



INTRODUCING

GENDER

VICTORIA ROBINSON

& WOMEN'S

DIANE RICHARDSON

STUDIES

FOURTH EDITION

Also by Victoria Robinson

MASCULINITIES IN TRANSITION (*with Jenny Hockey*)

ROCK CLIMBING: The Ultimate Guide

MUNDANE HETEROSEXUALITIES: From Theory to Practices
(*with Jenny Hockey and Angela Meah*)

EVERYDAY MASCULINITIES AND EXTREME SPORT: Male Identity
and Rock Climbing

Also by Diane Richardson

SEXUALITY, EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY (*with Surya Monro*)

INTERSECTIONS BETWEEN FEMINIST AND QUEER THEORY
(*co-edited with Janice McLaughlin and Mark E. Casey*)

CONTESTING RECOGNITION: Culture, Identity and Citizenship
(*co-edited with Janice McLaughlin and Peter Phillimore*)

HANDBOOK OF LESBIAN AND GAY STUDIES (*co-edited with Steven
Seidman*)

RETHINKING SEXUALITY

THEORISING HETEROSEXUALITY

WOMEN, MOTHERHOOD AND CHILDREARING

Diane Richardson and Victoria Robinson are co-editors of the Palgrave Macmillan
book series *Genders and Sexualities in the Social Sciences* (GSSS)

Introducing Gender and Women's Studies

Fourth Edition

Edited by

Victoria Robinson

and

Diane Richardson



palgrave

Understanding social movements	43
The birth of women's and gender studies	44
A third wave?	44
Conceptualising third wave feminism	45
Case study 1: Young women's activism in the United Kingdom	46
Case study 2: The Egyptian revolution	48
Women's political representation	50
Quotas	52
Changing politics	53
Conclusion	56
4 Masculinity Studies, Gender Relations and Feminism	58
<i>Victoria Robinson</i>	
Introduction	58
The historical context	59
The institutionalisation of the study of men and masculinities	60
Conceptual developments in the study of masculinity	62
The 'crisis of masculinity'	63
Hegemonic masculinity	65
Hegemonic masculinities and heterosexuality	66
Case study: men and sport	67
Masculinities and extreme sports	68
Critiques of theorising on men and masculinities	70
Critiques of hegemonic masculinity	71
Conclusion	73
5 Gender-Sensitive Method/ologies	76
<i>Gayle Letherby</i>	
Introduction	76
Taking gender seriously	77
Different differences	79
Counting, quoting and other interesting stuff	82
Gender-sensitive researchers	85
Epistemological concerns	87
Influence and impact	90
Conclusion	92
Section II Bodies-Identities	95
6 Gendered Bodies: Gendered Lives	97
<i>Kath Woodward</i>	
Introduction	97
Bodies	99
Classifying bodies: bodies in sport	101
Feminist critiques of the body	102
Embodied identities: body and self	104
Phenomenology: embodiment and experience	107

Affective bodies	110
Conclusion	112
7 Violence Against Women	114
<i>Liz Kelly</i>	
Introduction	114
The emergence of an issue	115
Naming, language and definitions	116
Theorising VAW and gender	119
Establishing a field of research	121
Meaning, impacts and consequences	123
State responses and responsibilities	125
Neoliberal shifts	127
The challenge of prevention	128
Conclusion	129
8 Racing the Feminist Agenda: Exploring the Intersections Between Race, Ethnicity and Gender	133
<i>Kate Reed</i>	
Introduction	133
Feminism, race and the invisible black woman	134
Black feminist challenges	135
Postcolonial feminism	137
Black feminism, postmodernism and difference	138
Race, ethnicity and gender – recent developments in the field	140
Race, ethnicity and identity	140
Women and whiteness	142
Masculinity, race and ethnicity	143
Developments in postcolonial studies in feminism?	145
Transnational feminism	146
Conclusion	147
9 Sexuality	150
<i>Priscilla Dunk-West and Heather Brook</i>	
Introduction	150
Theories and their uses: thinking sexuality	153
Bodies and identities: being sexual	157
Cultures and contexts: living sexuality	158
Institutions and politics: governing sexuality	162
Conclusion	163
Section III Institutions	167
10 Families, Domesticity and Intimacy: Changing Relationships in Changing Times	169
<i>Stevi Jackson</i>	

Violence Against Women

LIZ KELLY

Introduction

Hardly a week passes without major national and international news stories featuring violence against women (VAW), and whilst many of these are 'spectacular' cases this is, nonetheless, a level of recognition that was unthinkable when the first women's studies courses were established in the 1970s. That VAW would become the issue around which the strongest global feminist coalitions have been built could not have been predicted then, when it was the subject of much contention between radical and socialist feminists (see Charles, this volume). It has since transformed from being marginal in both research and gender/women's studies, located primarily in activism, to a field with its own academic journal (*Violence Against Women*, published by Sage, was founded in 1995 and now has 12 issues per year) alongside a global knowledge base and a significant profile in public policy and international law. This remarkable shift speaks to the commitment and achievements of several generations of feminist scholars, professionals and activists (not mutually exclusive categories) to naming, researching, addressing and preventing violence in women's lives.

In the process feminists have discovered that violence is extensive, occurring across the life course and in a range of contexts, not just the family/intimate relationships but in schools, workplaces, public space and institutions, during conflict and dislocation. It is committed by men (and by a much smaller number of women), the majority of whom know the woman or girl concerned.

VAW takes a number of forms, some, like sexual harassment, rape, sexual assault, trafficking and intimate-partner violence appear to be universal, whereas others, including Female Genital Mutilation (FGM; see Box 7.1), forced and early marriage and honour-based violence, are more associated with the Global South. That said, globalisation, specifically mass migration, means that women and girls who have experienced or are at risk of these forms of violence, also live in the Global North. It is not possible to address all the forms of violence in a single chapter; rather, I explore a number of key themes, using different forms of violence as illustrations of the wider issue. This chapter discusses:

Violence Against Women

- the early origins of work o
- naming, language and defi
- VAW and contemporary g
- researching violence;
- meanings, impacts and cor
- state responses and respon
- the challenges of preventio

The emergence of an is

It is easy to forget how little w
of gendered violence. Initial
ences in consciousness-raisin
Movement conferences; this
offered safety and support. A
responses – refuges, rape-crisi
of belief and mutual respect.
were innovators and had to
leaky tap to financial accounti
institutions, understanding e
ence' as a foundation for femi
this volume). It would not, h
established just how common

Outside the women's mo
committed by a few deviant
was a strong focus on how th
'victim precipitation' was wid
2007). Whilst these ideas w
early feminist texts also differ
majority of 'normal' men (s
rape). This, too, would be ch
in women's lives: that it coul
and that the men who did it

This uncovering is often
by the public testimonies an
activism in the 1970s. An in
on Crimes Against Women,
able at <http://www.dianar>
documents women from eve
sive practices. More recent w
and silencing. The starting p
spoken, and continue to sp
tion then shifts to whether
also been theorised as an act
to speak would be dangero

Violence Against Women

LIZ KELLY

Introduction

Hardly a week passes without major national and international news stories featuring violence against women (VAW), and whilst many of these are 'spectacular' cases this is, nonetheless, a level of recognition that was unthinkable when the first women's studies courses were established in the 1970s. That VAW would become the issue around which the strongest global feminist coalitions have been built could not have been predicted then, when it was the subject of much contention between radical and socialist feminists (see Charles, this volume). It has since transformed from being marginal in both research and gender/women's studies, located primarily in activism, to a field with its own academic journal (*Violence Against Women*, published by Sage, was founded in 1995 and now has 12 issues per year) alongside a global knowledge base and a significant profile in public policy and international law. This remarkable shift speaks to the commitment and achievements of several generations of feminist scholars, professionals and activists (not mutually exclusive categories) to naming, researching, addressing and preventing violence in women's lives.

In the process feminists have discovered that violence is extensive, occurring across the life course and in a range of contexts, not just the family/intimate relationships but in schools, workplaces, public space and institutions, during conflict and dislocation. It is committed by men (and by a much smaller number of women), the majority of whom know the woman or girl concerned.

VAW takes a number of forms, some, like sexual harassment, rape, sexual assault, trafficking and intimate-partner violence appear to be universal, whereas others, including Female Genital Mutilation (FGM; see Box 7.1), forced and early marriage and honour-based violence, are more associated with the Global South. That said, globalisation, specifically mass migration, means that women and girls who have experienced or are at risk of these forms of violence, also live in the Global North. It is not possible to address all the forms of violence in a single chapter; rather, I explore a number of key themes, using different forms of violence as illustrations of the wider issue. This chapter discusses:

- the early origins of work on VAW;
- naming, language and definitions;
- VAW and contemporary gender theory;
- researching violence;
- meanings, impacts and consequences;
- state responses and responsibilities;
- the challenges of prevention.

The emergence of an issue

It is easy to forget how little was known in the 1970s about the range and extent of gendered violence. Initially, awareness developed through sharing experiences in consciousness-raising groups and workshops at Women's Liberation Movement conferences; this also revealed how few spaces there were which offered safety and support. Activists began creating new by-women, for-women responses – refuges, rape-crisis helplines, self-defence classes – based on a culture of belief and mutual respect. The women who established these organisations were innovators and had to learn a multitude of skills – from how to mend a leaky tap to financial accounting. As other women found and used these feminist institutions, understanding expanded: an example of the importance of 'experience' as a foundation for feminist understandings of knowledge (see Letherby, in this volume). It would not, however, be until the 1980s that prevalence research established just how common abuse was in the lives of women and girls.

Outside the women's movement, violence and abuse were viewed as rare, committed by a few deviant men and/or in dysfunctional families, and there was a strong focus on how the victims contributed to their fates: the concept of 'victim precipitation' was widely accepted in criminology and sociology (Walklate, 2007). Whilst these ideas were critiqued and reframed as 'victim blame', key early feminist texts also differentiated between men who used violence from the majority of 'normal' men (see, for example, Brownmiller, 1975, in relation to rape). This, too, would be challenged as we discovered how routine violence was in women's lives: that it could be considered normative rather than pathological, and that the men who did it were part of our social networks.

This uncovering is often referred to as 'breaking the silence', exemplified by the public testimonies and 'speak outs' which were a core part of feminist activism in the 1970s. An internationalist example is the International Tribunal on Crimes Against Women, held in Brussels in 1975: the written record (available at http://www.dianarussell.com/f/crimes_against_women_tribunal.pdf) documents women from every continent speaking about a multitude of oppressive practices. More recent work, however, offers different perspectives on silence and silencing. The starting point here is recognition that women and girls have spoken, and continue to speak, to friends, family and state agencies: the question then shifts to whether and how they are heard (Stanko, 1990). Silence has also been theorised as an active and strategic decision made in contexts in which to speak would be dangerous, with the position of black and minority ethnic

(BME) women often in focus (Kanyeredzi, 2013). Thus, cultures of scepticism or belief and intersectional contexts play a part in whether women speak about violence, what they say and to whom (Rehman et al., 2013).

Naming, language and definitions

To speak even at a basic level, however, requires language – words which name experiences. Whilst rape has been named and defined in law for centuries, many of the other forms of abuse were neither named nor defined, so whilst women and girls might have a sense of having been abused there was no language of social recognition (Kelly, 1987). The concepts of domestic violence and sexual harassment were created in the 1970s, and others would follow. The meaning and significance of naming was an important theme throughout the 1970s and 1980s, marking the emergence of a field of study and policy development. Naming challenges what in the Nordic countries has been theorised as ‘normalisation’ (see, for example, Lundgren, 2004). This is a political process which enables taken-for-granted practices to be problematised. For individuals, naming is a complex process since it both places them in the stigmatising category of ‘victim’, whilst simultaneously locating the perpetrator in the category of abuser or rapist. Given that many perpetrators are members of women’s social networks and families, naming involves consequential decisions.

For most forms of VAW there have been debates about how they should be named, with multiple shifts in language over the last four decades. For example, domestic violence was often referred to in the 1970s as ‘battering’, with the corollaries of ‘battered women’ and ‘batterers’. As it became clearer that physical violence was only one of a range of control strategies, ‘domestic violence’ was more often used, and most recently ‘domestic abuse’. The tendency for policy makers to conflate all violence between family members with that by partners led many researchers to use the term ‘intimate partner violence’. Whilst all of these concepts are not without problems, since they fail to accurately name ‘who is doing what to whom’ (Hester, 2013), several now have wide social recognition.

A parallel debate, following earlier challenges to rape as a ‘property’ crime, has been whether rape should be considered a crime of violence or a sex crime (Gavey, 2005). Early feminist approaches stressed the former, and postulated that if the crime were to parallel physical assault there would be no legal rationale for addressing consent or the character and behaviour of women victims in court. Legal reform in Canada and some states in the United States took this approach, replacing the crime of rape with gender-neutral grades of sexual assault. Recent reflections (Sheehy, 2012) suggest that not only were the hoped-for changes not achieved, but most cases are now charged at the lower end of the scale and the symbolic loss of the word *rape* has had other unintended consequences. The conceptual critique of positioning rape as a crime of violence has been most eloquently articulated by Catharine MacKinnon (2011), who argues that it leaves the boundary between rape and sex precisely where it was, undercutting

critical feminist engagement has come to be termed has are presumed to have an women are responsible for bodies.

Box 7.1 Naming and

In the 1970s, the practices of ‘female genital mutilation’. The concept of ‘female genital mutilation’ was not until the fact that FGM was not more dangerous, with serious long-term health consequences. Anthropologist Janice Boddy argued that we should use words like ‘Female genital cutting’ for survivors and the intent of the term *mutilation* carries stigmatising connotations. Community activists still choose the term *mutilation* as common, especially with

How these practices have been using detailed and explicit definitions of sunna (Roach and Mommsen) including whether they place the most ‘barbaric’ practices from the World Health Organization of external genitalia for what constitutes genital mutilation of black women’s bodies, the labiaplasty and vaginoplasty cosmetic surgery. When FGM is usually practiced without consent. At the same time their cultural meaning may vary as forms of body modification versions of twenty-first century

As VAW became recognised as an overarching definition based on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the Istanbul Convention:

‘violence against women’ is defined as any act of discrimination against women which results in, or is likely to result in, suffering to women, including physical, sexual, psychological, liberty, whether occurring

(BME) women often in focus (Kanyeredzi, 2013). Thus, cultures of scepticism or belief and intersectional contexts play a part in whether women speak about violence, what they say and to whom (Rehman et al., 2013).

Naming, language and definitions

To speak even at a basic level, however, requires language – words which name experiences. Whilst rape has been named and defined in law for centuries, many of the other forms of abuse were neither named nor defined, so whilst women and girls might have a sense of having been abused there was no language of social recognition (Kelly, 1987). The concepts of domestic violence and sexual harassment were created in the 1970s, and others would follow. The meaning and significance of naming was an important theme throughout the 1970s and 1980s, marking the emergence of a field of study and policy development. Naming challenges what in the Nordic countries has been theorised as ‘normalisation’ (see, for example, Lundgren, 2004). This is a political process which enables taken-for-granted practices to be problematised. For individuals, naming is a complex process since it both places them in the stigmatising category of ‘victim’, whilst simultaneously locating the perpetrator in the category of abuser or rapist. Given that many perpetrators are members of women’s social networks and families, naming involves consequential decisions.

For most forms of VAW there have been debates about how they should be named, with multiple shifts in language over the last four decades. For example, domestic violence was often referred to in the 1970s as ‘battering’, with the corollaries of ‘battered women’ and ‘batterers’. As it became clearer that physical violence was only one of a range of control strategies, ‘domestic violence’ was more often used, and most recently ‘domestic abuse’. The tendency for policy makers to conflate all violence between family members with that by partners led many researchers to use the term ‘intimate partner violence’. Whilst all of these concepts are not without problems, since they fail to accurately name ‘who is doing what to whom’ (Hester, 2013), several now have wide social recognition.

A parallel debate, following earlier challenges to rape as a ‘property’ crime, has been whether rape should be considered a crime of violence or a sex crime (Gavey, 2005). Early feminist approaches stressed the former, and postulated that if the crime were to parallel physical assault there would be no legal rationale for addressing consent or the character and behaviour of women victims in court. Legal reform in Canada and some states in the United States took this approach, replacing the crime of rape with gender-neutral grades of sexual assault. Recent reflections (Sheehy, 2012) suggest that not only were the hoped-for changes not achieved, but most cases are now charged at the lower end of the scale and the symbolic loss of the word *rape* has had other unintended consequences. The conceptual critique of positioning rape as a crime of violence has been most eloquently articulated by Catharine MacKinnon (2011), who argues that it leaves the boundary between rape and sex precisely where it was, undercutting

critical feminist engagement with traditional modes of heterosexuality – what has come to be termed heteronormativity (Richardson, 1996) – in which men are presumed to have an ever-present biological drive to seek and have sex and women are responsible for setting and policing the boundaries of access to their bodies.

Box 7.1 Naming and defining FGM

In the 1970s, the practices now named as FGM were referred to as ‘female circumcision’. The concept of ‘female genital mutilation’ was coined to draw attention to the fact that FGM was not equivalent to male circumcision. The practice itself is more dangerous, with some girls not surviving, and has a range of serious long-term health consequences. In a 1998 piece entitled ‘Violence embodied?’, feminist anthropologist Janice Boddy argued, based on field work in Sudan and Somalia, that we should use women’s own language, and commends the term ‘cutting’. ‘Female genital cutting’ has been taken up by some, defended through respect for survivors and the intent of parents and/or practicing communities for whom the term *mutilation* carries stigma and blame. However, many survivors and community activists still choose to use FGM. The compromise of FGM/C has become more common, especially within international organisations, including UNICEF.

How these practices have been defined has also shifted, with early definitions using detailed and explicit descriptions of the three ‘types’: infibulation, excision, sunna (Roach and Momoh, 2013). Many questioned what such descriptions ‘did’ – including whether they played into neo-colonial approaches which position FGM as the most ‘barbaric’ practice (Roach and Momoh, 2013). The more recent definition from the World Health Organisation – ‘complete or partial removal or alternation of external genitalia for non-medical reasons’ – has prompted new debates about what constitutes genital mutilation. Some raise the question of why, when it is black women’s bodies, the practice is deemed a human-rights abuse and crime, yet labiaplasty and vaginoplasty, which arguably fit this definition, are deemed legal cosmetic surgery. When exploring these paradoxes it is important to remember that FGM is usually practiced on girls who are not in a position to give or withdraw consent. At the same time some adult women do choose to have FGM, and whilst their cultural meaning may include body aesthetics, this will not be seen in the same way as forms of body modification and self-improvement that are now part of some versions of twenty-first century western femininity (Roach and Momoh, 2013).

As VAW became recognised in international law and policy, the need for an overarching definition became clear, the one used for some time by the United Nations is the basis of the most recent in the 2011 Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combatting Violence against Women, often referred to as the Istanbul Convention:

‘violence against women’ is understood as a violation of human rights and a form of discrimination against women and shall mean all acts of gender-based violence that result in, or are likely to result in, physical, sexual, psychological or economic harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life.

(Council of Europe, 2011: Article 3)

The concept of 'gender-based violence' has been contested, since arguably almost all violence is this, if violence is understood as a masculinity practice, including violence between men and boys in, for example, gangs and street-based youth cultures (Mullins, 2006) and armed conflict (Enloe, 1993). This has led to the recuperation of both the language of VAW within the UN, and a definition which appeared in the first international policy document, the 1993 UN Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women:

the term 'violence against women' is understood to mean any act of gender-based violence that is directed against a woman because she is a woman or that affects women disproportionately ... manifested in a continuum of multiple, interrelated and sometimes recurring forms ... physical, sexual and psychological/emotional violence and economic abuse and exploitation, experienced in a range of settings, from private to public, and in today's globalized world, transcending national boundaries.

(UN, 2006: para. 28 and 104)

The concept of disproportionality is preferred by those who seek to recognise that some men and boys are, for example, raped or experience forced marriage, but the overwhelming majority of those subjected to these practices are female. The reference to 'a continuum of multiple, interrelated and sometimes recurring forms' draws on Kelly's (1987) work, based on interviews with 60 women and which explored all the forms of violence they had experienced as girls and adult women and how these might be connected. The original formulation drew on two dictionary definitions: firstly, 'a basic common character that underlies many different events', indicating that the many forms of intrusion, coercion, abuse and assault were connected. Secondly, 'a continuous series of elements or events that pass into one another and cannot be readily distinguished', suggesting that the categories used in law, research and policy to name and distinguish forms of violence shade into and out of one another in lived experience. This second meaning has been less-often taken up, yet remains a challenge at both the level of women's experience – they may name similar experiences differently – and with respect to research methods, policy and practice.

Part of what the continuum concept sought to make visible were the everyday, routine intimate intrusions theorised as connected to forms of violence which are criminalised. The connection was the use of power to diminish and control; what Bea Campbell (2009) has powerfully argued are 'crimes of dominion', in which the fundamental right to bodily integrity is denied, and women's safety and freedom are curtailed. The concept of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991) has enabled further conceptual development, since it illuminates how violence can sit at the intersection of gender, race, class, sexuality and/or disability (Kelly, 2012), changing not the acts so much as their meanings and the options available to deal with it.

The continuum concept further contends that the legal binary between rape and consensual sex does not reflect women's experience. What is

recounted in qualitative research have unwanted sex, only a (2005) has more recently violence. In 1987 Kelly coined 'rised sex', 'coercive sex' and 'sex', 'unwanted sex' 'coercive work of feminist theory rape' (2005: 1), again, a binary (legally based) definitions have been made with (Kelly, 2007); in law and they shade into and out of experiences of women and men.

Within feminist theory, fault line, with more than intersections (see for example victimhood and the contestations women as inevitable is to be passive, vulnerable construction, agency exist and identity of victim. The tant dimensions of femininity deed, word and thought and they were victimised (Kelly, temporal denial of agency silence, to the status of an instrument of another's agency

Theorising VAW and

In conventional approaches that as women become more violence against women may be too simplistic. The level to establish formal evidence of reported rape per capita. Similarly, development of economic resources through generation, can have the violence in interpersonal relationships.

Diana Russell and Rebecca if violence against women power may, at least in the levels of violence. The implications policy are multiple and profound.

The concept of 'gender-based violence' has been contested, since arguably almost all violence is this, if violence is understood as a masculinity practice, including violence between men and boys in, for example, gangs and street-based youth cultures (Mullins, 2006) and armed conflict (Enloe, 1993). This has led to the recuperation of both the language of VAW within the UN, and a definition which appeared in the first international policy document, the 1993 UN Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women:

the term 'violence against women' is understood to mean any act of gender-based violence that is directed against a woman because she is a woman or that affects women disproportionately ... manifested in a continuum of multiple, interrelated and sometimes recurring forms ... physical, sexual and psychological/emotional violence and economic abuse and exploitation, experienced in a range of settings, from private to public, and in today's globalized world, transcending national boundaries.

(UN, 2006: para. 28 and 104)

The concept of disproportionality is preferred by those who seek to recognise that some men and boys are, for example, raped or experience forced marriage, but the overwhelming majority of those subjected to these practices are female. The reference to 'a continuum of multiple, interrelated and sometimes recurring forms' draws on Kelly's (1987) work, based on interviews with 60 women and which explored all the forms of violence they had experienced as girls and adult women and how these might be connected. The original formulation drew on two dictionary definitions: firstly, 'a basic common character that underlies many different events', indicating that the many forms of intrusion, coercion, abuse and assault were connected. Secondly, 'a continuous series of elements or events that pass into one another and cannot be readily distinguished', suggesting that the categories used in law, research and policy to name and distinguish forms of violence shade into and out of one another in lived experience. This second meaning has been less-often taken up, yet remains a challenge at both the level of women's experience – they may name similar experiences differently – and with respect to research methods, policy and practice.

Part of what the continuum concept sought to make visible were the everyday, routine intimate intrusions theorised as connected to forms of violence which are criminalised. The connection was the use of power to diminish and control; what Bea Campbell (2009) has powerfully argued are 'crimes of dominion', in which the fundamental right to bodily integrity is denied, and women's safety and freedom are curtailed. The concept of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991) has enabled further conceptual development, since it illuminates how violence can sit at the intersection of gender, race, class, sexuality and/or disability (Kelly, 2012), changing not the acts so much as their meanings and the options available to deal with it.

The continuum concept further contends that the legal binary between rape and consensual sex does not reflect women's experience. What is

recounted in qualitative research are a range of contexts in which women have unwanted sex, only a portion of which they name as rape. Nicola Gavey (2005) has more recently described this as a 'dimensional view' of sexual violence. In 1987 Kelly conceptualised unwanted sex as including 'pressurised sex', 'coercive sex' and rape; two decades later, Gavey talks of 'unsexy sex', 'unwanted sex' 'coercive sex' and 'rape'. She describes the deconstructive work of feminist theory and research as a 'remaking of sex, rethinking rape' (2005: 1), again, a conceptual intervention which challenges simplistic binary (legally based) definitions through experiential data. Similar arguments have been made with respect to trafficking, smuggling and migration (Kelly, 2007); in law and policy they are defined as mutually exclusive, but they shade into and out of one another in complex ways in the lived experiences of women and men.

Within feminist theory, the victimhood/agency debate constituted a new fault line, with more thoughtful engagements exploring rarely acknowledged intersections (see for example, Kelly et al., 1996; Lamb, 1999). The concept of victimhood and the contention that feminist research on sexual violence positions women as inevitable victims are rooted in the notion that to be a victim is to be passive, vulnerable and devoid of any power (Roiphe, 1993). In this construction, agency exists only to the extent that women eschew the status and identity of victim. This simplistic binary is based on ignoring two important dimensions of feminist knowledge: that many women and girls do resist in deed, word and thought and are not passive, but this does not alter the fact that they were victimised (Kelly, 1987); and that violence is an exercise of power, a temporal denial of agency to the person victimised: 'one has been reduced to silence, to the status of an object or, worse, made into someone else's speech, an instrument of another's agency' (Brison, 2002: 55).

Theorising VAW and gender

In conventional approaches to gender equality and VAW, it has been assumed that as women become more equal – economically, socially and politically – then violence against women will decline. Data from Sweden suggests this model may be too simplistic. The country that has done the most on a state policy level to establish formal equality between women and men has the highest level of reported rape per capita of population in Europe (Lovett and Kelly, 2009). Similarly, development programmes are increasingly aware that channelling economic resources through women, whilst more effective in promoting income generation, can have the unintended consequence of heightening tension and violence in interpersonal relations (Oxfam, 2012).

Diana Russell and Rebecca Bolen (2000) offered the contentious view that if violence against women is an expression of men's power, challenges to that power may, at least in the short term, result in increasing rather than decreasing levels of violence. The implications of this theory for national and international policy are multiple and profound.

To analyse these dilemmas and paradoxes we need sophisticated theoretical framings which place the continuum of violence at the core of gender inequality, whilst allowing for change, retrenchment and unintended consequences at multiple levels. Connell's (2009) theoretical framework distinguishes between the overarching 'gender order', 'gender regimes' (more localised within institutions, including the family) and 'gender relations' between individual women and men. Whilst the levels are connected, divergences between them are not only possible, but to be expected and explored in specific times and places. Anne Morris (2009) drew on Connell in her concept of an 'abusive household gender regime' to reflect both the continuum of violence and coercive control in intimate partner violence and familial child sexual abuse. She and other theorists recognise that gender is constantly reproduced (see Richardson, in this volume) and that violence is a remaking within gender relations, which simultaneously reproduces gender as hierarchy at the group and social levels. Eva Lundgren (2004), in her research on intimate partner violence, but with wider application, refers to this process as 'gender constitution' – that men construct themselves as men through their use of violence and control. To the extent that they are successful they simultaneously diminish the women they are abusing through making them adopt their version of femininity.

In public policy, if not in women's studies, gender is often understood as being about women, making the gendering of men and masculinities a critical component in VWA theory. One excellent example is *Holding Your Square* (Mullins, 2006), an ethnographic study of young black men in the United States, which documents the ways these men divide women into a small number of intimates deserving of respect and the rest, who are ripe for exploitation. This complex, careful and critical analysis reveals how this group of young disadvantaged men construct their masculinity on the street, through violence and gender, which in turn creates a sense of entitlement to public space and to women's time, attention, loyalty and bodies. Similar analysis can be found in UK research on sexual exploitation of gang-associated young women (Firmin, 2013; also see Robinson, in this volume for further discussion of masculinity).

A further challenge is how to deal with the intersection of gender and sexuality, especially with respect to violence in same sex relationships. Whilst early studies from the United States (see Renzetti and Harvey Miley, 1996) argued that violence was as common in this context, this claim is complex since the samples were not random and the methodology not comparable to studies of violence in heterosexual relationships. That said, it is clear that abuse does take place in same sex relationships. Combining a survey and interviews, a UK study (Donovan et al., 2006) explores the extent to which the dynamics are similar, whilst paying attention to additional layers of complexity. Both heteronormativity, with its roots in gender construction, and homophobia are drawn on in explanatory frameworks, including the fact that victim-survivors still prefer to use counselling over criminal justice or specialist domestic violence services (Donovan and Hester, 2011). Understanding violence in same sex relationships also requires clarity and sophistication in gender analysis.

Establishing a field of

The early research agenda r those which valued and valid nist epistemology (see Lether a strength in the field, with of: the same serial rapist (Jo and mothers living with dom women's involvement in sex from these studies cannot be the survey to measure the ex on public policy and generat

The first community-based in the late 1970s and early 1 2000) and United Kingdom the widespread prevalence o including partners and relat about many forms of violen all women with knowledg women recalled at least one many reported multiple intr Simultaneously, a much sho Tactics Scale (CTS) – was d violence'. The CTS has been guish between offensive and or impact; disconnecting vio for example, Dobash et al., 1 some of these limitations, bu however, become the temp have been built, but with a Commission, 2010). Many, Crime Survey England and V has been shown to influence framed in terms of women? surveys are organised arou many forms of VAW, but esp quintessentially a course of c sising a combination of phy as 'incidents' of crime fails 'pattern of coercive control in coercive control who ne consequence of an 'any inci violence – where an inciden surveys which include wom violent as men. The most r women and 5 per cent of r

To analyse these dilemmas and paradoxes we need sophisticated theoretical framings which place the continuum of violence at the core of gender inequality, whilst allowing for change, retrenchment and unintended consequences at multiple levels. Connell's (2009) theoretical framework distinguishes between the overarching 'gender order', 'gender regimes' (more localised within institutions, including the family) and 'gender relations' between individual women and men. Whilst the levels are connected, divergences between them are not only possible, but to be expected and explored in specific times and places. Anne Morris (2009) drew on Connell in her concept of an 'abusive household gender regime' to reflect both the continuum of violence and coercive control in intimate partner violence and familial child sexual abuse. She and other theorists recognise that gender is constantly reproduced (see Richardson, in this volume) and that violence is a remaking within gender relations, which simultaneously reproduces gender as hierarchy at the group and social levels. Eva Lundgren (2004), in her research on intimate partner violence, but with wider application, refers to this process as 'gender constitution' – that men construct themselves as men through their use of violence and control. To the extent that they are successful they simultaneously diminish the women they are abusing through making them adopt their version of femininity.

In public policy, if not in women's studies, gender is often understood as being about women, making the gendering of men and masculinities a critical component in VWA theory. One excellent example is *Holding Your Square* (Mullins, 2006), an ethnographic study of young black men in the United States, which documents the ways these men divide women into a small number of intimates deserving of respect and the rest, who are ripe for exploitation. This complex, careful and critical analysis reveals how this group of young disadvantaged men construct their masculinity on the street, through violence and gender, which in turn creates a sense of entitlement to public space and to women's time, attention, loyalty and bodies. Similar analysis can be found in UK research on sexual exploitation of gang-associated young women (Firmin, 2013; also see Robinson, in this volume for further discussion of masculinity).

A further challenge is how to deal with the intersection of gender and sexuality, especially with respect to violence in same sex relationships. Whilst early studies from the United States (see Renzetti and Harvey Miley, 1996) argued that violence was as common in this context, this claim is complex since the samples were not random and the methodology not comparable to studies of violence in heterosexual relationships. That said, it is clear that abuse does take place in same sex relationships. Combining a survey and interviews, a UK study (Donovan et al., 2006) explores the extent to which the dynamics are similar, whilst paying attention to additional layers of complexity. Both heteronormativity, with its roots in gender construction, and homophobia are drawn on in explanatory frameworks, including the fact that victim-survivors still prefer to use counselling over criminal justice or specialist domestic violence services (Donovan and Hester, 2011). Understanding violence in same sex relationships also requires clarity and sophistication in gender analysis.

Establishing a field of research

The early research agenda reflected a preference for qualitative methods, as those which valued and validated women's experiences, in discussions of feminist epistemology (see Letherby, in this volume). This preference has remained a strength in the field, with some key examples being studies with survivors of: the same serial rapist (Jordan, 2008); ritual abuse (Scott, 2001); children and mothers living with domestic violence (Mullender et al., 2002); and young women's involvement in sexual exploitation (Coy, 2009). Whilst the insights from these studies cannot be underestimated, it is the reclaiming by feminists of the survey to measure the extent of violence which has had the most influence on public policy and generated ongoing debates.

The first community-based surveys on violence against women were conducted in the late 1970s and early 1980s in the United States (see Russell and Bolen, 2000) and United Kingdom (Hanmer and Saunders, 1984). They established the widespread prevalence of violence, committed in the main by known men, including partners and relatives. The carefully constructed questionnaires asked about many forms of violence in diverse contexts, and the interviewers were all women with knowledge and understanding of VAW. Most respondent women recalled at least one incident of intimate intrusion in their lifetime and many reported multiple intrusions by the same and/or different perpetrators. Simultaneously, a much shorter and more limited instrument – the Conflicts Tactics Scale (CTS) – was developed in the United States to investigate 'family violence'. The CTS has been subjected to extensive criticism for: failing to distinguish between offensive and defensive violence; having no measure of frequency or impact; disconnecting violent acts from the context in which they occur (see, for example, Dobash et al., 1992). A revised version of the instrument addressed some of these limitations, but by no means all (Straus et al., 1996). The CTS has, however, become the template on which most subsequent prevalence studies have been built, but with a narrower focus on domestic violence (European Commission, 2010). Many, including the British Crime Survey (BCS, now the Crime Survey England and Wales) frame the survey as being about 'crime', which has been shown to influence disclosure of experiences of violence – yet, surveys framed in terms of women's safety or health get higher reporting rates. Crime surveys are organised around documenting 'incidents'. This is problematic for many forms of VAW, but especially so with respect to domestic violence, which is quintessentially a course of conduct, with most definitions of this violence emphasising a combination of physical, sexual and psychological abuse. Measuring it as 'incidents' of crime fails to capture this reality: most succinctly defined as a 'pattern of coercive control' (Stark, 2007). It is those who become entrapped in coercive control who need – and seek – protection and support. A further consequence of an 'any incident' definition is that headline findings on domestic violence – where an incident can be a single slap or a push – is that prevalence surveys which include women and men produce 'evidence' that women are as violent as men. The most recent data (ONS, 2013), reports that 7 per cent of women and 5 per cent of men experienced an incident in the last 12 months,

with 31 per cent of women and 18 per cent of men reporting an incident in their lifetimes. When data is analysed to reflect a course of conduct – using variables on frequency, fear and injury – the gendered pattern of the majority of victims being female and perpetrators male, a pattern that is so apparent in service-level data from police and other agencies, re-emerges (Towers, 2013).

This shift from surveys on all forms of VAW to an over-focus on domestic violence has meant that sexual violence is often an ‘add on’ with a limited set (2–4) of questions. Methodological development in prevalence studies of sexual violence has been limited. One important exception is the SAVI study from Ireland (McGee et al., 2002), based on a quota sample of 1,584 women and 1,534 men, aged 18 to 90. A series of questions explored a range of potential acts, with three measures of prevalence summarised below:

- 20.4 per cent of women and 16.2 per cent of men reported childhood sexual abuse, occurring when under 17 years old;
- 20.4 per cent of women and 9.7 per cent of men reported adult sexual violence – occurring when 17 and over;
- the lifetime measure – the most serious incident from either childhood or adulthood – found 42 per cent of women and 28 per cent of men had experienced sexual violence.

Intersectional analysis of prevalence data has come primarily from the United States, with several studies finding higher rates for minority women:

- Patricia Tjaden and Nancy Thoennes (2000) analysed the results of their national Violence against Women Survey, finding that American Indian/Alaska Native women were significantly more likely than white women to report sexual violence, with African-American women, or mixed-race having higher rates of reported rape;
- The Centre for Disease Control (2004) found higher rates of forced sex reported by university students – Black (12.3 per cent) Hispanic (10.4 per cent), White (7.3 per cent).

Valli Kanuha (1996) raised the question of whether there are differential prevalence rates across social groups. We know that violence against women and children occurs in all social groups; but as research becomes more sophisticated and global in reach, it is clear that rates of violence are not consistent across social groups, or between societies. Heightened rates of violence seem most common for women of colour, and especially Aboriginal women (Tjaden and Thoennes, 2000; Brownridge, 2009). This analysis can also be applied to conflict, where in many contexts, but not all, sexual violence is heightened (Wood, 2009).

Few contemporary surveys, even when they are cast as about VAW and/or health, ask about the everyday intrusions which were a core element in the continuum concept. Exceptions here are recent French and German studies (European Commission, 2010), which show that sexual harassment is the most common form of violence in women’s lives. Prevalence research is not suited to

establishing the extent of picking, although module practice is common.

Prevalence research has been an issue in many women’s studies; this has been at the cost of exploring the contexts in which it occurs, or asymmetry (whether women’s or partner violence, are as much a reality of violence in the home (2008) has argued persistent patterns, including: ‘controlling violence is used, where terrorism’ and ‘domestic terrorism’ violence as a way to control perpetrators).

Other strands of research on the intersection of legal reform and domestic violence over the last two decades have explored the contents of the journal, *Violence and Victims*, work on ‘attrition’ – the criminal justice system is

Meaning, impacts and

It is a truism to say that violence can be understood through lenses, covering both physical impacts more broadly, as summarised by the UN Secretary-General’s ‘consequence’ of gender violence. The consequences of VAW are complex, framing, whilst the health impacts may be slight, it is non-negotiable status and curtails the intrusion. The ever-present ‘safety work’ (Kelly, 2012) about whether, where, who purports to be ‘preventive’ how not, to behave, especially do not follow the rules to them. The most obvious with the implicit, but never not take advantage of a woman has played out through

with 31 per cent of women and 18 per cent of men reporting an incident in their lifetimes. When data is analysed to reflect a course of conduct – using variables on frequency, fear and injury – the gendered pattern of the majority of victims being female and perpetrators male, a pattern that is so apparent in service-level data from police and other agencies, re-emerges (Towers, 2013).

This shift from surveys on all forms of VAW to an over-focus on domestic violence has meant that sexual violence is often an ‘add on’ with a limited set (2–4) of questions. Methodological development in prevalence studies of sexual violence has been limited. One important exception is the SAVI study from Ireland (McGee et al., 2002), based on a quota sample of 1,584 women and 1,534 men, aged 18 to 90. A series of questions explored a range of potential acts, with three measures of prevalence summarised below:

- 20.4 per cent of women and 16.2 per cent of men reported childhood sexual abuse, occurring when under 17 years old;
- 20.4 per cent of women and 9.7 per cent of men reported adult sexual violence – occurring when 17 and over;
- the lifetime measure – the most serious incident from either childhood or adulthood – found 42 per cent of women and 28 per cent of men had experienced sexual violence.

Intersectional analysis of prevalence data has come primarily from the United States, with several studies finding higher rates for minority women:

- Patricia Tjaden and Nancy Thoennes (2000) analysed the results of their national Violence against Women Survey, finding that American Indian/Alaska Native women were significantly more likely than white women to report sexual violence, with African-American women, or mixed-race having higher rates of reported rape;
- The Centre for Disease Control (2004) found higher rates of forced sex reported by university students – Black (12.3 per cent) Hispanic (10.4 per cent), White (7.3 per cent).

Valli Kanuha (1996) raised the question of whether there are differential prevalence rates across social groups. We know that violence against women and children occurs in all social groups; but as research becomes more sophisticated and global in reach, it is clear that rates of violence are not consistent across social groups, or between societies. Heightened rates of violence seem most common for women of colour, and especially Aboriginal women (Tjaden and Thoennes, 2000; Brownridge, 2009). This analysis can also be applied to conflict, where in many contexts, but not all, sexual violence is heightened (Wood, 2009).

Few contemporary surveys, even when they are cast as about VAW and/or health, ask about the everyday intrusions which were a core element in the continuum concept. Exceptions here are recent French and German studies (European Commission, 2010), which show that sexual harassment is the most common form of violence in women’s lives. Prevalence research is not suited to

establishing the extent of less common forms of violence, such as FGM and trafficking, although modules on the former have been used in countries where the practice is common.

Prevalence research has been an important tool in showing that violence is an issue in many women’s lives, but the limitations of many studies mean that this has been at the cost of accurately reflecting the full extent of violence and the contexts in which it occurs. The intense debates about gender symmetry or asymmetry (whether women are as violent as men), with respect to intimate partner violence, are as much debates about research methods as they are about the reality of violence in the lives of those women and men. Michael Johnson (2008) has argued persuasively that surveys are measuring several distinct patterns, including: ‘common couple violence’ – occasional conflicts where violence is used, where there is a symmetry in victimisation and perpetration; and ‘domestic terrorism’ – where one partner repeatedly and systematically uses violence as a way to control the other (in which men constitute the vast majority of perpetrators).

Other strands of research investigate institutional responses, including evaluation of legal reform and demonstration projects. The majority of studies published over the last two decades have been this type of ‘policy-relevant’ research, as the contents of the journal, *Violence Against Women* attests. One influential body of work on ‘attrition’ – the way cases drop out of the prosecution process – in the criminal justice system is drawn upon in a later section.

Meaning, impacts and consequences

It is a truism to say that violence is harmful, but its impacts and consequences can be understood through several lenses. The most obvious is the medical lens, covering both physical and mental health. A feminist lens theorises the impacts more broadly, as an indicator of women’s status, perhaps most succinctly summarised by the UN statement that violence against women is ‘a cause and consequence’ of gender inequality: here the meaning, impacts and consequences of VAW are connected directly to women’s oppression. Drawing on this framing, whilst the health consequences of what is termed ‘street harassment’ may be slight, it is nonetheless a regular reminder to women of their subordinate status and curtails their freedom to occupy public space without the risk of intrusion. The ever-present threat of violence leads many women to undertake ‘safety work’ (Kelly, 2012) – having to factor their personal safety into decisions about whether, where, when and how they do certain things. Much of what purports to be ‘prevention’ is advice to women about how, or more accurately how not, to behave, especially in public space: the message being that if women do not follow the rules they are to some extent responsible for what happens to them. The most obvious example here is advice about alcohol consumption, with the implicit, but never-stated assumption that men cannot be trusted to not take advantage of a woman who is drunk. In the United States, this debate has played out through the concept of ‘date rape’ (Roiphe, 1993), which has

limited purchase in other jurisdictions, where few rapes appear to take place in the context of 'dates'.

Recent reanalysis of the UK Adult Psychiatric Morbidity Survey data (Scott et al., 2013), which has a random sample of over 7,000 women and men, identified several distinct patterns of abuse which correlate with mental health outcomes. One group, equivalent to 1 in 25 of the UK population, had experienced extensive physical and sexual violence, with an abuse history extending back to childhood. Nearly all members of this group had:

- been assaulted by a partner;
- half had been threatened with death;
- most had been sexually abused as children;
- many had also been raped as an adult.

Members of this group were five times more likely to have a common mental disorder and fifteen times more likely to have three or more mental disorders, including attempted suicide and self-harm. The other group with a similar profile was overwhelmingly female and had experienced extensive physical violence and coercive control in an adult partner relationship.

Research is also drawing attention to the intersection of material and emotional disadvantage, with increased burdens in the aftermath of violence: Ava Kanyeredzi (2013) shows this to be the case for African-Caribbean heritage women, and recent work on child sexual exploitation (Beckett et al., 2013) suggests that class stereotypes result in girls as young as 13 being deemed by professionals to be 'choosing' a lifestyle of exchanging sex for money and material goods. They are thus abandoned to ongoing and repeated abuse. Research on trafficking also suggests that there are extensive health impacts (Zimmerman et al., 2003).

One troubling research finding, now replicated across many studies, is that repeated child sexual abuse correlates with re-victimisation as an adult (Messman-Moore and Long, 2000) through both additional sexual violence and intimate partner violence. This group of women is also over-represented in prisons and in mental health services. At the same time many survivors manage the legacies of childhood abuse and rebuild their selves and their lives in extraordinary ways. We know too little about the pathways which enable this, but some elements are being believed and supported by a significant other as children and adults. The emergence of the concept of 'resilience' disguises the 'violence work' (Kelly, 2012) that survivors undertake to cope, since there are still burdens to carry even where lives are not determined by abuse. Here, the work of Veena Das (1998), drawing on Bourdieu's concept of social suffering – the weight of inequality in lived lives – is an important reference point. The harms of violence are burdens many women have to shoulder, stealing energy and time from what their life projects could have been (Kelly et al., 2014).

Philosophy professor Susan Brison's *Aftermath* (2002) offers both a personal and intellectual engagement with what it means to be a survivor of violence. The

book charts her own process and how reflecting on this

I develop and defend a view of violence, but it is not done by violence, but it is (xi). ... The trauma has changed my family acknowledge it, the

Brison explores the changing of another of the relationships with the question of the redress of harms, since the others'. This is precisely doing for four decades. This is to normal' – but a joint effort to her sense of self and relationship a consequence (Kelly et al.)

State responses and

The alternative institution – resulted in feminists having state agencies to protect 'secondary victimisation'

- being left in danger;
- not being informed of
- having the symptoms of cause;
- removing a woman's

This prompted campaign work. The greatest change in domestic violence and sexual violence is extensive in local areas, the inside and outside. In the 1990s in the United Kingdom, the government's commitment of governments has especially the defining of gender-equality issue (Kelly on the Elimination of Violence Against Women report to the CEDAW Committee, this has included reports subjected to it.

limited purchase in other jurisdictions, where few rapes appear to take place in the context of 'dates'.

Recent reanalysis of the UK Adult Psychiatric Morbidity Survey data (Scott et al., 2013), which has a random sample of over 7,000 women and men, identified several distinct patterns of abuse which correlate with mental health outcomes. One group, equivalent to 1 in 25 of the UK population, had experienced extensive physical and sexual violence, with an abuse history extending back to childhood. Nearly all members of this group had:

- been assaulted by a partner;
- half had been threatened with death;
- most had been sexually abused as children;
- many had also been raped as an adult.

Members of this group were five times more likely to have a common mental disorder and fifteen times more likely to have three or more mental disorders, including attempted suicide and self-harm. The other group with a similar profile was overwhelmingly female and had experienced extensive physical violence and coercive control in an adult partner relationship.

Research is also drawing attention to the intersection of material and emotional disadvantage, with increased burdens in the aftermath of violence: Ava Kanyeredzi (2013) shows this to be the case for African-Caribbean heritage women, and recent work on child sexual exploitation (Beckett et al., 2013) suggests that class stereotypes result in girls as young as 13 being deemed by professionals to be 'choosing' a lifestyle of exchanging sex for money and material goods. They are thus abandoned to ongoing and repeated abuse. Research on trafficking also suggests that there are extensive health impacts (Zimmerman et al., 2003).

One troubling research finding, now replicated across many studies, is that repeated child sexual abuse correlates with re-victimisation as an adult (Messman-Moore and Long, 2000) through both additional sexual violence and intimate partner violence. This group of women is also over-represented in prisons and in mental health services. At the same time many survivors manage the legacies of childhood abuse and rebuild their selves and their lives in extraordinary ways. We know too little about the pathways which enable this, but some elements are being believed and supported by a significant other as children and adults. The emergence of the concept of 'resilience' disguises the 'violence work' (Kelly, 2012) that survivors undertake to cope, since there are still burdens to carry even where lives are not determined by abuse. Here, the work of Veena Das (1998), drawing on Bourdieu's concept of social suffering – the weight of inequality in lived lives – is an important reference point. The harms of violence are burdens many women have to shoulder, stealing energy and time from what their life projects could have been (Kelly et al., 2014).

Philosophy professor Susan Brison's *Aftermath* (2002) offers both a personal and intellectual engagement with what it means to be a survivor of violence. The

book charts her own process of negotiating the aftermath of brutal stranger rape and how reflecting on this changed her approach to theories of the self:

I develop and defend a view of the self as fundamentally relational – capable of being undone by violence, but also of being remade in connection with others (Brison, 2001: xi). ... The trauma has changed me forever, and if I insist too often that my friends and family acknowledge it, that's because I'm afraid they don't know who I am.

(Brison, 2002: 21)

Brison explores the changed self, following victimisation, as a relational self, illuminating another of the harms of violence: the betrayal of trust which brings into question relationships with other human beings. Brison's analysis also points to the redress of harms, since she argues that the self can be 'remade in connection to others'. This is precisely what the women-run specialist services have been doing for four decades. Theirs is not a medical model of 'recovery' – as in 'return to normal' – but a joint exploration of how violence has changed a woman's life, her sense of self and relations to others and how she wishes to 'remake' herself as a consequence (Kelly et al., 2014).

State responses and responsibilities

The alternative institutions established in the 1970s – refuges, rape crisis centres – resulted in feminists hearing recurrent stories about not only the failure of state agencies to protect and support women, but a catalogue of what some call 'secondary victimisation'. This is more than victim blame, encompassing:

- being left in danger;
- not being informed of rights or options;
- having the symptoms of abuse addressed, through medication, but not the cause;
- removing a woman's children rather than protecting her.

This prompted campaigns for change targeted initially at police and social work. The greatest change in the 1980s came from the police in relation to domestic violence and social work around child sexual abuse. Change was extensive in local areas where coalitions were created between feminists on the inside and outside. Institutional change has continued, spurred since the 1990s in the United Kingdom by government initiatives. The formal involvement of governments has been encouraged by international developments, especially the defining of VAW in 1993 by the UN as a human-rights and gender-equality issue (Kelly, 2005). All signatories to the UN Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) have to report to the CEDAW committee at regular intervals: since the mid-1990s this has included reporting on preventing VAW and protecting women subjected to it.

Global legal reforms over the last 40 years have been extensive, making forms of violence such as psychological abuse and stalking illegal for the first time, through overhauls and reforms of existing laws on rape, child sexual abuse and trafficking, and also using civil law for protection orders. Whilst feminist legal theorists have analysed the ways in which some legal reforms have challenged the masculinism embedded in law, sociologists have raised different questions. Sandra Walklate (2008), for example, critiques what she sees as a 'turn to law' in the VAW movement, noting that the state has failed to deliver the promised protection. Empirical studies by VAW researchers confirm this through studying attrition in cases of domestic violence (Hester, 2006) and rape (Kelly et al., 2005; Lovett and Kelly, 2009). Attrition research tracks cases through the legal process, noting at what stage they fall out of the process: whilst reporting has increased substantially, the vast majority of reported cases do not result in a conviction – 5 per cent of domestic violence cases in Northumbria (Hester, 2006) and 7 per cent of rape cases across England and Wales in 2013 (ONS, 2013). The result is falling conviction rates.

One of the key findings of the first rape attrition study in England (Kelly et al., 2005) was that there is a culture of scepticism and pessimism at all levels of the criminal justice system. Stereotypes of rape, rapists and rape victims influence whether police and prosecutors find cases 'believable' and/or 'winnable' (Munro and Kelly, 2009). Here, we see the limits of the impacts of feminist engagements with legal systems (see also Conaghan and Russell, 2014). Women are still expected to take appropriate precautions and act in predictable ways in the aftermath of rape. Those who do not conform to expected schemas can become the focus of 'blame work' (Yancey Martin, 2005). One study of 58 rape trials in the United States (Parraig and Renner, 1998 cited in Munro and Kelly, 2009) suggests that in order to be an effective witness the complainant must enact non-consent in the courtroom. This involves being: polite but not compliant; co-operative but not submissive; answering promptly and precisely; and speaking without shame. This is a tall order for any witness, let alone one who is required to speak about sexual violation.

Judith Herman's (2005) thoughtful reflections on what justice might be from the perspective of women who have suffered violence begins from the recognition that since most perpetrators are known to women – many of them part of their inner circle – and that community standards continue to blame women, neither the criminal justice system as usual, nor restorative justice deliver what is needed. From interviews with survivors, Herman concludes they want:

- recognition – that they have been victimised;
- vindication – that the dishonour, stigma and loss of status are transferred to perpetrators;
- re-connection – with others and communities they are part of;
- accountability – sanctions which protect them and others, which may or may not be punitive;
- freedom from the burdens of harm.

Violence Against Women

This is an agenda for change through even procedural/parallel justice communities, friends and family.

Neoliberal shifts

This agenda is not, however, particularly with respect to the United Kingdom in particular, the concepts of risk and multi-agency services (Coy and Kelly, 2010). A parallel agenda.

The critique of the criminal justice system for women of colour in the United Kingdom were introduced in the 1990s, with convictions of both African-American women now been termed 'dual arrests'.

It has become an article of faith that multi-agency work is necessary if violence is to be addressed. 20 years ago that multi-agency work was in each of the agencies. The veil has served as a veil to disguise the evidence in many reports of the IPCC on domestic violence. It has made domestic violence a priority for being referred to them. Peter F. Tudinal case study of local government to domestic violence, documented by a crime-incident focus, many 'ties framework'. Here, equality as victims. As a consequence, the to both the violence and relationships.

Part of this process has been in domestic violence policy (Munro) targeted at those designated 'high risk'. Factors have replaced a gendered approach is the Multi Agency Risk Assessment is institutionalised across England.

Multi-Agency Risk Assessment is the cornerstone of our approach to identifying and managing risk through the use of risk assessment.

MARACs, whilst not statutory, are the agencies that might be involved.

Global legal reforms over the last 40 years have been extensive, making forms of violence such as psychological abuse and stalking illegal for the first time, through overhauls and reforms of existing laws on rape, child sexual abuse and trafficking, and also using civil law for protection orders. Whilst feminist legal theorists have analysed the ways in which some legal reforms have challenged the masculinism embedded in law, sociologists have raised different questions. Sandra Walklate (2008), for example, critiques what she sees as a 'turn to law' in the VAW movement, noting that the state has failed to deliver the promised protection. Empirical studies by VAW researchers confirm this through studying attrition in cases of domestic violence (Hester, 2006) and rape (Kelly et al., 2005; Lovett and Kelly, 2009). Attrition research tracks cases through the legal process, noting at what stage they fall out of the process: whilst reporting has increased substantially, the vast majority of reported cases do not result in a conviction – 5 per cent of domestic violence cases in Northumbria (Hester, 2006) and 7 per cent of rape cases across England and Wales in 2013 (ONS, 2013). The result is falling conviction rates.

One of the key findings of the first rape attrition study in England (Kelly et al., 2005) was that there is a culture of scepticism and pessimism at all levels of the criminal justice system. Stereotypes of rape, rapists and rape victims influence whether police and prosecutors find cases 'believable' and/or 'winnable' (Munro and Kelly, 2009). Here, we see the limits of the impacts of feminist engagements with legal systems (see also Conaghan and Russell, 2014). Women are still expected to take appropriate precautions and act in predictable ways in the aftermath of rape. Those who do not conform to expected schemas can become the focus of 'blame work' (Yancey Martin, 2005). One study of 58 rape trials in the United States (Parraig and Renner, 1998 cited in Munro and Kelly, 2009) suggests that in order to be an effective witness the complainant must enact non-consent in the courtroom. This involves being: polite but not compliant; co-operative but not submissive; answering promptly and precisely; and speaking without shame. This is a tall order for any witness, let alone one who is required to speak about sexual violation.

Judith Herman's (2005) thoughtful reflections on what justice might be from the perspective of women who have suffered violence begins from the recognition that since most perpetrators are known to women – many of them part of their inner circle – and that community standards continue to blame women, neither the criminal justice system as usual, nor restorative justice deliver what is needed. From interviews with survivors, Herman concludes they want:

- recognition – that they have been victimised;
- vindication – that the dishonour, stigma and loss of status are transferred to perpetrators;
- re-connection – with others and communities they are part of;
- accountability – sanctions which protect them and others, which may or may not be punitive;
- freedom from the burdens of harm.

This is an agenda for change that extends beyond criminal and civil justice, and even procedural/parallel justice; it requires a holistic response from the state, communities, friends and family.

Neoliberal shifts

This agenda is not, however, the one that has been pursued in recent years, particularly with respect to domestic violence, where in the United States and United Kingdom in particular, a criminal justice route has been prioritised, with the concepts of risk and multi-agency responses taking centre stage (Stark, 2007; Coy and Kelly, 2010). A parallel process has been the marketisation of support services.

The critique of the criminal justice route has been most strongly articulated by women of colour in the United States, where both mandatory arrest and prosecution were introduced in the 1990s. The outcomes have been disproportionate convictions of both African-American men and women, the latter in what has now been termed 'dual arrests' where both parties are arrested (Stark, 2007).

It has become an article of faith in policy that multi-agency responses are necessary if violence is to be addressed effectively. Jalna Hanmer (1995) noted 20 years ago that multi-agency responses can only be as good as the practice in each of the agencies. The neoliberal emphasis on good and best practice has served as a veil to disguise the more common bad and poor practice, as evidenced in many reports of the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) on domestic violence homicides between 2010 and 2014 – the IPCC made domestic violence a priority in 2014 because of the large increase in cases being referred to them. Peter Harvie and Tony Manzi (2011) report on a longitudinal case study of local government Crime Reduction Partnerships responses to domestic violence, documenting how a feminist approach has been eclipsed by a crime-incident focus, managerialism and what they term a 'perverse equalities framework'. Here, equality is understood as paying equal attention to men as victims. As a consequence, the understanding of power and control as central to both the violence and relations between agencies has been lost.

Part of this process has been that the concept of risk has replaced that of need in domestic violence policy (Mythen and Walklate, 2011), with resources being targeted at those designated 'high risk': in the process, risk assessment and risk factors have replaced a gendered analysis of power and control. A clear illustration is the Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARACs), which have been institutionalised across England and Wales, with over 260 currently operating:

Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARACs) have become the cornerstone of our approach to identified high risk victims of domestic violence as indicated through the use of risk assessment tools.

(Home Office, 2008: 38)

MARACs, whilst not statutory, are meetings where cases are discussed by all the agencies that might be involved, each of which is obliged to share all the

information they have about a case, with an emphasis on reducing risk for the victim-survivor. They are not present, however, and it is not clear whether all are asked for their informed consent for the information to be shared (Coy and Kelly, 2010). Observation of four MARACs revealed explicit victim blame and women being held responsible for protecting their children (Coy and Kelly, 2010). MARACs reflect the concern of Gill Hague and Ellen Malos (1998) that surveillance and monitoring of women's lives might replace the empowerment perspective of women's organisations.

A way of working that has restored agency to women in the aftermath of violence, which was a foundational principle in feminist-inspired refuges and other support services, has been undermined further by marketisation, localism and commissioning (Kelly et al., 2014). A UK government decision to move decision-making to local areas coincided with drastically reduced budgets for local government, alongside an interpretation of EU procurement legislation that funding above a specific threshold must be made available to open commercial tender. This has enabled large-scale providers, including generic housing associations, faith-based organisations and G4S (a global private security company), to take over community-based services established by women's organisations decades previously. The losses are most evident with respect to BME women's organisations, as their intersectional specialism no longer 'fits' the new funding regime (Rehman et al., 2013), and in faith-based organisations running the majority of support services for victims of trafficking. This marketisation is justified by officials through the cuts in public expenditure which have reduced the funding pot. Sylvia Walby and Jude Towers (2012) documented a 31 per cent cut in funding of domestic and sexual violence services at the local level compared to allocations in 2009.

Thus, neoliberal economics and social policies – cuts to welfare budgets and legal aid also have serious implications for women's possibilities of escaping violence – have had the effect of undermining the dedicated organisations which established the knowledge base on violence and have advocated for women's-interests reform for over four decades. It is an open question what the landscape of support will look like in the coming decade.

The picture in the United States is somewhat different, given the significant amounts of money dedicated in successive Violence Against Women Acts to support services. However, even here larger organisations have benefitted the most, with small community-based organisations either losing funding or being absorbed into larger ones. Where this involves sexual violence services being absorbed into larger domestic violence organisations, sexual violence became marginalised in provision (Brown, J. et al., 2010).

The challenge of prevention

Responding to the needs of women who have been victimised has been a priority for both women's organisations and governments. As a consequence, prevention has taken something a backseat. The exception was the innovative Zero Tolerance campaign established in the 1990s in Scotland (<http://www.zerotolerance.org>

Westminster government violence-against-women little apart from the gov.uk/) campaign, co people. In 2011, the fer published a medium- a *Is Possible*, but only mi makes clear that preven number of connected le entitlement. A new glo many men and boys de are for prevention strate priority for the UN sinc as potential perpetrator possibility of eschewing peers (Potter, 2012).

The challenges of pre assault, much of which t should learn to say no, everyday communication they are careful and hes party (Kitzinger and Fr women to do refusals in discourse was evident in sexual consent (Coy et al sexual consent: from giv enthusiastic and embodie

A new challenge is hov includes harassment and environment, with its pe context' for VAW, which viduals and women's org networking sites such as with limited success. Th element in a resurgence the routine sexual harass young women through Everyday Sexism (everyd less than 12 months, to experiences of violence at

Conclusion

Violence against women feminism and feminists h

information they have about a case, with an emphasis on reducing risk for the victim-survivor. They are not present, however, and it is not clear whether all are asked for their informed consent for the information to be shared (Coy and Kelly, 2010). Observation of four MARACs revealed explicit victim blame and women being held responsible for protecting their children (Coy and Kelly, 2010). MARACs reflect the concern of Gill Hague and Ellen Malos (1998) that surveillance and monitoring of women's lives might replace the empowerment perspective of women's organisations.

A way of working that has restored agency to women in the aftermath of violence, which was a foundational principle in feminist-inspired refuges and other support services, has been undermined further by marketisation, localism and commissioning (Kelly et al., 2014). A UK government decision to move decision-making to local areas coincided with drastically reduced budgets for local government, alongside an interpretation of EU procurement legislation that funding above a specific threshold must be made available to open commercial tender. This has enabled large-scale providers, including generic housing associations, faith-based organisations and G4S (a global private security company), to take over community-based services established by women's organisations decades previously. The losses are most evident with respect to BME women's organisations, as their intersectional specialism no longer 'fits' the new funding regime (Rehman et al., 2013), and in faith-based organisations running the majority of support services for victims of trafficking. This marketisation is justified by officials through the cuts in public expenditure which have reduced the funding pot. Sylvia Walby and Jude Towers (2012) documented a 31 per cent cut in funding of domestic and sexual violence services at the local level compared to allocations in 2009.

Thus, neoliberal economics and social policies – cuts to welfare budgets and legal aid also have serious implications for women's possibilities of escaping violence – have had the effect of undermining the dedicated organisations which established the knowledge base on violence and have advocated for women's-interests reform for over four decades. It is an open question what the landscape of support will look like in the coming decade.

The picture in the United States is somewhat different, given the significant amounts of money dedicated in successive Violence Against Women Acts to support services. However, even here larger organisations have benefitted the most, with small community-based organisations either losing funding or being absorbed into larger ones. Where this involves sexual violence services being absorbed into larger domestic violence organisations, sexual violence became marginalised in provision (Brown, J. et al., 2010).

The challenge of prevention

Responding to the needs of women who have been victimised has been a priority for both women's organisations and governments. As a consequence, prevention has taken something of a backseat. The exception was the innovative Zero Tolerance campaign established in the 1990s in Scotland ([http://](http://www.zerotolerance.org.uk/ViolenceAgainstWomen)

www.zerotolerance.org.uk/ViolenceAgainstWomen). Whilst two successive Westminster governments have stated that prevention is a priority in their violence-against-women strategies, this assertion has amounted to relatively little apart from the ground-breaking ThisIsAbuse (<http://thisisabuse.direct.gov.uk/>) campaign, coordinated by the Home Office and targeted at young people. In 2011, the feminist coalition End Violence Against Women (EVAW) published a medium- and long-term prevention strategy, *A Different World Is Possible*, but only minimal progress has been made since. This document makes clear that prevention requires understanding the causes of violence at a number of connected levels, including constructions of masculinity and male entitlement. A new global discussion linked to this is the recognition that many men and boys do not use violence, and what the implications of this are for prevention strategies. Involving men in preventing VAW has become a priority for the UN since 2013. Many interventions have positioned men only as potential perpetrators, but relatively new 'bystander' approaches offer the possibility of eschewing violence, supporting women and challenging abusive peers (Potter, 2012).

The challenges of prevention can also be illustrated in approaches to sexual assault, much of which to date has focused on women's 'refusal skills': that they should learn to say no, clearly and emphatically. Analysis of human refusals in everyday communication reveal that they are rarely 'just saying no', but rather they are careful and hesitant in an attempt not hurt the feelings of the other party (Kitzinger and Frith, 1999). Yet we expect – and even teach – young women to do refusals in a different way with respect to sex. The power of this discourse was evident in a recent study of young peoples' understandings of sexual consent (Coy et al., 2013). This study argues for a refocusing of work on sexual consent: from giving consent to getting it; from a focus on refusal to an enthusiastic and embodied 'yes'.

A new challenge is how to deal with the violence that is enacted online, which includes harassment and stalking and threats of rape and death. The online environment, with its potential for anonymity, has become a new 'conductive context' for VAW, which limits women's engagement and presence. Many individuals and women's organisations have campaigned for service providers and networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter to address women's safety, but with limited success. The overt and blatant misogyny expressed has been one element in a resurgence of feminist activism in many countries, focusing on the routine sexual harassment. Here, the online environment has been used by young women through projects such as Hollaback (www.ihollaback.org) and Everyday Sexism (everydaysexism.com), both of which became international in less than 12 months, to provide a space for women to recount and challenge experiences of violence and abuse.

Conclusion

Violence against women is an arena in which some of the best aspirations of feminism and feminists have been made real: global coalitions which thrive on

diversity; continuing and challenging connections between research, activism and public policy; legal reform based on recognition of women's physical integrity and sexual autonomy; and the creation of safety and options for women and girls whose lives have been dominated and controlled. It has made a number of critically important contributions to knowledge, policy and practice.

Feminist research and activism has made major contributions to understandings of VAW:

- There are multiple forms of VAW that exist on a continuum from the everyday to the extreme.
- The majority of perpetrators are men known to the women and girls, and very few of the perpetrators have any kind of psychiatric disturbance.
- Certain contexts are conducive to VAW: the family; institutions; conflict and transition; public space and online environments.
- What makes a difference to survivors is being believed, heard, recognised, enabled and supported to regain control over their bodies and lives.
- Whilst victim blame has been challenged, it remains strong; we still ask: 'why did she not leave?' rather than 'why did he hurt his partner?'
- Legal reform has created more access to justice, both through extending the reach of law to more behaviours – harassment, stalking, rape in marriage, trafficking – and the use of civil law to create protection from violence.
- Practices by the police, prosecutors, courts, social work and health are informed by feminist research.
- VAW is recognised internationally – by the United Nations and Council of Europe – as a core pillar of gender inequality and a human rights issue.

At the same time, VAW is also the arena in which the extent of what remains to be done is most visceral. Can we claim with any certainty to have done more than make the range and extent of abuse visible, identify flagship projects, and document the continued failure of both justice and welfare systems to respond adequately? Does any country have a credible claim to have created an effective and consistent system of provision, protection and prosecution, let alone to have seriously begun the crucial task of prevention?

In the current context in which stories of sexual abuse of children are 'everywhere' – for example, in the United Kingdom, with respect to child sexual exploitation by gangs and groups, and ongoing revelations about the television personality, Jimmy Saville, having a 'career' of abusing girls, boys and young women – it is worth taking a few moments to reflect on how far we have come. What has changed? There is both a climate of belief and disbelief – a sense that this happens on a wide scale, quickly followed by a question: how could it happen so often, how are these things 'hidden in plain sight'? Unfortunately, too often this slides into a 'blame game', holding individuals to account rather than examining the institutional and sexist cultures which serve to protect powerful adult men when the word of accusation comes from a woman/girl (Jordan, 2004). Whilst there is undoubtedly more belief in the abstract about the scale of VAW, the context in which each woman/girl is abused includes who the perpetrator

is, the circumstances a
questioning her credibi

We are, therefore, st
Liberation Movement
– of ending violence ag
tion needs to be at the
extra. Walby (2011) an
gender equality have sta
moment characterised b
will be evident. Camp
and includes militarise
refund its voice, espec
gender revolution will a
gence of feminist activ
Interestingly, these you
criminal offences, but
which were a focus in t

Further reading

S. Brison (2000) *Aftermath*. University Press. An extra and trauma theory. It is author's own process follow however, located within a trauma, narrative, theories that one is changed by en or recognise this. Finding is vital, but all too often in and consistent account.

L. Kelly (1987) *Surviving*. the concept on the continu their encounters with viol

positioned as victims, bu maths. The later chapters

L. Price (2005) *Feminist F* Point, NS, Fernwood Publ decades to offer students touched on in this chapte choices and accountability

Y. Rehman, L. Kelly and H *Lives of Minority Women* together research and thi including two chapters o theme of intersectionality forms and contexts of viol

diversity; continuing and challenging connections between research, activism and public policy; legal reform based on recognition of women's physical integrity and sexual autonomy; and the creation of safety and options for women and girls whose lives have been dominated and controlled. It has made a number of critically important contributions to knowledge, policy and practice.

Feminist research and activism has made major contributions to understandings of VAW:

- There are multiple forms of VAW that exist on a continuum from the everyday to the extreme.
- The majority of perpetrators are men known to the women and girls, and very few of the perpetrators have any kind of psychiatric disturbance.
- Certain contexts are conducive to VAW: the family; institutions; conflict and transition; public space and online environments.
- What makes a difference to survivors is being believed, heard, recognised, enabled and supported to regain control over their bodies and lives.
- Whilst victim blame has been challenged, it remains strong; we still ask: 'why did she not leave?' rather than 'why did he hurt his partner?'
- Legal reform has created more access to justice, both through extending the reach of law to more behaviours – harassment, stalking, rape in marriage, trafficking – and the use of civil law to create protection from violence.
- Practices by the police, prosecutors, courts, social work and health are informed by feminist research.
- VAW is recognised internationally – by the United Nations and Council of Europe – as a core pillar of gender inequality and a human rights issue.

At the same time, VAW is also the arena in which the extent of what remains to be done is most visceral. Can we claim with any certainty to have done more than make the range and extent of abuse visible, identify flagship projects, and document the continued failure of both justice and welfare systems to respond adequately? Does any country have a credible claim to have created an effective and consistent system of provision, protection and prosecution, let alone to have seriously begun the crucial task of prevention?

In the current context in which stories of sexual abuse of children are 'everywhere' – for example, in the United Kingdom, with respect to child sexual exploitation by gangs and groups, and ongoing revelations about the television personality, Jimmy Saville, having a 'career' of abusing girls, boys and young women – it is worth taking a few moments to reflect on how far we have come. What has changed? There is both a climate of belief and disbelief – a sense that this happens on a wide scale, quickly followed by a question: how could it happen so often, how are these things 'hidden in plain sight'? Unfortunately, too often this slides into a 'blame game', holding individuals to account rather than examining the institutional and sexist cultures which serve to protect powerful adult men when the word of accusation comes from a woman/girl (Jordan, 2004). Whilst there is undoubtedly more belief in the abstract about the scale of VAW, the context in which each woman/girl is abused includes who the perpetrator

is, the circumstances and their intersectional position: each and all can lead to questioning her credibility or holding her responsible for what has happened.

We are, therefore, still a very long way from the ambition of the Women's Liberation Movement – later adopted by the UN and the Council of Europe – of ending violence against women. For this to be more than rhetoric, prevention needs to be at the centre of our thinking, rather than it being an optional extra. Walby (2011) and Campbell (2014) both asked whether efforts to create gender equality have stalled across the Global North and whether we are in a new moment characterised by neoliberalism, in which a rollback of rights and progress will be evident. Campbell goes further, arguing that violence is now endemic and includes militarised masculinities, while impunity reigns and misogyny has refound its voice, especially in social media. She argues that nothing short of a gender revolution will address violence effectively, and takes heart from the resurgence of feminist activism among young women (see Charles, in this volume). Interestingly, these young women are not only paying attention to acts which are criminal offences, but discussing and sharing the everyday intimate intrusions which were a focus in the 1970s for feminist activists and researchers.

Further reading

S. Brison (2000) *Aftermath: Violence and the Re-making of the Self*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. An extraordinary book which traverses personal experience, philosophy and trauma theory. It is a deeply felt and philosophically sophisticated account of the author's own process following a brutal rape and attempted murder. Her experiences are, however, located within an intellectual engagement with approaches to sexual violence, trauma, narrative, theories of the self, autonomy and community. She argues passionately that one is changed by encounters with violence, and that others often fail to understand or recognise this. Finding a narrative account that allows one to make sense and move on is vital, but all too often interrupted by criminal justice processes which require a specific and consistent account.

L. Kelly (1987) *Surviving Sexual Violence*. Cambridge, Polity Press. This book established the concept on the continuum of violence, based on interviews with 60 women in which all their encounters with violence are explored. The title also indicates that women are not

positioned as victims, but that they survive the violence itself and its complicated aftermaths. The later chapters explore coping, survival and resistance.

L. Price (2005) *Feminist Frameworks: Building Theory on Violence Against Women*. Black Point, NS, Fernwood Publishing. A short but insightful book which draws on the last four decades to offer students an accessible route into key debates and feminist ideas that are touched on in this chapter: defining violence; intersectionality; violence as process; the choices and accountability of perpetrators; interventions; and jurisprudence.

Y. Rehman, L. Kelly and H. Siddiqui (eds) (2013) *Moving in the Shadows: Violence in the Lives of Minority Women and Children*. London, Ashgate. This unique collection draws together research and thinking on minority women's experiences in the United Kingdom, including two chapters on working with perpetrators from minority backgrounds. The theme of intersectionality threads throughout all the chapters alongside discussions of: the forms and contexts of violence minority women experience; the role of culture and faith in

the control of women and girls; the types of intervention within multi-cultural and social cohesion policies; the impacts of violence on British-born and migrant women and girls; and the intersection of race, class, gender and sexuality highlighting issues of similarity and difference. Specific chapters focus on: FGM; forced marriage; honour-based violence; polygyny; gang-associated sexual violence; and witchcraft accusations. Many of the most prominent women of colour activists on VAW have contributed to this volume.

E. Stark (2007) *Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. This provocative book challenges the focus on criminal justice intervention in US responses to domestic violence and, specifically, framings of it as a crime like any other. Stark argues this is a misstep, since many of the ways in which women are entrapped and controlled in abusive relationships are gendered practices of subjugation rather than physical assaults. He also documents, through moving case studies of women he has supported as an expert witness, how state agencies frequently misread and misunderstand women's situations. As a consequence, women are criminalised for the occasions on which they fight back, or have their children removed without any effort to make the perpetrator accountable. In defining domestic violence as a 'liberty crime' he insists this is a human-rights violation and that policy and practice should be equally focused on enhancing women's freedom and creating safety.

Questions

1. In what ways is VAW a core pillar of gender inequality?
2. Is the concept of the continuum of violence still relevant?
3. What is justice for victim-survivors of violence against women?
4. How might we explain the continued increase in the reporting of rape to the police, when the criminal justice system is less effective in prosecuting it today than 20 years ago?
5. Should sexual consent be re-framed to focus, not on whether and how young women 'say no', but rather how we 'get' consent, and that it should be understood as an 'enthusiastic and embodied yes'?

Racing the Female Exploring the Between Race Gender

KATE REED

Introduction

This chapter seeks to outline gender, race and ethnicity in relationship has been transformed over issues of race and ethnicity have Drawing on a selection of examples to explore and evaluate the ways in which black feminism the feminist agenda. The chapter disciplinary shifts in the fields also have underpinned this 30 years, as a result of these changes in women's studies in the context in the second half of this chapter on issues of identity, whiteness and racialised feminism.

At the outset, it is important to note that the relationship between ethnicity, contentious concepts and tensions made between people are not move beyond biological or essential race theorists refuse to take race as the socially constructed (and often This fluid and socially constructed this chapter. However, as Hall argues while immutable hierarchical

'This 4th edition contains some of the best writing and research I have ever seen on gender and women's studies. As always, Robinson and Richardson have brought together a set of authors of exceptionally high quality. A brilliant volume! Bravissima!'
– Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Professor,
Sociology, University of California
Santa Barbara, USA

'This accessible and richly informed volume provides a lucid outline of the variety of writing in gender and women's studies, as well as suggesting possible issues for further debate and discussion.'
– Mary Evans, Centennial Professor,
Gender Institute, London School of
Economics and Political Science, UK

Victoria Robinson is Reader in Sociology at the University of Sheffield, UK. Her recent books include *Masculinities in Transition* (2011, with Jenny Hockey) and *Everyday Masculinities and Extreme Sport* (2008).

Diane Richardson is Professor of Sociology at Newcastle University, UK. Her recent books include *Sexuality, Equality and Diversity* (2012, with Surya Monro) and *Intersections Between Feminist and Queer Theory* (2012, with Janice McLaughlin and Mark E. Casey). With Victoria Robinson, she co-edits the *Genders and Sexualities in the Social Sciences* book series (Palgrave Macmillan).

The fourth edition of this classic, comprehensive and best-selling text on gender and women's studies marks over twenty years of engaging with the key issues and developments in gender and feminist theory. With fully revised chapters written by specialists across a range of core topics, including sexuality, work, the media, race, education, family, bodies, masculinity, methodologies, social movements and politics, this accessible but academically rigorous collection breaks down contemporary debates with helpful examples and questions, whilst also underlining the complexities and contradictions of this area of study.

In particular, this new edition:

- continues to reflect the shift from 'women's studies' to 'gender studies', incorporating masculinity studies throughout;
- features new chapters on violence and the environment, reflecting continuing and more recent feminist concerns;
- includes expanded discussion of intersectionality, international and transnational issues.

Coinciding with an upsurge in new forms of feminist politics, this timely publication confirms the continuing relevance of gender and women's studies. It remains an indispensable resource for students, academics and anyone interested in this lively field.



palgrave

ISBN 978-1-137-32187-9



9 781137 321879

90101

www.palgrave.com

Cover image © Datacraft Co Ltd/Getty