Parkes, J. and Unterhalter, E. (2015) Hope and History: Education engagements with poverty, inequality and gender violence. In Parkes, J. (ed) **Gender Violence in Poverty Contexts: The Educational Challenge**. London: Routledge. Pp.11-29. (pre-publication version)

Incidents of violence against women and girls currently feature frequently in international news and, since 2010, have ignited a global policy discussion. The role of education in perpetuating and challenging gender violence has been a key theme of these discussions, but recent reviews have questioned whether we are any nearer to tackling and reducing violence (United Nations 2011; Leach, Dunne and Salvi 2014). The purpose of this chapter is to look critically at the sorts of assumptions being made about violence – how it is defined, what causes it, with what consequences. We focus in particular on assumptions in academic literature about how violence has intensified, dropped or transformed over time and across space, including its links with poverty. The epidemiological studies reviewed in *The Spirit Level* (Wilkinson and Pickett 2010) suggested that violence was linked with inequalities, eliciting considerable controversy[1] (e.g. Saunders 2010). This chapter aims to investigate the interface between poverty, inequality and violence, and shows how there is no simple story. It maps a wide range of links between poverty, inequality and the levels of violence experienced by young people and reflects on the implications for thinking about education interventions.

Here, we offer a particular multi-dimensional definition of gender violence and link this with some of the ways in which poverty and inequality have been analysed. Drawing on these definitional refinements, we argue that the contours of gender violence do indeed ebb and flow across time, space and place. However, we consider that generalised claims about global rises or reductions in violence are misguided, since they neglect the multi-dimensionality of violence and complex ways in which violence is embedded and produced differently in diverse moments, contexts, spaces and places associated with particular forms of inequality. Gender violence is indeed associated with poverty and inequality but these links are not causal in a simple direction. Considerable work remains to be done to understand and explain some of these connections, associations and the possibilities for change. In this, education has much to contribute, but much work remains ahead to develop research and relevant programmes in this area. Our account therefore offers, we hope, a valuable platform on which to build the field.

Defining violence, inequality and poverty

Table 2:1   **Global declarations on violence: contested definitions**

Women's rights	Children's rights
1981 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) Obliged countries to pledge to take measures to eliminate discrimination against women	

	1989 UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) Education as a fundamental human right; states required to take all appropriate measures to ensure that school discipline is administered in manner consistent with child's human dignity
1993 Vienna Declaration Called for elimination of violence in public and private life as a human rights obligation **1993 UN Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women (DEVAW)** Gender-based violence defined as any act '*that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life*' UN appointed Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women (SRVAW) **1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action** Opposition to violence against women recognised as integral to realisation of equality, development and peace	
	2000 Dakar Framework for Action on Education For All Goals on education for all children (EFA), especially girls, to have access to and complete basic education cycle by 2015 **2000 Millennium Development Goals** Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education, ensuring that by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women, eliminating gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005 and at all levels of education by 2015
United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000) on Women, Peace and Security	**2000 Optional protocols to CRC** Provided more detailed protection for children from forms of violence, including sale of children, child prostitution

Mandates protection of women and girls during and after conflict and greater involvement of women in conflict resolution, peace building and peace keeping.	and pornography, and involvement and rehabilitation of children in armed conflict.
2006 Ending Violence Against Women: From Words to Action Report commissioned by UN Secretary General	**2006 UN Report of Violence Against Children** Violence against children defined as '*All forms of physical and mental violence, injury and abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation, including sexual abuse*' Established Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary General on Violence Against Children (SRSG) to assist governments, international organisations and civil society to work towards ending violence
2008, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1820 Explicitly recognises sexual violence as a security issue and weapon of war and emphasise the importance of women's participation in peace processes	

Table 2.1 provides a time line of global declarations on eliminating violence against women and children. This shows how since the 1980s, violence has been framed in terms of children's rights and women's rights, with the two strands tending to operate largely independently of each other. Key definitions, including the UN Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women's (DEVAW) definition of gender based violence (1993) and the definition of violence against children in the UN Report on Violence Against Children (2006) speak to a view of violence that is addressed in terms of its effects rather than its causes. Violence is largely associated with particular kinds of violent *acts* perpetrated under particular kind of conditions. Such perspectives have been a major feature of the engagement of UN agencies and large NGOs in relation to policy making and legal protection on gender based violence, notably in conflict areas. They have been influential in how data are collected and analysed, and have affected programmes on violence in schools, sexual and reproductive health, and work with boys and men[2]. While we acknowledge the achievement of the definition in the context of widespread silence and denial regarding these forms of violence, these perspectives close off analysis of how the association with poverty and inequality might be explored.   For example, in considering causes, DEVAW acknowledges that violence against women and girls is:

> a manifestation of historically unequal power relations between men and women, which have led to domination over and discrimination against women by men and to the prevention of the full advancement of women, and that violence against women is one of the crucial social mechanisms by which women are forced into a subordinate position.

17

While there is an acknowledgement here of the origins of violence in unequal power relations and gender discrimination, it is so broadly stated that the space to understand links with poverty and nuanced forms of inequality is not apparent. This analysis suggests that the primary social division is between women and men, and that other forms of inequality are not explicit or implicit in these relationships. In the case of the UN Report on Violence Against Children, by contrast, the definitional emphasis is on some of the special features of childhood, and elements of the abuse of care across the generations. However, again the stress is on consequences, particular acts of violence, and one form of social division - between adults and children - rather than the complexity of the situations causing violence.

By contrast, some of the academic conceptualisations on violence, and specifically gender violence, draw out its connections with multiple sites of inequality and that it cannot just be confined to particular kinds of actions, although these are important For example, Philippe Bourgois' definition of violence includes structural, symbolic and everyday strands. Structural violence is 'chronic, historically entrenched political-economic oppression and social inequality, ranging from exploitative international terms of trade to abusive local working conditions and high infant mortality rates' (Bourgois 2004a: 426). His emphasis on social and political inequalities as well as economic inequalities addresses the critiques of the concept of structural violence which implies an association exclusively with the poor (Kleinman 2000: 228). Drawing on Bourdieu's work, Bourgois views symbolic violence as the ways in which hierarchy and inequality become taken for granted, internalised and 'misrecognised' within subjectivities. At the interface of structural and symbolic violence is everyday violence, which include not just extreme acts of force but also mundane 'daily practices and expressions of violence on a micro-interactional level' (Bourgois 2004a: 426).

The multi-dimensionality of inequalities associated with violence can help illuminate some of its connections with poverty. Iris Marion Young (1990) links a number of specific oppressions associated with vulnerability and disadvantage as features of poverty, some of which are structural, some symbolic, and some which mix the two. Her list comprises: exploitation; marginalization; violence; powerlessness; cultural imperialism; and, exclusion from decision-making. By implication gender violence in its association with poverty and inequality may be linked with any of these. Frances Stewart has written about inequality indicating that it concerns not just inequality of *what* (opportunities, outcomes or capabilities), but inequality amongst *whom* (Stewart 2002; 2008; 2009). She illuminates how it is important to understand the significance of inequalities and how they operate vertically (for example, as socially constructed and maintained networks for the distribution and consumption of resources defined in terms of socio-economic groups or classes). In addition, inequalities operate horizontally in relation to ideas such as religious beliefs, cultural or political values. They are also embedded in aspirations, bodies, feelings and emotions associated with valued or reviled identities, material and symbolic exchanges between socially constructed groups defined in terms of race, ethnicity or location.

Elaine Unterhalter (2012) has drawn on three metaphors to indicate different ways of understanding poverty, which we have extended to help us think further about the connections that need investigating between poverty, inequality and gendered violence. In one guise, Unterhalter suggests poverty is seen as a *line* of income, expenditures or education level; inequalities are captured either by the numbers of men or women from different groups who do or do not cross this line or the amount of resource distributed above or below this line. From this

perspective, when delineating violence the presence or absence of acts of violence by groups, who are described as situated above or below the poverty line, is investigated. Education programmes to address violence perpetrated or experienced tend to take on particular notions of recasting the behaviours associated with these groups, who are often portrayed in essentialised forms. For example, boys living in poor neighbourhoods can be portrayed in uniform terms as tough members of gangs, while girls from these neighbourhoods can be portrayed as particularly vulnerable because of where they live and the assumptions young men make about them. Education projects that aim to work with these communities aim to shape behaviours of perpetrators or victims to try to insure against violent acts.

In a second approach to thinking about poverty, Unterhalter uses the metaphor of the *trap* or the *net* in which structures of exclusion, exploitation and denigration associated with denial of economic, political, social and cultural resources shape the vulnerability of the poor. From this perspective, violence is structural and symbolic and particular acts of violence are indications of these structures at work. Approaches to education which draw on this type of analysis are concerned with a reshaping of structures and symbols and will work over lifetimes with teachers, learners, education and information systems to build alternative relationships based on class, gender, race or ethnicity.

Unterhalter's third metaphor for thinking about poverty concerns a *fuel* which can drive action against poverty or inequality, but this might take positive or negative directions. Thus, engaging with violence and poverty can take a positive route, as exemplified by Gandhi, Martin Luther King, and Mandela, who all thought, wrote and worked to formulate particular words, strategies and social movements to confront the violence of structural inequalities with actions that did not share the violence of this oppression, but instead sought to change it[3]. These processes and social movements were themselves explicitly educational. However, other active engagements with violence may be 'bad education' entailing crime, risk and harm.

Drawing on these writers, we consider that poverty and violence may be understood as both an effect and a cause of vertical and horizontal inequalities, linked both with structural and symbolic manifestations of oppression. Thus gender violence is structural and symbolic, derived from and implicated in inequalities and associated forms of exclusion and oppression. The implications are that, in seeking to document its features and bring about the social change that can transform both the deep forces that maintain gender violence and the particular acts which are its most evident form, education projects and programmes need to work on many levels and with many partners.

In the discussion that follows, we look at a range of writers on violence in different settings and draw out the ways in which their analyses tend to focus on certain aspects of poverty or gender, while underplaying others. We begin by considering different perspectives on whether gender violence is on the increase. The analysis we wish to develop suggests that a multi-dimensional definition of poverty and inequality is needed to make such an assessment. This will throw forms of violence into sharper relief and help to clarify the forms of educational engagement required to address such forms.

Violence on the rise?

We live in turbulent times, with the start of the 21st century scarred by global crises. Devastating wars and long-standing conflicts in parts of Africa and the Middle East, natural disasters including hurricanes and extended periods of drought, and financial crises and food shortages have particular repercussions for the lives of women (Unterhalter, North and Parkes 2010). Global inequality is staggering, with the wealthiest 1% of the world's adult population owning 40% of global assets, while the poorest 50% own barely 1% (Davies, Sandstrom, Shorrocks and Wolff 2006). Research is beginning to uncover the extent not just of single, brutal acts but also everyday, taken for granted violence, with a recent World Health Organisation (WHO) study claiming that globally a third of women have experienced intimate partner violence (WHO 2013), and another study estimating that 150 million girls and 73 million boys have been forced to have sex or experienced sexual violence by people known to them (Jones, Moore, Villar-Marquez and Broadbent 2008). Such statistics beg the question has gender violence intensified in recent times and are forms of poverty and inequality implicated?

Explanations for rises in violence are sometimes associated with inequalities. Wilkinson and Pickett (2010) use statistical evidence to demonstrate that levels of violence are highest in more economically unequal countries, though their analysis has been criticised for over-generalising from a limited evidence base, mainly drawn from high income countries (see endnote 1). The World Health Organisation study on intimate partner violence (IPV) found that prevalence was higher in poorer regions, with 37% of women in Africa, Eastern Mediterranean and South-East Asia regions experiencing IPV, and lower in high income countries, though still 23% of women in these countries reported such experiences (WHO 2013). Another study in ten sites around the world found considerable variability, with between 15% and 71% of women reporting violence by their intimate partners, and violence more prevalent and more severe in rural settings than in more industrialised sites (Garcia-Moreno, Jansen, Ellsberg, Heise and Watts 2006). A review of 41 studies of economic empowerment and intimate partner violence found that household assets and women's education were protective, though sometimes women's engagement in income generation was associated with increases in violence in the home (Vyas and Watts 2009). Sylvia Walby (2013) claims that a number of features of modernity are generating new forms of violence, including violence associated with inequalities produced by neoliberalism, increasingly coercive criminal justice systems, and changing patterns of warfare. These forms of violence associated with interconnected modernities, she argues, reveal how violence is perpetrated by the powerful against the disadvantaged.

However, in contrast to the line of discussion on violence rising, other writers claim that we are living in more peaceful times, and that modernity brings a civilising influence (Elias 1994; Pinker 2011). Steven Pinker stresses the influence since the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 of human rights discourse: 'the decline of violence against women in the West is pushed along by a humanist mindset that elevates the rights of individual people over the traditions of the community, and that increasingly embraces the vantage point of women' (Pinker 2011: 499). Walby (2013), however, criticises such perspectives for associating contemporary violence with poorer countries and disadvantaged people, and neglecting the inequalities and injustices in countries in the north. For many women and girls, life has never been better, with huge strides towards gender equality in education, health, and participation in political, social and economic life since the 1990's, although there is still a considerable road to go (World

Economic Forum 2013). In the USA and UK, although it remains difficult for women who are victims of rape or other sexual assault to have these crimes investigated, prosecuted, and perpetrators punished, feminist activism has led to legislative change, provision of domestic violence shelters and rape crisis centres. Pinker claims that the world today 'is blessed by unprecedented levels of peaceful coexistence' (Pinker 2011: xix). Could it be that, as women become more central to the political, social and economic stage, there is a shift away from militaristic, 'masculinised' norms towards more democratic, 'feminised' norms? Perhaps we should not be so quick to dismiss the 'civilising' dimensions of modernity, which include the influence of movements for the rights of women, children and other marginalised groups. We might allow the possibility that feminism has had a positive influence on gender regimes, perhaps leading to reductions in gender violence through shifting attitudes, changing inequitable norms and improving institutional practices for violence prevention and response.

Given the multidimensionality of our definition of gender violence, it appears to us that both processes may be happening simultaneously. Thus failures to address entrenched inequalities and forms of poverty within and between countries may continue to perpetuate gender violence while, at the same time, the education, peace and tolerance dividend will deliver improved quality of life with reduced threats of violence for those who live in particular locales. An important aspect of global policy-making with regard to gender and education is to try to ensure that the benefits for the few are extended to the many. This point is brought into sharp focus when we consider gender violence in zones of war and conflict.

Gender and youth in war and conflict

War and armed conflicts associated with insurrections, revolutions, terrorism and crime are a key index of conflict, and gender is very often deployed in inciting support for and sustaining armed conflict (Enloe 2000; Al-Ali and Pratt 2009). Poverty and inequalities often form part of the rationale for armed conflicts. Since the end of the Cold War, there has been a general decline in global armed conflict, but this has been much more marked in richer countries. There have been protracted smaller scale and more diverse conflicts in some of the poorest regions, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa and Central and South Asia, as well as in the Middle East (Lacina and Gleditsch 2005; Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development 2012).

War and conflict are highly gendered, with men, women, boys and girls affected differently by fragility and conflict. Men, who make up the majority of soldiers and those taking an active combat role, are more likely to suffer from direct violence, injury and killing through combat. Women do serve in some armies, but not always on the front line. In addition a key feature of armed conflict from the end of the 19th century has been the extension of the field of combat to include civilian populations. Feminist activism has resulted in key UN Resolutions (1325 and 1820 - see table 2.1) that recognise the extent of systematic rape and sexual violence and sexual exploitation as well as women's involvement in conflict resolution and peace-building. As Graca Machel's seminal work documented, rape can be used to torture, humiliate and terrorise the enemy (Machel 1996). Men and boys too suffer from sexual violence in war and conflict, though the evidence on this is sparse, in part because disclosure risks further shame of humiliation and emasculation (Trenholm et al. 2013).

The gendered effects of conflicts do not end with a cessation of armed attacks. In fragile states, weak public services, lack of access to justice and physical insecurity affect women, and particularly poor women, disproportionately. In the aftermath of conflict, violence and sexual assault against girls has been found to persist in and around schools (McKay 2004; Sharkey 2008). A study of refugee camps in Guinea and Sierra Leone, for example, found that girls were exploited for sex by humanitarian workers and teachers and that, although employing classroom assistants offered some protection, these assistants tended to reinforce rather than challenge unequal gender norms (Kirk, 2007). Further, a number of studies attest to the deprivations refugees experience, even in the richest countries (Pinson, Arnot and Candappa 2010; Hyndman and Giles 2011).

Overwhelmingly it is and always has been men who commit most acts of violence. Social scientists have struggled to account for this 'truth' without resorting to essentialising biological explanations about male aggression or testosterone levels. Raewyn Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity has generated a rich scholarship which goes some way to explain the association of masculinity and violence. Connell conceives hegemonic masculinity to be 'the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women' (Connell 1995: 77). While there has been a lack of conceptual clarity about whether hegemonic masculinities describe norms, aspirations or ideals (Hearn 2012), and while features vary from context to context, there tends to be a confluence around particular constellations of characteristics, including 'heterosexuality, toughness, power and authority, competitiveness and the subordination of gay men' (Frosh, Phoenix and Pattman 2002: 76). Within this framing, violence may be a strategy to maintain the gender order and, while not all men practise violence, the fact that some men do enables men in general to 'reap the patriarchal dividend', often leading to complicity.

In an attempt to theorise the link between violence and masculinity, Henrietta Moore argues that hegemonic masculinities are idealised discourses, invested with fantasies of power and agency, and that the failure to sustain or achieve subject positions in the dominant gender discourse can generate a crisis of identity: 'the inability to maintain the fantasy of power triggers a crisis in the fantasy of identity and violence is a means of resolving this crisis because it acts to reconfirm the nature of a masculinity otherwise denied' (Moore 1994: 154). In other words, violence may both be performative, projecting an idealised masculine identity of control over women and weaker, or feminised men, and it may arise from frustration or thwarting at the impossibility of attaining the ideal.

The scholarship on war, gender and the difficulties of peace building (Cockburn 1996; Jacobs, Jacobson and Marchbank 2000) illustrates the importance of using multi-dimensional concepts to think about gender in relation to why particular forms of violence are incited. Narratives of women and girls about their wartime experiences illuminate how the reverberations extend far beyond the explosive moments of violence. For example, in an ethnographic study in the highlands of Peru with communities affected by the armed conflict of the 1980s and 90s, women spoke sometimes about rape and sexual violations, but more often about how they suffered legal and socio-economic injustice and ethnic discrimination (Theidon 2007). In the aftermath of conflicts, women's experiences of war may be silenced or distorted. In Rwanda, for example,

the government project of re-building the nation post-genocide has led to the creation of forms of cultural memory that remember the dead but fail to recognise the experiences of vast numbers of women survivors' of violence – both as victims and perpetrators (Burnet 2012; Andrews 2013).

However, there are studies that reveal women's memories of war, and how conflict can be both destructive and transformatory for young women. Joanne de Berry's study of young women living in settlement camps during the war in Uganda documents their horrific experiences of rape and sexual abuse by soldiers, often resulting in pregnancy, the threat of HIV/AIDS, and depression and anxiety (de Berry 2004). Yet after the war, their liminal position as single mothers forced them to labour (often brewing beer and working on the land) which enabled them to maintain positions of comparative social and economic advantage, and relative autonomy in a traditionally patriarchal context. In another study, women recalling their engagement as members of the female detachment of FRELIMO in the military conflict in Mozambique in the 1960s, recalled how the socialist ideology of the insurgency had invited them to overturn gender- and age-based hierarchies (West 2005). In retrospect, this time was viewed as a 'golden age', while the post-independence period was viewed with resentment and disappointment, as FRELIMOs commitment to gender equality flagged. Atreyee Sen's study of women in India traces how joining the aggressive right wing Shiv Sena movement derived from harsh socio-economic conditions combined with displacement and alienation, as well as sexual exploitation in the jobs they took following migration to Bombay slums. In a context where girls and women were expected to be gentle and compliant, for these women, although violence transgressed gender boundaries, they viewed it as functional since it enabled them to gain a sense of control and solidarity in their lives (Sen 2006: 8).

These studies show how war and conflict may sometimes expand women's autonomy, increasing their mobility, resources and leadership opportunities, and disrupting social codes and gender regimes. The material changes to their lives can enable women to recognise inequalities and injustices previously taken for granted through processes of symbolic violence, and to realise their own resourcefulness and resilience. But often these disruptions are momentary, and multiple political, social, cultural and economic forces combine in working against long term transformations. Education seems to have the potential to support these struggles against intersecting inequalities, but there is little evidence of this happening. Indeed some writers have argued that a global tendency to merge security and development is leading to resources re-directed towards the military and away from areas like education, thus deflecting attention away from the structural inequalities at the root of conflict (Novelli 2013). Since Dakar (see Table 2.1) and the growing awareness that at least half of children out of school live in conflict affected areas, there has been increasing emphasis on provision of education in emergencies and education for peace building; however, inequalities, including gender, are frequently not taken on board in programming (UNICEF 2010; UNESCO 2011; Corrie 2013).

Girlhood, masculinity, modernity and risk

The evident forms of violence implicated in armed conflicts and their aftermath highlight extreme conditions. However, more taken for granted forms of inequality are persistent features of experiences of everyday violence, with its mixture of the structural and the symbolic, under conditions of modernity and risk. Indeed, it may be that the very conditions that help fuel

modernity and market liberalisation, such as physical, financial and social mobility, entrepreneurialism, risk and the power of symbols, often associated with gendered bodies conferred by ICT, both erode some forms of inequality and entrench others. A number of writers have argued that increasing economic insecurity, inequalities and destabilisation of gender norms that sustain male privilege combine to make the attainment of hegemonic masculine ideals even more impossible, increasing the potential for violence (Wilkinson and Pickett 2010; Decoteau 2013). Indeed, some of the insights regarding the connection between the ideal and the real noted in the debate about hegemonic masculinities discussed above, may be useful in explaining the ways in which particular configurations of gender are evident in forms of violence associated with inequalities in the global north and south.

Recent sociological studies of girlhood in the global north have traced some of the dilemmas faced by girls today, bombarded as they are by mixed messages about what it means to be a girl. Judith Butler's theory of gender performativity has informed much of this work, generating rich insights into how masculine and feminine identities become 'fixed' through repeated acts (Butler 1990). According to Butler, the fragility of gender categories is revealed by the forms of violence, denigration and exclusion that are used to 'police' those who transgress gender codes. Other writers have stressed how the erosion of structures of class, community and family in 'risk societies' and the shift towards reflexive individualism can create uncertainty, anxiety and risk for young people constructing identities (Mitchell, Bunton and Green 2004). New technology can aggravate these anxieties, as illustrated in UK studies, in which a third of 11-16 year olds admitted that they had been targeted, threatened or humiliated through cyberbullying (Livingstone and Palmer 2012), and one in six girls reported having been forced to have sex by their boyfriends, with mobile phones and the internet used by boys to humiliate and threaten girlfriends (Barter, McCarry, Berridge and Evans 2009). 'Sexting', in which young people exchange sexual messages and images through mobile phones and the internet, is increasingly commonplace and, in a context where consumer oriented, popular culture sexualises female bodies, often young people, and particularly girls, feel pressurised to engage in these practices (Ringrose, Gill, Livingstone and Harvey 2012).

Alongside this body of work which stresses girls' increasing vulnerability is another strand that views girls as becoming increasingly violent in contemporary societies. McRobbie (2009) asserts that shifting technologies associated with fashion and beauty, education and work, sexuality and reproduction, and commercialism are producing new femininities, resulting in, for example the 'phallic girl', who mimics masculine norms, like swearing, drinking and fighting. Other studies lend some support to the notion that girls in the UK are increasingly adopting masculine practices, but see this not as mimicry but as a form of resistance or rupture (Renold and Ringrose 2010). Girls are expected to display contradictory characteristics, including hyper-feminine embodiments as nice, nurturing, passive and sexually desirable as well as those ascribed to masculinity (rational, competitive, sexually assertive). These contradictory characteristics were clearly evident in an account given by Lauren, a 15 year old girl who participated in a study of risk in a gang affected neighbourhood in London. Her frequent movement between glamorous femininity embodied in the piercings on her face and elaborately crafted hairstyles, together with frequent violent conflicts that had resulted in exclusion from school were summed up in her self-description: **'**Put it this way, I'm a fighter, that's how I am. I take out my piercings and I fight' (Parkes and Conolly 2011). While for many girls movement between these contradictory subject positions may be managed successfully, for Lauren, and for the working class, urban girls on the

fringes of school exclusion in another London based study, these moves could bring them into conflict with school authorities and with their families (Archer, Hollingworth and Mendick 2010). Indeed, Archer, Hollingworth and Mendick argue that these findings challenge claims of the erosion of social structures, but that the effects of social class, gender and ethnicity/race are becoming more obscure, hidden within a discourse of individualism in a meritocratic society.

At the same time, claims about increasing levels of female violence are frequently exaggerated, with young women accounting for a tiny amount of violent crime in the UK (Youth Justice Board 2009). A number of studies reveal that girls' reasons for committing crime and violence are far more complex than a straightforward mimicking of boys' aggression, including histories of physical, sexual and emotional abuse, of self-harm and drug abuse, and of coercive sexual relationships in which they may be expected to carry weapons or drugs for their boyfriends (Burman, Brown and Batchelor 2003; ROTA 2010).

Studies with boys in schools have illustrated the processes through which hierarchies of masculinity are struggled over. Emma Renold traced how boys in UK primary schools attempted to demonstrate 'doing tough, being hard', through games that involved physical power, domination and endurance (Renold 2005). Studies in schools have examined how violence sustains masculine privilege through disciplinary systems, misogynist acts towards female pupils and teachers, and through boys denigrating male peers who transgress gender codes (Mills 2012). A number of studies have examined how homophobic practices in school are central to the constitution of heterosexual masculinity for boys (Frosh, Phoenix and Pattman 2002; Davies and McInnes 2012). The fragile, conflicted subject positions of boys and the elusiveness of hegemonic masculine ideals may produce violence, as the borders of 'acceptable' heterosexuality are policed in classrooms and playgrounds (Phoenix, Frosh and Pattman 2003). Some boys, however, refuse to take up the denigrated identities ascribed to them, remaking their own identities in a way which defies the heterosexual matrix (Youdell 2004).

While these studies help to show how violent practices are learned in schools and how they may become inscribed in masculine subjectivities, studies drawing on postcolonial gender theory have been particularly effective in illuminating how the contours of violent masculinities may change over time and place. For example, Robert Morrell's ethnography of a white boarding school in Natal, South Africa, traced how colonialism, gender order, racial hierarchies and black resistance influenced punishment practices and the formation of masculinities that oppress women and subordinated men (Morrell 1998). A further school-based ethnography examined the violent practices of young 'tsotsi boys' in an economically deprived school in Durban, showing how oppositional street masculinities became hegemonic, fuelled by competition for food, and enacted through misogyny, jostling for power between boys, and denigrating weaker 'yimvu' boys (Bhana 2005). These analyses reveal how masculinities are shaped by colonial histories, conflictual transitions, and modernising processes.

A further strand of research has focused on the self-destructive dimensions of contemporary youth masculinities. Globally, fuelled by the commercial interests of the tobacco and alcohol industries, men face greater health burdens than women because of masculinity norms that involve risk-taking, including consumption of alcohol, smoking, unsafe sex, driving injuries and violence (Hawkes and Buse 2013). Much of the work on masculinity and risk focuses on how precarious socio-economic conditions create uncertainty and insecurity for young men (Barker 2005; Connell 2008). In the USA, for example, Philippe Bourgois studied Puerto-Rican young

men in crack joints in an East Harlem barrio, for whom crack dealing, and associated violence, offered 'respect' in a context where legitimate opportunities were denied, in part through institutionalised racism. He describes hearing graphic accounts of rapes by those he had befriended during his field work: 'ultimately the violence against women […] reflected itself back on a sense of internalised worthlessness that the misogyny of their frustrated patriarchal dreams was not able to placate' (Bourgois 2004b: 346).

In the UK, John Pitts traces the proliferation of gangs from the end of the 20th century to a political economy which created neighbourhoods of acute deprivation and crime (Pitts 2008: 7). While gang crime has been influenced by the global drugs trade, Jamaican 'yardies', and Americanisation of popular youth culture, for most young men who join gangs, he argues that popular culture is much less influential than socio-cultural factors. And for many young men, whom he terms 'reluctant gangsters', joining gangs is a way to try to keep themselves safe in a highly dangerous situation. Similarly, studies of young people living in gang affected neighbourhoods in the UK and in South Africa identified a complex range of emotions influencing boys' risk engagements (Parkes 2007; Parkes and Conolly 2013). Boys were both attracted to the hegemonic ideals of toughness, control and affluence displayed by gang members, and critical of their extreme violent practices. Boys in London spoke of how they felt it necessary to fight back if attacked with a knife, because they perceived humiliation by their peers if they were seen to display signs of cowardice as a greater risk to their identities (Parkes and Conolly 2013). Negotiating masculinities for boys growing up in communities blighted by high levels of gang crime and unemployment can be fraught, with violence of the neighbourhood reverberating in peer relationships in school.

Transforming forms of violence and gender associated with hyper-modernities requires multi-layered engagements with young people, and with the institutions – schools, media and technology, commerce and advertising – that foster these paradoxical youth subjectivities. Education may have an important role in bringing into view the continuing political, social and economic divisions and inequalities that are obscured in consumerist, individualistic cultures, so that girls and boys are able to reflect on processes of subjectification and the configurations of gender that produce everyday violence.

Conclusion

These examples indicate a complex set of relations in which, depending on particular social relations, locations and conditions of conflict or post conflict, some forms of violence are increasing and others, decreasing. Sometimes the structural features of violence are particularly salient, sometimes its symbolic features are more evident, and sometimes both are apparent. Poverty construed as a line, a trap or as fuel and violence are implicated with each other and, as we have shown, may be read both as an effect and a cause of reproducing vertical and horizontal inequalities. These in turn support structural and symbolic manifestations of oppression.

 However, detailed contextualization of these processes shows up the many different forms of violence and poverty associated with gender inequalities. In our view, it is a mistake therefore to think about direct, simple causal links between gender, poverty and violence. To do this directs analysis towards a single meaning of poverty, possibly based on income, or a single form of

violence, say a physical act, and a single notion of gender implicating men or women. As we have shown, gender, poverty and violence are multidimensional, dynamic and associational in more complex ways. For example, particular networks of relationships, like horizontal and vertical inequalities and hegemonic masculinities are nested in each other. Clusters of structural and symbolic violence tend to be seen together under particular kinds of conditions.

This more detailed form of associational mapping of relationships appears to us a crucial accompaniment to work on the ways in which formal and informal education can be used to undo the structural and symbolic manifestations of violence by offering alternative explanations and enactments of different social relationships. Some schools and educational encounters reproduce the rage and exclusion documented in work on gender, poverty and violence. But education is also a key component of efforts at peace building, reforming gender relationships, and reducing inequalities. In order for this process to be more effective the details of the multi-dimensional associational relationships entailed in poverty, gender inequality and violence need to be better understood.

Thus gender violence is structural and symbolic, derived from and implicated in vertical and horizontal inequalities and associated forms of exclusion and oppression, and the many different ways in which poverty can be understood. In seeking to document its features and bring about the social change that can transform both the deep forces that maintain gender violence and the particular acts which are its most evident form, education projects and programmes need to work on many levels and with many partners. There is much to understand in order to effect the change so movingly invoked in Seamus Heany's poem as the moment when 'hope and history rhyme'[4].

---

[1] The Spirit Level draws on statistical evidence to claim that more unequal states suffer from a range of social and health problems, including higher levels of crime and violence, concluding that all would benefit from more egalitarian distribution of income. Critical discussion includes Saunders (2010)who comments they draw selectively from data on homicides in the USA, with no evidence from low income countries. Other responses make the point that reporting crime is not the same as levels of crime, thus there are methodological problems with the approach.

[2] For example in programmes in South Africa working with boys through sport to examine the consequences of violence, if a boy, practising ball control, kicks a ball into a cone, he personally has to do 20 press-ups. In another moment in the programme where his action has negative consequences for the team they all have to do press-ups (Dringus 2013). This kind of programme aims to change personal behaviour by indicating the consequences for individuals and groups.

[3] All three are notable for leading struggles that opposed violence and inequality based on race or caste. While these leaders did not themselves articulate a politics that directly challenged gender inequalities, women were prominent members of their movements, and in the process began to articulate ideas about how gender intersected with other inequalities.

[4] From '*The Cure at Troy: A Version of Sophocles' Philoctetes'* by Seamus Heaney (1991)
" History says, don't hope
On this side of the grave.
But then, once in a lifetime

The longed-for tidal wave
Of justice can rise up,
And hope and history rhyme."

References

Al-Ali, N. and Pratt, N. (2009), *What kind of Liberation? Women and the Occupation in Iraq*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Andrews, K. (2013), *Fragmented memories: Women, experience and place in Rwanda's genocide memorialisation.* Unpublished MA thesis, Institute of Education, London.

Archer, L., Hollingworth, S. and Mendick, H. (2010), *Urban Youth and Schooling*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Barker, G. (2005), *Dying to be Men: Youth, Masculinity and Social Exclusion*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Barter, C., McCarry, M., Berridge, D. and Evans, K. (2009), *Partner Exploitation and Violence in Teenage Intimate Relationships*.

Bhana, D. (2005), 'Violence and the gendered negotiation of young masculinities in South African schools'. In R. Morrell and L. Ouzgane (eds), *African Masculinities* (pp. 205-220). New York: Palgrave.

Bourgois, P. (2004a), 'The continuum of violence in war and peace: Post-Cold war lessons from El Salvador'. In N. Scheper-Hughes and P. Bourgois (eds), *Violence in War and Peace: An Anthology* (pp. 425-434). Oxford: Blackwell.

Bourgois, P. (2004b), 'The everyday violence of gang rape'. In N. Scheper-Hughes and P. Bourgois (eds), *Violence in War and Peace: An Anthology* (pp. 343-347). Oxford: Blackwell.

Burman, M., Brown, J. and Batchelor, S. (2003), "Taking it to heart': girls and the meanings of violence'. In E. Stanko (ed.), *The Meanings of Violence* (pp. 71-89). London: Routledge.

Burnet, J. (2012), *Genocide Lives in Us: Women, Memory and Silence in Rwanda*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble*. New York: Routledge.

Cockburn, C. (1996), *The Space Between Us: Negotiating Gender and National Identities in Conflict*. London: Zed Books.

Connell, R. (2008), 'A Thousand Miles from Kind: Men, Masculinities and Modern Institutions'. *The Journal of Men's Studies,* 16 (3)*,* 237-252.

Connell, R. (1995), *Masculinities*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Corrie, L. (2013), 'Designing a gender module for teachers working in emergency contexts'. Unpublished MA dissertation, Institute of Education, London.

Davies, C. and McInnes, D. (2012), 'Speaking violence: homophobia and the production of injurious speech in schooling cultures'. In S. Saltmarsh, K. Robinson and C. Davies (eds), *Rethinking School Violence: Theory, Gender, Context* (pp. 131-148). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Davies, J., Sandstrom, S., Shorrocks, A. and Wolff, E. (2006), ' The World Distribution of Household Wealth '. [Online]*,* Last accessed 13 January 2014.

de Berry, J. (2004), 'Sexual vulnerability of adolescent girls during civil war in Teso, Uganda'. In J. Boyden and J. de Berry (eds), *Children and Youth on the Front Line: Ethnography, Armed Conflict and Displacement* (pp. 45-62). Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Decoteau, C. L. (2013), 'The Crisis of Liberation: Masculinity, Neoliberalism, and HIV/AIDS in Postapartheid South Africa'. *Men and Masculinities,* 16 (2)*,* 139-159

Dringus, S. (2013) Process evaluation and qualitative impact assessment of a sports-based HIV prevention intervention in South African high schools (unpublished report).

Elias, N. (1994), *The Civilizing Process*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Enloe, C. (2000), *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Frosh, S., Phoenix, A. and Pattman, R. (2002), *Young Masculinities*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Garcia-Moreno, C., Jansen, H., Ellsberg, M., Heise, L. and Watts, C. (2006), 'Prevalence of intimate partner violence: findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence'. *The Lancet* 368*,* 1260-69.

Hawkes, S. and Buse, K. (2013), 'Gender and global health: evidence, policy, and inconvenient truths'. *The Lancet* (381)*,* 1783-87.

Hearn, J. (2012), 'A multi-faceted power analysis of men's violence to known women: from hegemonic masculinity to the hegemony of men'. *The Sociological Review,* 60*,* 589-610.

Hyndman, J. and Giles, W. (2011), 'Waiting for What? The Feminization of Refugees in Protracted Situations'. *Gender, Place and Culture,* 18 (3)*,* 361-379.

Jacobs, S., Jacobson, R. and Marchbank, J. (2000), *States of Conflict: Gender, Violence and Resistance*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Jones, N., Moore, K., Villar-Marquez, E. and Broadbent, E. (2008), *Painful Lessons: The Politics of Preventing Sexual Violence and Bullying at School, Working Paper 295*. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Kirk, J. (2007), 'Gender-based violence in and around schools in conflict and humanitarian contexts'. In G. Terry and J. Hoare (eds), *Gender-Based Violence* (pp. 121-132). Oxford: Oxfam.

Kleinman, A. (2000), 'The violences of everyday life: the multiple forms and dynamics of social violence'. In V. Das, A. Kleinman, M. Ramphele and P. Reynolds (eds), *Violence and Subjectivity* (pp. 226-241). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lacina, B. and Gleditsch, N. (2005), 'Monitoring Trends in Global Combat: A New Dataset of Battle Deaths'. *European Journal of Population* 21*,* 145-166.

Leach, F., Dunne, M. and Salvi, F. (2014), *School-Related Gender-Based Violence: A global review of current issues and approaches in policy, programming and implementation responses to School-Related Gender-Based Violence (SRGBV) for the Education Sector*. Paris: UNESCO Education Sector.

Livingstone, S. and Palmer, T. (2012), *Identifying vulnerable children online and what strategies can help them*. London: UK Safer Internet Centre.

Machel, G. (1996), *Impact of Armed Conflict on Children*. New York: United Nations, UNICEF.

McKay, S. (2004), 'Reconstructing fragile lives: Girls' social reintegration in northern Uganda and Sierra Leone '. *Gender and Development,* 12 (3)*,* 19-30.

McRobbie, A. (2009), *The Aftermath of Feminism: Gender, Culture and Social Change. .* London: Sage.

Mills, M. (2012), 'Schools, violence, masculinities and privilege'. In S. Saltmarsh, K. Robinson and C. Davies (eds), *Rethinking School Violence: Theory, Gender, Context* (pp. 94-110). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Mitchell, W., Bunton, R. and Green, E. (eds) (2004), *Young People, Risk and Leisure: Constructing identities in everyday life*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Moore, H. (1994), 'The problem of explaining violence in the social sciences'. In P. Harvey and P. Gow (eds), *Sex and Violence: Issues in Representation and Experience*. (pp. 138-55) London: Routledge.

Morrell, R. (1998), 'Of boys and men: masculinity and gender in South African studies'. *Journal of South African Studies,* 24 (4)*,* 605-630.

Novelli, M. (2013), 'The merging of security and development in the education sector: Discourses, programmes and effects'. *Educação & Sociedade* 43 (123)*,* 345-370.

OECD (2012), *Fragile states 2013: Resource flows and trends in a shifting world*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Parkes, J. (2007), 'Resisting the magnet: A study of South African children's engagements with neighbourhood violence'. In R. Stevenson and G. Cox (eds), *Violence*. Amityville, NY: Baywood.

Parkes, J. and Conolly, A. (2011), Young people and neighbourhood risk project: the girls' perspectives, *Negotiating risk: Gender, youth and urban neighbourhoods*. Institute of Education.

Parkes, J. and Conolly, A. (2013), 'Dangerous Encounters? Boys' peer dynamics and neighbourhood risk'. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education,* 34 (1)*,* 94-106.

Phoenix, A., Frosh, S. and Pattman, R. (2003), 'Producing contradictory masculine subject positions: narratives of threat, homophobia and bullying in 11-14 year old boys'. *Journal of Social Issues,* 59 (1)*,* 179-195.

Pinker, S. (2011), *The Better Angels of Our Nature*. London: Penguin.

Pinson, H., Arnot, M. and Candappa, M. (2010), *Education, Asylum and the 'Non-Citizen' Child: The Politics of Compassion and Belonging* London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Pitts, J. (2008), *Reluctant Gangsters: The changing face of youth crime*. Cullompton, Devon: Willan Publishing.

Renold, E. (2005), *Girls, Boys and Junior Sexualities: Exploring children's gender and sexual relations in the primary school*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Renold, E. and Ringrose, J. (2010), 'Phallic girls?: Girls' negotiating phallogecentric power '. In N. Rodriguez and J. Landreau (eds), *Queer Masculinities: A Critical Reader in Education*. New York: Springer Publishing.

Ringrose, J., Gill, R., Livingstone, S. and Harvey, L. (2012), *A qualitative study of children, young people and 'sexting': a report prepared for the NSPCC*. London: National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.

ROTA. (2010), *Female voice in violence project: A study into the impact of serious youth and gang violence on women and girls*. London: Race on the Agenda (ROTA).

Saunders, P. (2010), *Beware false prophets: Equality, the good society and The Spirit Level*. London The Policy Exchange.

Sen, A. (2006). 'Reflecting on resistance: Hindu women 'soldiers' and the birth of female militancy.' *Indian Journal of Gender Studies,* 13(1), 1-36.

Sharkey, D. (2008), 'Contradictions in girls' education in a post-conflict setting'. *Compare,* 38 (5)*,* 569-579.

Stewart, F. (2002), *Horizontal Inequalities: A Neglected Dimension of Development*. QEH Working Paper Series 81: Oxford.

Stewart, F. (2008), *Horizontal Inequalities and Conflict: Understanding Group Violence in Multethnic Societies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stewart, F. (2009), *A Global View of Horizontal Inequalities: Inequalities experienced by Muslims worldwide*: MICROCON Research Working Paper 13, Brighton, MICROCON

Theidon, K. (2007), 'Gender in Transition: Common Sense, Women,and War'. *Journal of Human Rights,* 6*,* 453-478.

Trenholm, J., Olsson, P., Blomqvist, M. and Ahlberg, B. (2013), 'Constructing Soldiers from Boys in Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo'. *Men and Masculinities,* 16 (2)*,* 203-227.

UN. (2011), *Five Years On: A global update on violence against children. Report from the NGO Advisory Council for follow-up to the UN Secretary-General's Study on Violence Against Children*. New York: United Nations.

UNESCO. (2011), *The Hidden Crisis: Armed conflict and Education. Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2011*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNICEF. (2010), *Progress Evaluation of the UNICEF education in emergencies and post-crisis transition programme*

Unterhalter, E. (2012). ' Poverty, education, gender and the Millennium Development Goals: Reflections on boundaries and intersectionality', *Theory and Research in Education, Vol. 10*(3): 253-274.

Unterhalter, E., North, A., and Parkes, J. (2010) *Gender Equality and Women and Girls' Education, 1995-2010: How much is there a space for hope?,* Paris: UNESCO

Vyas, S. and Watts, C. (2009), 'How does economic empowerment affect women's risk of intimate partner violence in low and middle income countries? A systematic review of published evidence'. *Journal of International Development,* 21 (5)*,* 577-602.

Walby, S. (2013), 'Violence and society: Introduction to an emerging field of sociology'. *Current Sociology,* 61 (2)*,* 95-111.

West, H. (2005), 'Girls with Guns: Narrating the Experience of War of FRELIMO's 'Female Detachment''. In J. Boyden and J. de Berry (eds), *Children and Youth on the Front Line* (pp. 105-129). Oxford: Berghahn.

WHO (World Health Organisation), Department of Reproductive Health and Research, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine and South African Medical Research Council. (2013), *Global and regional estimates of violence against women: Prevalence and health effects of intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence*.

Wilkinson, R. and Pickett, K. (2010), *The Spirit Level: Why equality is better for everyone*. London: Penguin.

World Economic Forum. (2013), 'The Global Gender Gap Report 2013'. Online http://www.weforum.org/reports/global-gender-gap-report-2013 (accessed 14 January 2014).