposals to mainstream gender in surveys, and to define violence more narrowly by adding the concept of injury. This article applies Walby and Towers' quality criteria to a Norwegian survey on violence and rape and finds that it performs relatively well in accounting for the main gender dimensions they propose. The article presents an analysis of the gender dimensions of violence in the original study, as well as a re-analysis of the data, including harm in line with Walby and Towers' propositions. It also adds fear of being severely injured or killed. Based on this analysis, the authors conclude that acts alone represent an adequate measure for severe violence and sexual violence and the gendered pattern of exposure. In contrast with Walby and Towers' assumption, adding harm did not change the gender distribution of exposure. However, adding fear of being injured or killed made a gender difference.

6. Intimate partner violence and the Nordic paradox

Anna-Karin Ivert, Malmö University and Maria Wemrell, Lund University, Sweden

Intimate partner violence against women (IPVAW) is a major public health problem in countries around the world, including the Nordic region. Contrary to what would be expected, as the Nordic countries are rated among the most gender equal in the world, survey data suggests that the lifetime prevalence rates of IPVAW in Sweden and neighboring Nordic countries are among the highest in the EU. Within the scope of our research project we explore this apparent Nordic paradox by using a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods, with a special focus on Sweden and Spain. Findings from the first studies indicate that the higher prevalence of IPVAW in Sweden than in Spain are not the result of measurement bias, and thus support the idea of the Nordic paradox. However, multilevel analysis shows that while significant differences in country averages exist with regard to IPVAW, country of residence does not discriminate very well with regards to individual experiences of IPVAW in cross-national comparisons. The relationship between experiences of IPVAW and country-level gender equality is weak and heterogeneous. Meanwhile, review studies of qualitative Nordic research on IPVAW, and of other research on IPVAW in Sweden, point not only to advancements made but also to remaining limitations and challenges in prevention an addressing of IPVAW in Sweden.

7. Undoing the Nordic paradox

Anne Laure Humbert and colleagues, Oxford Brookes University, UK

The paper explores the so-called Nordic gender equality paradox, whereby rates of gender-based violence are higher in countries that are typically associated with greater gender equality (Gracia and Merlo, 2016). In this paper, we want to explore the 'Nordic Paradox' further. We critically examine EU Agency for Fundamental Rights' (FRA) EU-wide survey on violence against women as measure of



prevalence (2012). While recognising the rigorous and robust methodology employed by such surveys, we also recognise that they only capture disclosed violence as opposed to *actual levels of violence*. This means that we conceptualise *actual violence* as the sum of disclosed and undisclosed violence. The 'Nordic Paradox' needs to be reassessed in relation to this conceptual shift. It might be for example that it is not that there is more violence in Nordic countries, but instead greater awareness, less acceptance and therefore higher levels of disclosure. In this analysis, we therefore consider a range of methodological and contextual factors of relevance to prevalence data on violence against women. In a second related step, we use the results of these analyses to provide a tentative 'corrected' ranking of EU countries. We discuss similarities and differences between the two classifications, and draw out methodological and policy implications.



PARTICIPANTS

David Meier-Arendt, Student assistant, Technical University of Darmstadt, Germany.

Tobias Axelsson, Senior Lecturer, Education, Örebro University, Sweden.

Dag Balkmar, Associate Professor and Senior Lecturer, Gender Studies, Örebro University, Sweden.

Elin **Bjarnegård**, Associate Professor, Political Science, and Senior Lecturer in Development Studies, Uppsala University, Sweden.

Margunn **Björnholt**, Research Professor at the Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies, Norway.

Klara **Bolinder**, Coordinator Men's Violence against Women, County Administrative Board, Örebro, Sweden.

Pia Efraimsson, County Administrative Board, Örebro, Sweden.

Alexandra Gribble, PhD candidate Tema genus, Linköping University, Sweden.

Lena **Gunnarsson**, Researcher in Gender Studies, Örebro University, and associate professor in gender studies, Lund university, Sweden

Matthew Hall, Programme Team Leader, Psychology, Arden University, UK.

Hannes Hart Svedberg, County Administrative Board, Örebro, Sweden.

Jeff **Hearn**, Senior Professor, Gender Studies, Örebro University, Sweden; Professor of Sociology, University of Huddersfield, UK; Professor Emeritus Hanken School of Economics, Finland; Professor Extraordinarius, University of South Africa.

Marc **Lafrance**, Associate Professor in Sociology & Anthropology, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada.

Monika Hjeds Löfmark, PhD, statistician, Swedish Prison and Probation Service, Sweden.

Anne Laure **Humbert**, Reader, Director of the Centre for Diversity Policy Research and Practice, Oxford Brookes, UK.

Anna-Karin Ivert, Associate Professor, Criminology, Malmö University, Sweden.

Susanne **Strand**, Associate Professor and Senior Lecturer, Criminology, Örebro University, Sweden.

Sofia Strid, Associate Professor and Senior Lecturer, Gender Studies, Örebro University, Sweden.

Zara Saeidzadeh, PhD candidate, Gender Studies, Örebro University, Sweden

Maria Wemrell, Senior Lecturer, Gender Studies, Lund University, Sweden.