



Carol Hagemann-White
Liz Kelly
Thomas Meysen (eds.)

Interventions Against Child Abuse and Violence Against Women

Ethics and culture in practice and policy

Cultural Encounters in
Intervention Against Violence, Vol I

Verlag Barbara Budrich



Interventions Against Child Abuse and Violence Against Women

Cultural Encounters in Intervention Against Violence, Vol. 1

Carol Hagemann-White
Liz Kelly
Thomas Meysen (eds.)

Interventions Against Child Abuse and Violence Against Women

Ethics and culture in practice and policy

Verlag Barbara Budrich
Opladen • Berlin • Toronto 2019

This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 291827. The project CEINAV was financially supported by the HERA Joint Research Programme (www.heranet.info) which is co-funded by AHRC, AKA, BMBF via PT-DLR, DASTI, ETAG, FCT, FNR, FNRS, FWF, FWO, HAZU, IRC, LMT, MHEST, NWO, NCN, RANNÍS, RCN, VR and The European Community FP7 2007-2013, under the Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities programme.



HERA
Humanities in the European Research Area

© 2019 This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 (CC-BY-SA 4.0)

It permits use, duplication, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you share under the same license, give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

© 2019 Dieses Werk ist beim Verlag Barbara Budrich GmbH erschienen und steht unter der Creative Commons Lizenz Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0): <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

Diese Lizenz erlaubt die Verbreitung, Speicherung, Vervielfältigung und Bearbeitung bei Verwendung der gleichen CC-BY-SA 4.0-Lizenz und unter Angabe der UrheberInnen, Rechte, Änderungen und verwendeten Lizenz.



This book is available as a free download from www.barbara-budrich.net (<https://doi.org/10.3224/84742047>). A paperback version is available at a charge. The page numbers of the open access edition correspond with the paperback edition.

ISBN 978-3-8474-2047-7

eISBN 978-3-8474-1029-4

DOI 10.3224/84742047

Verlag Barbara Budrich GmbH
Stauffenbergstr. 7. D-51379 Leverkusen Opladen, Germany

86 Delma Drive. Toronto, ON M8W 4P6 Canada
www.barbara-budrich.net

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from
Die Deutsche Bibliothek (The German Library) (<http://dnb.d-nb.de>)

Jacket illustration by Bettina Lehfeldt, Germany – www.lehfeldtgraphic.de

Typesetting: Bernd Burkart, Weinstadt-Baach

Picture credits: Photo: Original_R_K_by_Wolfgang Dirscherl_pixelio.de

Printed in Europe on acid-free paper by paper & tinta, Warschau

Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Preface | 7 |
| <i>Carol Hagemann-White, Thomas Meysen & Liz Kelly</i> | |
| SECTION ONE | |
| APPROACHING INTERVENTION: THE ARENA | 11 |
| Crafting methodology for an innovative project | 13 |
| <i>Liz Kelly & Carol Hagemann-White</i> | |
| Theorising complex inequalities to meet the challenges of intervention against violence | 28 |
| <i>Vlasta Jalušič</i> | |
| Foundations in ethical theory to guide intervention against gender-based and intergenerational violence | 49 |
| <i>Carol Hagemann-White</i> | |
| SECTION TWO | |
| UNDERSTANDING THE FRAMEWORKS THAT SHAPE INTERVENTION | 75 |
| Information, Intervention, and Assessment – Frameworks of child physical abuse and neglect interventions in four countries | 77 |
| <i>Thomas Meysen</i> | |
| Redress, Rights, and Responsibilities – Institutional Frameworks of Domestic Violence Intervention in Four Countries | 87 |
| <i>Carol Hagemann-White</i> | |
| Trafficking for sexual exploitation and the challenges of intervention: the price of human rights | 104 |
| <i>Jackie Turner</i> | |

| | |
|---|-----|
| SECTION THREE | |
| KEY ISSUES IN INTERVENTION | 119 |
| The contested concept of culture: encounters in policy and practice on violence and abuse | 121 |
| <i>Liz Kelly, Maria José Magalhães, Thomas Meysen & Maria Garner</i> | |
| Protection and Self-Determination | 134 |
| <i>Thomas Meysen & Bianca Grafe</i> | |
| The responsabilisation of women who experience domestic violence: a case study from England and Wales | 151 |
| <i>Maddy Coy & Liz Kelly</i> | |
| Empowerment and intervention: perspectives of survivors and professionals | 164 |
| <i>Maria José Magalhães, Jackie Turner & Carol Hagemann-White</i> | |
| SECTION FOUR | |
| REFLECTIONS | 187 |
| Intervention cultures: gender, family, and the state in responses to violence | 189 |
| <i>Carol Hagemann-White & Thomas Meysen</i> | |
| Working with voice in research | 208 |
| <i>Bianca Grafe</i> | |
| Making visible: employing art in researching intervention against violence | 232 |
| <i>Vlasta Jalušić, Lana Zdravković & Raquel Felgueiras</i> | |
| Reading ethics into interventions against violence | 254 |
| <i>Liz Kelly & Thomas Meysen</i> | |
| Transnational Foundations for Ethical Practice in Interventions Against Violence Against Women and Child Abuse | 256 |
| <i>Liz Kelly & Thomas Meysen</i> | |
| <i>Carol Hagemann-White, Vlasta Jalušić & Maria José Magalhães</i> | |
| Authors | 269 |
| Subject index | 272 |
| Author index | 278 |

Chapter 1

Preface

Carol Hagemann-White¹, Thomas Meysen² & Liz Kelly³

¹ University of Osnabrück, Germany

² SOCLEs International Centre for Socio-Legal Studies, Heidelberg, Germany

³ Child and Woman Abuse Studies Unit, London Metropolitan University, United Kingdom

The research project “Cultural Encounters in Intervention Against Violence (CEINAV)”¹ listened to the voices of professionals and of victim-survivors in four countries – England & Wales, Germany, Portugal and Slovenia. Collaborating across disciplines and in cooperation with practitioners for three years, from September 2013 until November 2016, we sought a deeper understanding of how and why different professionals intervene and how intervention is experienced when women are confronting intimate partner violence, trafficking for sexual exploitation or physical child abuse and neglect. Within the frame of Humanities in the European Research Area (HERA) and the overarching programme of Cultural Encounters, CEINAV took a dual approach. We aimed for a deeper understanding how the diverse legal-organisational frameworks as well as the socio-cultural backgrounds affect practices of intervention, and we reflected how belonging to a majority or minority group or being seen as such plays out on the level of intervention practice. The research crafted an empirical methodology as well as a theoretical foundation that would make comparative analysis possible. We built on previous collaborative research which explored the legal and philosophical foundations for interventions in Europe. Some of the findings were published during the course of the project as working papers (<http://tinyurl.com/ceinavproject>). A multilingual anthology of stories taken from the interviews with women and young people about their experiences with intervention appeared as Volume 2 of this series in 2017. The book was given an artistic design by the Porto team and is also available open access online².

This volume brings together some of the findings from, and reflections on, the project as a whole. The sections are organised to reflect the overlapping and multiply linked streams of work and thinking within the project. In the first section, “Approaching the arena”, Chapter 2 describes the methodology of the project and how it was developed to an-

¹ This project has received funding from the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 291827. The project CEINAV is financially supported by the HERA Joint Research Programme (www.heranet.info) which is co-funded by AHRC, AKA, BMBF via PT-DLR, DASTI, ETAG, FCT, FNR, FNRS, FWF, FWO, HAZU, IRC, LMT, MHEST, NWO, NCN, RANNÍS, RCN, VR and The European Community FP7 2007–2013, under the Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities programme.

² Hagemann-White, Carol & Bianca Grafe, eds. (2016): *Experiences of Intervention Against Violence. An Anthology of Stories*. Cultural Encounters in Intervention Against Violence, Vol. II. Opladen: Barbara Budrich Publishers.

swer the research questions. Particular attention was given to the challenge of in-depth qualitative methods that could uncover significant nuances of difference and their rationale, on the one hand, while devising an approach to data analysis that permitted comparative analysis on the other. Chapters 3 and 4 introduce the theoretical foundations for our lively debates and the multi-perspectivity of our discourses. Intersectional approaches, cultural differences, positional inequalities, and postcolonial foundations are discussed and linked to their relevance for understanding the challenges of intervention (chapter 3). A key premise of CEINAV was that, given the different legal and institutional systems, histories and cultural traditions in the four countries, the ethical issues emerging from narratives and the ethical dilemmas experienced by professionals would be at the core of a comparative analysis. Thus, Chapter 4 reviews ethical theories, seeking to identify which approaches have the potential to offer guidance for intervention against violence.

In section two: “Understanding the frameworks that shape intervention” three chapters describe the legal-organisational frameworks for intervention against child physical abuse and neglect (Chapter 5), domestic (or intimate partner) violence (Chapter 6), and trafficking for sexual exploitation (Chapter 7). These analyses are based on knowledge from country context papers written for each of the four countries as well as published research and documents, enriched by the picture of intervention pathways that emerged from focus groups in which different professionals identified their role and the conditions for their involvement in intervention.

Section three “Key issues in intervention” focuses on challenging issues that emerged from the empirical work in CEINAV. The research in the four countries was carried out in the four different languages, as was the initial data analysis. Both for the multi-professional focus groups and for the interviews with victim-survivors, analytical papers on each form of violence in each country were written and quotes were translated to English. The chapters in this section build on this foundation, linking the empirical results with national and international research and recent policy developments. Language and framings play a crucial role in debates about “culture” or “cultural backgrounds”. The different understandings and positions as emerged and discussed in the project team are reflected in light of the discussions in the 24 interdisciplinary focus groups with professionals in Chapter 8. Chapter 9 explores the tensions and complexities arising from the obligation to intervene in cases of interpersonal violence, and how protection can be balanced with the fundamental right to self-determination. Here the transnational comparison based on the CEINAV data reveals unexpected commonalities within and between the work in fields of the three forms of violence, as well as in the different countries. A range of diverging viewpoints on the ethical dilemmas that confront professionals when the bodily and social integrity of women, children, or parents is revealed.

A deeper ethical concern comes into view in Chapter 10, that takes a critical look at the concept of “reponsibilisation” and its implications for practice. The recognition of a state responsibility to end violence against women has recently, in particular in England and Wales, encountered policy shifts which move responsibility for safety back onto victim-survivors, often without ensuring the protection or external support that was previously understood as necessary. Chapter 11 can be read as a response to these and other challenges of intervention as it focuses on the concept of empowerment, generally regarded as the key orientation for intervention systems that aims to overcome gender- and generationally based violence. Drawing on both the views and practical strategies of professionals and the intervention experiences recounted by women and young people, this chapter seeks to describe with concrete examples how empowerment can be implemented or can fail.

Section four “Reflections” comprises three chapters that engage in different ways with what we learned from this multidisciplinary and multi-country research. Chapter 12 dis-

cusses approaches to understanding different institutional cultures in Europe and how these influence intervention practices. Chapter 13 unfolds with the quotes of professionals and of victim-survivors how their voices contributed to understanding the dilemmas of intervention. Chapter 14 describes how creative art was integrated into the empirical research process, reflects on what was achieved by this, and considers to what extent art and art creation can be fruitful resources for empirical research.

The book concludes with a synthesis of the understanding gained across four countries and three forms of violence: ethical foundations for respectful and responsible intervention. Chapter 15 introduces the reader to the process by which the CEINAV group arrived at transnational foundations for ethical practice. Developing such an empirically and theoretically grounded shared framework for ethical practice in interventions against violence against women and child abuse was a major goal of CEINAV (Chapter 16). It aims to offer an understanding of violence and of intervention growing from the knowledge gained in CEINAV, while respecting the diversity of contexts within which professionals in each country have to frame their decisions and actions.

The CEINAV project was collaborative from the planning stage up into the final report. It was enabled and enriched by the sustained engagement of the 12 associate partners, who met repeatedly with the researchers at key stages of the project, from the development of the methodology to interpretation of the data and reflective discussion of theoretical and ethical issues. All of the topics in this book were discussed in virtual and in person meetings of the research teams. The empirical research (including the creative art workshops) was carried out according to methodological guidelines agreed by all five partners, and both the in-country working papers and draft comparative analyses were circulated and revised after receiving comments. With the widely differing backgrounds of the five partners, this continuing and often very intense interchange was a highly productive form of peer review.

Through all stages of the project and in all five teams, there were younger researchers and research assistants who could not take on the responsibility for co-writing a book chapter after the funding of the project ended, but who nonetheless contributed significantly to the ideas, the analyses and the reflections in this book. The research teams are listed below.

- *England and Wales*: Madeleine Coy, Liz Kelly, Alya Khan, Iona Roisin, Nicola Sharp & Jackie Turner
- *Germany*: Janna Beckmann, Bianca Grafe, Carol Hagemann-White, Barbara Kavemann, Thomas Meysen & Ninette Rothmüller
- *Portugal*: Vera Inês Costa Silva, Rita de Oliveira Braga Lopez, Angelica Lima Cruz, Raquel Helena Louro Felgueiras, Maria José Magalhães & Clara Sottomayor
- *Slovenia*: Veronika Bajt, Vlasta Jalušič, Katarina Vucko & Lana Zdravkovic

The associate partners were:

England & Wales:

Imkaan, Sumanta Roy: www.imkaan.org.uk

Black Association of Women Step Out Ltd. (BAWSO), Mwenya Chimba: www.bawso.org.uk

Childrens' Services, London Borough of Hounslow, Janet Johnson and Emma Worthington; www.hounslow.gov.uk/info/20059/children_and_families%20

Germany:

Koordinierungskreis gegen Frauenhandel und Gewalt an Frauen im Migrationsprozess – KOK e. V., Eva Kueblbeck and Naile Tanis: www.kok-buero.de

Bundesverband Frauenberatungsstellen und Frauennotrufe, Frauen gegen Gewalt e. V., Dr. Ute Zillig, www.frauen-gegen-gewalt.de/

German section of the Fédération Internationale des Communautés éducatives (FICE) e. V, Dr. Monika Weber, www.ighf.de

Portugal

União de Mulheres Alternativa e Resposta – Umar, Ilda Afonso: www.umarfeminismos.org

Associação Projecto Criar (APC), Leonor Valente Monteiro, <https://apcriar.org.pt/en/>

Association for Family Planning /Associação para o Planeamento e a Família (APF), Fernanda Pinto: www.apf.pt

Slovenia;

Association against sexual abuse, Erica Kovač: www.spolna-zloraba.si

“Society Kljuc – Centre for Fight Against Trafficking in Human Beings”, Polona Kovač: www.drustvo-kljuc.si

Association for Non-violent Communication, Katarina Zabukovec Kerin: www.drustvo-dnk.si/en

Many professionals and victim-survivors in each country gave generously of their time, knowledge and reflections. Now it is up to you as readers to add to that discourse. We hope the book provides you with new insights and thought provoking ideas.

SECTION ONE

APPROACHING INTERVENTION: THE ARENA

Chapter 2

Crafting methodology for an innovative project

Liz Kelly¹ & Carol Hagemann-White²

¹ *Child and Woman Abuse Studies Unit, London Metropolitan University, UK*

² *University of Osnabrück, Germany*

1 The research context

Cultural Encounters in Interventions Against Violence (CEINAV) was both a cross-disciplinary and multi-country project, demanding attention to methodology at multiple levels. Since members of the research teams had worked together on a number of previous projects we already knew the critical importance of allocating sufficient time and attention to building a shared approach to research methods: without this the data would not be comparable and, moreover, taken for granted similarities would turn out to be unexamined differences. As a team we were, therefore, committed to a process in which we worked to produce agreed overall approaches and detailed guidelines for both data creation and analysis. Our experiential knowledge meant the project application provided time and spaces (virtual and in person) through which we built shared starting points and understandings of what we were going to do and how we were going to do it. Too often multi-country projects take a series of basic steps for granted, we were anxious to avoid this: Our intellectual and practical collaboration involved each step being explored and carefully considered in order to create a flexible qualitative methodology which included focus groups with professionals, interviews with victim-survivors and art based workshops.

While there is a growing body of transnational studies on responses to gender-based violence (most centred on domestic violence), it is primarily concerned with comparing or assessing national policies and the processes that shape them. Some studies use pre-defined standards of good practice and seek to discover patterns in what policies states install; others take a discursive sociological approach to identify what institutions, agencies and voices influence policy outcomes in each country. Even when country case studies are written, the comparative goal is typically pursued through normative standards set by the researchers, such as asking whether policies are feminist or gender-neutral (Krizsan et al. 2007), whether they are transformational (Krizsan & Lombardo 2013), or whether they further feminist goals (Stetson & Mazur 1995). However, from previous research and monitoring for the Council of Europe we had learned that policies and standards on paper can take on very different meanings when implemented “on the ground”, and we sought to understand why this is the case. Thus, we could not make use of methods to analyse documents in the policy discourse. Research focused on policy-making and policy outcomes seldom reaches the level of the practice of intervention.

A second body of comparative research concerning intervention against violence is more closely tied to social work, collecting and comparing data on issues surrounding decision-making in child protection work or procedures when intimate partner violence has the potential to harm children. This work is more likely to study professionals rather than the policy-making process. After 20 years of European networks on gender violence (ENGV) and on interpersonal violence as a human rights violation (CAHRV¹) and ten years of monitoring implementation of Council of Europe standards (Hagemann-White 2006 and 2014b) the limits of measuring and comparing national policies and legal provisions on intervention had become visible. Our previous research has taught us that often it is not only *what* intervention comprises but *how* it is done which determines whether it brings about real change and makes a child or a woman safer from the threat of further or future harm and more able to take control of their lives. It was time to explore the cultural underpinnings that shaped the diversity of practices in Europe.

1.1 Our research questions

HERA funding required a thoughtfully designed (and fully costed) research project which addressed cultural encounters. Application was a two-stage process, each stage demanding three months of collaborative work, and the team meeting several times to ensure we were travelling in the same directions; from the first draft to funding approval the process stretched over more than a year. The application distilled our thinking at that point. We sought to explore why on the one hand, despite an explicit European consensus on stopping violence against women and protecting children from harm, the practices of intervention and the rationales behind them differ between countries. On the other hand, we saw a need to study how policies and institutional practices intended to ensure the “best interests of the child” and the freedom and safety of women from violence may be deployed differently and potentially have quite different effects for disadvantaged minorities within each country.

The wider context for our project was the growing formation and influence of European-level normative instruments, including standard setting and models of “good practice”, with the implication that not only the obligations of the state and its agencies, but also their practices, become more uniform. Yet the adoption of such norms in the national context often follows implicit and unreflected assumptions of what is presumed to be self-evident – in legal cultures, institutional cultures, dominant national cultures – incorporating ideas about what it means to be a child or a woman or a man, or what families can and should do. But they are also shaped by beliefs about the nature and purpose of social institutions, and about how and when they may justifiably intervene into personal life. These underlying premises are rarely examined in comparative studies. By including different forms of violence as well as countries whose history, traditions and institutions differ, we hoped to discover overall patterns of intervention – from legislation to practical responses such as law enforcement and social work and cooperation – that differ between countries, despite two decades of overarching European perspectives and policies. To explore these tensions we thus chose to focus on three forms of violence for which state responsibility is well established: intimate partner violence/domestic violence, physical child abuse and neglect, and trafficking for sexual exploitation.

It was not our intention to assess whether the four states in our study had implemented the provisions and fulfilled their obligations from transnational Conventions, nor to eval-

¹ The Coordination Action on Human Rights Violations (CAHRV) was funded 2004–2007 in the 6th EU framework program, linking 22 partners in 14 countries

uate whether practitioners met the standards that these agreements set. We expected rather that the assumptions, values and beliefs that are normally taken for granted would become most salient in difficult situations and dilemmas of practice as well as in the dissonances between offers of professional protection and support and the perceptions that victims of violence have of the intervention they experience. Such dissonances call into question the widespread but simplistic belief that ending violence against women and abuse of children can be overcome by standard setting and monitoring compliance. Instead, we aimed to contribute to an ethical approach to intervention that could adapt to and integrate the diversity of legal-institutional and cultural contexts (see chapters 4 and 15).

From the outset a double comparative approach (within and between countries) was envisaged, through the double lens of professionals understanding and procedures of intervention on the one hand and the experience of intervention by minority groups on the other. This second lens was understood as a paradigmatic test through which the normative frameworks of ethics, legal philosophy, culture, and human rights theory could be examined (see Rehman et al. 2013). Within this overarching framework our specific research questions were:

- What do key theoretical framings on complex inequalities illuminate in seeking to establish ethics for state intervention in private life?
- How do the multicultural history, institutions and beliefs in each country shape current perceptions of and responses to interpersonal violence? How do institutional norms and regulations define the threshold and procedures of intervention, and how do representations of European, national and local culture affect their implementation?
- To what extent do practices and models of dealing with violence recognise and respond to complex inequalities? How can the voices of the recipients of intervention enrich perceptions of how violence should be dealt with?
- What means and methods, including narrative and visual arts, can enable the public and professionals to hear more readily the diverse voices of women and children subjected to violence?
- Against the backdrop of diverse gender and generational regimes, are there ethical principles and orientations in interventions on violence and abuse which can traverse cultural contexts and recognise the different positions of various minority communities?

In this chapter we describe how we established the groundwork from which to proceed, the approach to our two sets of original data and how the creative/art based work was integrated into the project. All of these layers of knowledge creation are addressed in later chapters: here we explore what we did, why and how. We conclude by reflecting on what we learnt about methodology in the process.

1.2 Establishing the ground

Our starting point was not to presume either shared intellectual frameworks or approaches to interventions on violence. To ensure input from all team members and our linked associate partners² a system for sharing drafts of research tools and papers was an initial task, with a series of differently enabled folders. Draft and final papers were available to all team members and associate partners and the first two meetings (the “kick-off” in the

² Each country team had three associate partners with expertise in one of the three forms of violence.

second month and a five-day meeting after one year) brought together all five teams³, including the linked artists researchers and associate partners.

The socio-cultural histories and state formations of Germany, Portugal, Slovenia and the UK (England and Wales⁴) are very different, despite sharing membership of the European Union. Since we were part of a research programme on cultural encounters it mattered that we encounter the variations between the four countries and understand how these might affect interventions on violence, especially for women and children from minority communities.

CEINAV, therefore, began with two ground setting activities requiring country-specific background papers. The first covered the sociocultural context of diversity (colonial experience, cultural diversity, and migration), economic inequality, and data on prevalence of the three forms of violence. The second described the legal-institutional context of intervention across the three forms of violence. These papers gave us the foundations for grasping and understanding differences and commonalities among the four countries with respect to majority/minority communities in the context of histories of colonialism and migration and the infrastructure of laws, institutions and practices which underpinned interventions on violence (see chapters 5 to 7). Without these we were not in a position to develop research methods which were context sensitive.

An early challenge encountered here was how to define “minorities” in a way that worked across the four countries. We had at the outset considered that this would cover groups whose position was subordinate, but the historical, colonial and migration histories of the four countries differed too much to allow a common definition: even the concept “minority” did not transfer with a core shared meaning (see chapter 8). This was an important methodological insight, presenting complex issues for the empirical work. A methodological adaption took place whereby no specific minorities would be referred to in the focus group stories, rather the participants would be invited to describe when and how they encounter minority groups in their work. A linked challenge emerged in the selection of victim-survivors for the interviews, since the criteria of “belonging” to a “minority” in each of the four countries proved to create a further set of cultural encounters.

Since the country context papers were for internal use only, teams were asked to compile what was known from existing sources and link it to CEINAV questions. The legal-institutional background papers enabled us to understand the different structural conditions and potential pathways of intervention in the four countries, while the socio-cultural background assisted us as a team in clarifying what in our application we described as ‘the implications of European norms, national legislation and practices of protection and prevention for cultural encounters’. Other chapters in this volume draw on this background while interpreting our empirical findings.

Parallel to this, and extending over the data collection periods a set of theoretical working papers were produced, discussed in the course of our work and revised in the final stages of the project. They explored the potential usefulness for CEINAV of postcolonial theory, intersectionality, and multiculturalism. Here we were seeking to sharpen the analytical tools through which we explored difference, inequality and culture. Two further papers undertook to map ethical theories and their engagement (or in most cases non-engagement) with interpersonal violence. Whilst the abstract theories did not connect easily with our empirical data, they were important reference points in analysis, systematis-

³ There were two teams in Germany, one tasked with integrating the whole as well as expertise on violence against women, the other integrated expertise on law and on child protection.

⁴ The UK consists of four countries – England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales – England and Wales had a shared legal system and were thus chosen as the location for this study.

ing where and how ethical theories can decipher the conflicting demands and the normative and practical dimensions of intervening against violence.

Our goal in the theory strand was to develop a cross-disciplinary web of shared concepts and frames that could be translated between and within the languages and cultures of the four countries. In the course of the project, this work made it possible to identify promising theoretical approaches that could add deeper meaning to the empirically observed dilemmas and dissonances of practice and thus provide a basis for transnational comparative interpretation (see chapters 3 and 4).

2 Empirical methodology

There were three strands of empirical knowledge creation and knowledge exchange in CEINAV: focus group discussions with professionals; interviews with victim-survivors from minorities; and art workshops/art creation. The methodological challenge was to craft a format that worked across three forms of violence, could adapt to context and would enable us to tease out the underlying cultural assumptions. With regard to both theory and methodology, the project was itself a series of cultural encounters among the researchers from the four countries as well. To achieve consistent procedures, for each step of the work a detailed methodological guideline was written drawing on the different theoretical traditions, taking account of the growing literature on feminist methodology (Buchen et al. 2004; Hesse-Biber 2012) and research with children and young people (Mayring 2014) as well as the very large body of work that explores the potentials and challenges in qualitative research and of specific methods.

2.1 Exploring the intervention experience of professionals

The first stream of empirical work comprised workshops at which a wide range of professionals were invited to explore thresholds for intervention and to think about who should do what, in what circumstances it was legitimate to act without the consent of the person or, in the case of child abuse, of the family, and where they faced difficult decisions or encountered practical or ethical dilemmas. Two workshops for each form of violence per country were undertaken, a total of 24. While no workshop was reconvened with the same participants, those interested were invited to attend later meetings to enter into dialogue with the researchers and with some survivors as well as a closing conference.

A list of potential invitees across each form of violence was drawn up, with some categories common across all three (police, social workers, health, prosecutors/lawyers, NGOs) and others more particular to forms of violence (for example, teachers and nursery workers for child abuse and intimate partner violence; border/immigration for trafficking). In a number of cases the equivalents in different systems were identified or at least approximated. Participants were invited through the research teams and associate partners. The inclusion criteria were that participants would have practice-based knowledge about the form of violence in question and were commended for their openness to reflection. The selection process endeavoured to ensure that they would not be working together on the same cases, so that the workshop could be a space to share thoughts openly.

Textbooks define a focus group as typically consisting of six to eight people who meet once for a period of an hour to an hour and a half (see for example Finch & Lewis 2003). For the research aims of CEINAV, more participants (11 to 14 participants were foreseen

in order to have all important intervention actors included) and more time was needed. As a result, it can be said that focus group discussion periods were embedded in a workshop format that covered two half-days⁵ with informal interaction such as meals in the breaks. This also permitted a shift in focus after breaks. While finding the range of participants available on the set dates was sometimes challenging, those who agreed found the idea and aims of the workshops convincing, suggesting the projects aims and core questions resonated with concerns from practice. In all 234 professionals took part: 91 from the field of domestic violence, 68 from trafficking and 75 from child protection. Our concern that professionals would regard the time investment as prohibitive did not prove to be the case: rather in all countries some commented on how much they appreciated the opportunity to reflect on practice in a multi-agency context.

Participants were told that we were interested in difficult decisions and ethical dilemmas. A phased vignette approach provided the impulse for discussion, with a series of core questions to explore at each point⁶. The vignettes were developed in dialogue with associate partners and after translation checked with the practitioners in each country to ensure that there was a realistic intervention pathway which could be explored at each stage. The process of translation and back translation of the story and the questions was itself a process of cultural encounters in which the “self-evident” was questioned and further clarifications were required. Details were adapted to country context in light of the partners’ feedback.

Each vignette began with fragmented indications of possible violence, such that no one professional would have seen multiple signs. Participants were asked to imagine when and how this might become a case for intervention, and what might lead someone to try and discover whether violence was involved. The story then proceeded in two subsequent phases to present increasing evidence of harm, and participants discussed when a professional or organisation might see a need for intervention, how each would, could, or should act to prevent further violence, and what dilemmas might arise in this process. The first half-day moved through the three phases of the story, the second was devoted to exploration of whether anything would be different if the victim-survivor came from a minority.

While the guidance for country context papers provided a fairly straightforward outline with questions, the guidelines for empirical work recognised diverging intellectual traditions and sought a creative merging that would be fruitful in all four countries and across the forms of violence.

The workshop methodology also exemplifies how the project was itself a series of cultural encounters. In a simplified sketch: While the English language literature points to focus group methods as first established in marketing research and spreading to political sociology and public health studies, the German literature locates the entrance of group discussion methodology into social research with the major study of political attitudes in postwar Germany by the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research. While advice to researchers in English tends to emphasise the diversity of voices that should be heard⁷ and closing each discussion with a consensual summing up, the methodological guidance in German aims at uncovering existing collective orientations and commonality of experience. Underneath this difference are theoretical traditions: one refers to the co-construction of re-

⁵ Differences in country context, such as time constraints, pressure under funding cutbacks, cultural patterns of professional further education made it necessary to adapt how the workshops were organised.

⁶ On the construction and use of vignettes see for example Hughes and Huby 2004. The phased stories can be found in the background paper: Methodology and impulses, Part 2 on the project website (Hagemann-White 2014a)

⁷ Finch & Lewis (2003, p. 188): “The group context provides a key opportunity to explore difference and diversity”.

ality in social interaction (Morgan 2012), the other sees group discussions as uncovering “a more fundamental type of sociality” based on “what is shared in their action practice, in their biographical experience”. In the latter view, the group interaction does not construct reality but gives the researcher “access to the articulation of collective meaning-contexts” that already exist, stemming from the experience of shared sense of belonging (Bohnsack 2004, p. 218). In the Portuguese discussion, the tradition of the “pedagogy of the oppressed” (Freire 1970; Kamberelis & Dimitriadis 2011) has more to say to the purpose of group discussions. Wilkinson discusses this approach in feminist research as seeking to empower participants through collective awareness-raising (Wilkinson 1998).

Our methodological guidance, therefore, gave space to the different academic traditions whilst clarifying our shared purpose. The purpose was threefold. First, we were looking for the underlying cultural premises in each country, and thus for a common ground on which difficult situations were debated. Constructing groups with members of the different professions, all experienced in responding to the form of violence to be discussed and in practicing inter-agency cooperation, made it possible for the group process around a case to reveal shared meanings. In responding to the question of how intervention might differ if the violence occurred in a minority context the participants gave the researchers access to understandings of own and other cultures. Second, we were seeking to uncover the different approaches taken by each profession, and the expectations they have of the others. We surmised that not working with each other directly would create more space for discussion and debate, about the case itself and how professionals could or should act. Together the professionals constructed the pathways for intervention and framings which revealed obstacles and opportunities. Thirdly, our invitation to reflect on ethical dilemmas had potential for empowerment, offering them a context for considering how intervention might better be able to reach the goals that had emerged as a shared perspective in the course of the discussion. In this sense the focus groups could raise awareness and infuse participants with a renewed sense of purpose. This dimension of the groups was enhanced by the facilitator’s invitation to make a videotaped statement.

The case vignette method was successful in stimulating discussion among experienced practitioners directly involved in casework: it captured how situations of violence enter into the intervention system, as well as the subsequent pathways that may (or may not) ensue. Tensions emerged between the expectations with which professionals were confronted and their perceptions of what would be in the best interests of woman or the child. After each workshop, participants were invited to make a videotaped statement of an issue from the discussion that they found significant, or a message they wished to convey, for later use in the project documentary film, intended for education and awareness-raising.

2.2 Working with focus group data

Our purpose was not to generalise about how professionals think or what they do, nor to create a typology of countries or systems, but rather to understand cultural encounters within Europe, and how institutions meet the expectations of (trans)national norms. Attuned to the cultural premises underlying (sometimes quite subtly) differing practices of intervention, we expected connections between the approaches to the three forms of violence to emerge; these are questions that have received little or no research attention, and thus we were entering largely uncharted territory. This meant that the analysis of both the content and the dynamics of the focus group discussions could not be undertaken using a common overarching coding frame. For each form of violence in each country, after transcription the two workshops were analysed as a pair in the original language to capture nuances of meaning and thereby better identify how violence, the tasks and dilemmas of

intervention, and the situation of minorities were understood and negotiated. Three different methods of content analysis were then used, each designed to produce results that could be comparable while remaining as close as possible to the orientations and constructions of reality that emerged in each group. These comprised (1) a process analysis of what practitioners saw as possible or probable pathways through intervention, (2) an inductive frame analysis of the organising concepts in which intervention was discussed, and (3) an analysis of ethical issues which were identified. These three steps do not reflect different theoretical and methodological traditions, but rather cut across them, allowing each team to explore the data inductively from within the country context, grounded in the realities of intervention for each form of violence.

(1) The expected pathway that intervention would traverse was extracted by content analysis and supplemented, as needed, by the research team's background knowledge for clarity and to enable cross-national comparison. The account was organised chronologically as the case developed, including alternative contingencies.

(2) Frame analysis was used to explore how practitioners think about violence and its victims, appropriate interventions, the tasks of different agencies, and whether this changed in relation to minority groups. We examined how the participants framed the situation, the issues it raised, and the actions that might be taken. "Frames" were understood as conceptual tools that define the nature of a problem with implications for how it could be solved or dealt with (Verloo & Lombardo 2007; Ferree & Merrill 2000; Ferree 2012). Frames could be a group consensus or contested. An extended discussion among the researchers was needed to reach an understanding of what should be considered a "frame": in CEINAV it referred to a cognitive ordering of experiences and ideas that defined the nature of a problem and (perhaps implicitly) the nature of the actions (and responsibilities to act) that could appropriately respond to it. Thus, framing trafficking as sexual exploitation of vulnerable women has different implications in the priority of intervention and even on decisions about prosecution or invoking immigration law than does framing it first and foremost as a crime against the state. Making frames visible was crucial to understanding the differences in conceptual frameworks and practices across the four countries.

Frame analysis is commonly used in political science for discerning how social movements gain traction and in policy analysis drawing on public documents such as laws, parliamentary debates or newspapers (see Lombardo et al. 2009). In focus group discussions, both personal experience and socialisation into the professional role can also be presumed to shape the frames. Participants in a group always position themselves with regard to others and to the researchers (Helfferich 2004); in a multi-professional group framing can also serve to define disciplinary positions. In CEINAV frames were a means of uncovering (unspoken) structural and/or cultural premises, but also gave access to articulation of diverse positions and what these meant.

(3) The third step drew out the practical and ethical dilemmas experienced by practitioners. The point was not to capture how the participating individuals might resolve such a dilemma, nor to generalise from such a small group about how practice is implemented in each country. Rather our interest was uncovering the cultural premises shaping intervention, including what would be considered a significant dilemma or a difficult decision, whether practitioners from different professional groups agreed that this did, in fact, present a challenge, and what alternatives were considered. This third analytic approach was directed at understanding how professionals in this field perceive their ability to act in accordance with their mandate and/or their personal beliefs or ideals, and within the structural conditions in which they work. This meant identifying what they implicitly or explicitly perceive as a dilemma or a practical difficulty with ethical implications.

Points of conflict, tension, or disagreement were noted alongside descriptions of difficulties and problems, such as being at a loss to find the right course of action, or feeling

some anxiety over the actions “properly” taken. Some of the core questions were designed to elicit such difficulties. This methodological step involved analysis of the interactions within the group, giving close attention to passages in which the participants become more emotional, engaged in debate about what could or should be done, or adopted a reflective mode in which they were actively “organising and consolidating” shared meaning (Morgan 2012, pp. 170ff.)⁸.

For each form of violence in each country, a working paper in English identified the discursive constructions and normative representations, with translated citations from the transcripts. These papers describe: the process structure of intervention (within which some things require decisions and some are pre-determined); the way in which the form of violence and the duties, rights and norms of intervention were framed in the workshops; how culture, cultural difference, and minority situations were explored and understood; and the ethical issues and dilemmas that the professionals raised. After discussion with the associate partners (within country) and in a five-day joint working seminar (across countries) the frames and dilemmas were clustered with a view to suggesting similar or shared dimensions across all countries and possible commonalities between forms of violence. After this clustering and the discussion on how best to define frames, the working papers were revised and published online. (<http://ceinav-jrp.blogspot.de/p/working-paper.html> and <http://tinyurl.com/ceinavproject>).

Comparative analysis followed, enriched through further discussions with the associate partners and through meetings with participating professionals. A detailed and theoretically underpinned guidance paper on “Hermeneutic and comparative interpretation” was prepared by the Porto partner. Comparative papers based on the focus groups across the four countries were then drafted for each of the three forms of violence by a designated “task leader”, with feedback from the rest of the team. Each paper thus represents a joint effort of the five teams. By proceeding in this way, the analysis could uncover both great similarities and important differences in how professionals think and act across countries and across forms of violence. While striking similarities appear in their reflection on ethical issues, the constraints and resources of practice differ considerably. These papers were not offered online, since the authors planned to revise and submit them to suitable journals; one has since been published (Meysen & Kelly 2018) and a second is available on the project website (Magalhães et al. 2015).

Further papers, including chapters in this book have been written through the material and the analyses; together with the interview material described below it formed the foundations on which the transnational ethical framework (see chapter 16 this book) was written.

2.3 Hearing the experiences of victim-survivors

One of the key aims of this project was to gather the perspectives on their experiences of intervention of women who had been trafficked for sexual exploitation or had lived in an abusive relationship of domestic violence, and from young people who had been taken into care during childhood due to physical abuse or neglect. These interviews were different from those in much research to date in a number of ways.

- We searched for women and young people from a migration or a minority background, since we thought they were more likely to encounter additional obstacles to finding ap-

⁸ For more detail on the methodology see the “Background paper: Methodology and impulses” (Hagemann-White 2014a).

propriate help, in this way their stories could cast light on how intervention models might not meet the needs of disempowered groups.

- The focus would not be on telling the story of the violence, but on the story of intervention as they had experienced it.
- Whilst we made contact to interviewees, for ethical reasons, through specialised support services, the interview was not focused on an evaluation of that service, but rather focused on their contacts in the intervention process and over time with (among others) social welfare agencies, police, lawyers and courts, health care professionals, immigration authorities, youth welfare agencies, specialised support and refuge services, and often important informal contacts.

All partners were experienced in interviewing women or young people⁹, and methodological approaches to these have been developed in the international feminist discourse. There were, therefore, no divergent theoretical traditions with respect to interview methods: the gap that had to be bridged concerned the differing traditions of approaching violence against women and violence against children. CEINAV had to find a creative answer to the question of whether interview guidelines could work across all three forms of violence, and in particular, with the young people. The basic format was semi-structured beginning with an invitation for participants to tell their story of intervention, what people said and did, how helpful they found this at the time and what their views are now. An account might begin with thinking about asking for help, or the first contact they had with a support agency, and each interviewee was encouraged to tell their story without interruption. Only after this account were specific questions introduced about some of the ethical issues that had already been identified through the focus groups with professionals.

Templates were drawn up for the inclusion criteria, the preparatory and consent protocols and the interview guides – all were discussed, modified and agreed across the research teams. Core questions were translated and back translated, in order to ensure that they were cross-culturally meaningful. The final documentation included some general reminders of standards for good interviewing, including confidentiality, safety, and transparency. Each form of violence was dealt with separately, adapting the initial impulse and the core questions to the specific form of violence.

We set targets of seven interviewees for each form of violence, although this was not possible in Slovenia, or for trafficking in Portugal. Overall 78 women and young people were interviewed: 32 women who had experienced intervention due to domestic violence, 21 due to trafficking, and 25 young people who had been taken into care by child protection authorities.

Locating participants and completing the interviews (some of which were undertaken significant distances away from where the research team was based) was considerably more complex than the focus groups. In some instances the associate partners were not able to facilitate access to interviewees due to understaffing and a high workload; in others, teams saw this as outside their mandate and potentially risky for the victim-survivor, so additional support agencies had to be approached. Furthermore, meeting the criteria depended strongly on the associate partners, the context of their work, and their perceptions of what constitutes a minority in each country. England and Wales had associate partners dedicated to helping black, ethnic and minority women; in Germany, a variety of support services each offered contact to one or at most two women identified as having a migration background. Due to differences in the migration regimes, trafficked or abused women in Germany were likely to have been in the country considerably longer than those in

⁹ Or, for one partner, drew on the experience of an external interviewer for interviews with children/youth.

the UK. In Slovenia and in Portugal, only a few trafficked women could be contacted for interviews. In Germany, two young people had no memory of the event because they were so young at the time. Especially (but not only) with adolescents, interview appointments were more frequently cancelled, meaning that new contacts had to be sought. Since many of the interviewees told stories of intervention that went back quite a long time, the interview material could not be counterpoised to the workshop discussions, in which current procedures were discussed.

2.4 Working with interview data

Whilst methodologically the experiences of survivors cannot be placed in direct comparison either to the discussions among professionals or transnationally, they nonetheless offer a wealth of insights into the meaning that intervention action or inaction can have and the possible impact that how they were treated had on their lives subsequently. The interview data was highly personal, experiential and the goal of listening to voices that are often not heard precluded imposing a common structured way of working with the material such as uniform coding and comparing coded segments directly. In view of the project's commitment to a culturally sensitive comparative approach working towards ethical intervention, the guidance for interview analysis centred on distilling ethical issues out of the stories and thinking how we might use this material in creative ways.

A cluster of ethical dilemmas had been identified from the focus groups and informed our core questions in the victim-survivor interviews. A project working paper on "Salient ethical issues for intervention against violence" sought to link the ethical issues and dilemmas that had emerged so far with relevant aspects of ethical theory. These prior steps informed how we worked with the interview transcripts – seeking to identify and explore (possibly implicit) ethical issues that echoed or added to those already identified. The connection between theory and interview material was not easy to make, since women and young people rarely described their experiences as a dilemma. Rather, their accounts of intervention circled around whether it did or did not meet their needs, whether it was fair or unjust, caring or disrespectful or perhaps racist, whether it went too slowly or too fast, made them feel stronger or weaker. As with the professional workshops, in each country for each form of violence a working paper was written. These papers summarised for each interview the intervention experience in one paragraph, then presented ethical issues, illustrating them with excerpts from the transcripts. Although all names were changed, concern that a woman or young person might be identifiable through her story and thus the promise of confidentiality breached led to a decision not to publish these papers online, but to work with them for publishable outcomes.

Alongside close study of the interview transcripts for insights into analytical research questions, they were also approached from the viewpoint of the art of storytelling. The partners discussed how best to construct and shape short "stories" from the interviews that were both authentic with regard to the "voices" of interview partners and the key messages that they wanted to convey, whilst ensuring that the person who told the story is not identifiable. These accounts were intended for publication, for use in education and awareness-raising, so they needed to be focused, and coherent, and to be told in a way that makes a point; thus, they differ from the classical summary of a case in research. All five partners compiled stories and the interviewees were invited to review the narratives. In three countries, the stories also had to be translated into English for comparative study; it was quite challenging both to maintain the expressive style of the women and young people while transposing this into "natural" spoken English. In the areas where few interviews had been possible (trafficking in Portugal and Slovenia, child abuse in Slovenia) selected

stories were also translated from English or German into Slovenian or Portuguese, so that the eventual publication offered at least 7 stories in each of the languages for each form of violence.

Deriving brief and coherent stories from the interviews posed a range of questions: how to preserve an authentic voice when both language barriers of migrants and emotional barriers disrupted any simple “telling”? This was a different task to the usual format in research reports where summaries are interspersed with quotes. The resulting stories are thus the product of both the voice of the woman or young person experiencing intervention, and of the selective and creative contribution of the research teams. Without the solid empirical and theoretical work done before, it would not have been possible to craft stories that convey key elements of the intervention experience in all their diversity, but with an underlying consistency of focus. The stories, together with the videotaped statements by professionals, formed the basis for creating a video documentary and have been compiled in a publication in which all four languages of the countries are used; it is also available open access online (Hagemann-White & Grafe 2016).

2.5 Creative/art based work

To explore how the experiences of marginalised victims of violence could touch and influence those who design or deliver interventions, the potential of art was part of our project. In each country an artist-researcher was engaged to design and carry out two creative art workshops with those interviewees who were willing (and could arrange) to participate. This was understood in the project as offering an additional way of “telling” their stories: it was innovative in social research on violence, and there were many debates about how art could be integrated into the project. The artists who joined the teams in the four countries each had a different repertoire of media and creative methods, meaning that no unified approach was possible. After meeting for two days whilst the survivor interviews were in process they exchanged ideas in a dedicated “artists’ blog”.

This aspect of CEINAV must be seen as an experiment in its use of diverse approaches, both in the manner of enabling women and young people to express their experiences through art, and with regard to how the subsequent reflection and dialogue was organised. All artists as well as the researchers who were participant observers at the art workshops wrote reflective papers on the experience of integrating art into research. In addition the artists in our teams worked creatively with the stories and the art work from the workshops (see chapter 14).

The creative process for each country was documented in an “art process logbook”, and the art work produced was shared through photo documentation. Some presentations of the art work (with the participation of the artists, but without showing their faces) were videotaped. Collecting stories and working in a creative art process aimed to uncover the potential both of narrative and of visual art to stimulate the imagination needed to hear different voices and to recognise the agency of victims.

In each of the four countries, creative art and aesthetic education have been explored as potential resources that can be used in change processes; to this end, the art work was presented at “creative dialogue meetings” with associate partners and stakeholders in each country. This step, in which the interviewees could converse with professionals as equals, was a challenge, requiring skilled facilitation. Strategies were also needed to encourage and enable the women and young people to take part, and each team chose to do it in different ways. In England and Wales, for example, the art work on trafficking and domestic violence was shared with the interviewees, associate partners and a few local stakeholders. The art work by the young people was shared with them and the local child protection

team. In Germany both were combined, and a number of professionals working in the different fields of intervention as well as all five women and one of the young people who had created art in a workshop took part in a two-day seminar. In Portugal, two meetings were held, one with professionals and stakeholders to introduce them to the art work, and a second one with both professionals and participants in the art workshops.

In a final stage of CEINAV, three video films were created that are now available on the project website. *Everything I told them* sought to present key ethical issues through reflections by lead researchers, videotaped statements by professionals on issues from the workshops, and excerpts from survivor stories. It was shown at the closing event of the HERA Cultural Encounters research programme. A second film is a short documentary of one of the creative dialogue meetings showing some of the art by victim-survivors and professionals interacting with it. A third film called “Sendas / Paths” is an animation which represents the emotional healing journeys of a woman and two siblings. All three films can be accessed through the CEINAV website <http://tinyurl.com/ceinavproject>.

3 What we learnt

Our experience of carefully building a common methodology confirmed our expectation that emerging differences would point to cultural differences among the countries and within intervention systems. It heightened our awareness of the need for great caution in assuming, even within the community of activists or of researchers engaged with such important overarching issues as reducing violence, that words and concepts mean the same. Fluency in English does not preclude serious misunderstandings: these should not be thought of as something to be avoided, for example by setting up a project glossary (which we tried, but found not to be useful). Rather, such misunderstandings are valuable opportunities to access and understand diverse contexts, from which we could learn that the process of such cultural encounters is a permanent and productive feature of European life.

Whilst we worked to synthesise the different datasets and forms of knowledge produced during the project, we did not engage in direct comparison between the types of data, but drew on the insights from different methods to develop a broader understanding of how and why intervention systems differ (see chapter 12). Our methodology was aimed at uncovering cultural premises, unreflected assumptions. The focus group participants were not representatives, but selective – those who were attracted to the idea of giving deeper reflection to their practice. By asking them to think about difficult decisions, for example when conflicting rights or needs appear, or when the general rules laid down in laws or guidelines do not seem to fit well with reality, we hoped to find “lines of fracture” in their routines which would require that assumptions, which they are rarely required to identify or think about, were articulated.

We did not draw on the survivor interviews to assess the quality and sensitivity of intervention practice; the experiences of the women and young people referred to a variety of different times, places and agencies. The significance of their narratives lay in showing what it can be like and what effect on further action it can have to feel oneself treated in a particular way. Thus, while the focus group method yielded insight into professional discourses, the interviews offered experiential accounts of what being the subject (or in some cases object) of intervention felt like and meant at the time and subsequently.

Embedding participatory creative art in research was conceptualised as experimental in the proposal, and the four artists had all worked in different media and differed in their experience with regard to participatory art. While all teams successfully implemented art

workshops with survivors, the timing, the way the workshops were led, the kind of art produced and the follow-up all differed. The rich and varied outcomes represent an interesting range of possibilities rather than a set of comparable results. Across these differences, however, it can be said that the participants in the art workshops found this experience empowering and meaningful for their own process of overcoming victimisation. Many of the practitioners also saw the art work as a way to reach emotional dimensions that would not be verbalised easily, while questions on how art by survivors of violence can be used in intervention practice remained open.

Our original contribution methodologically was to create a context-sensitive, three-fold comparative approach (four countries, three forms of violence, majority and minority positions), which involved listening to the voices of victims as well as those of professionals and integrating creative art into the research process. In this process of “bridging” across and between three different forms of violence that are rarely studied together, CEIN-AV was able to identify and articulate commonalities as well as differences, allowing us to reach overarching conclusions on the ethics of intervention (see chapter 16) while learning more about the connections by which the structural and cultural conditions underlying professional responses and normative expectations of “good practice” interact with the realities as perceived by the victim-survivors of violence.

References

- Bohnsack, Ralf (2004): Group discussion and focus groups. In: *A Companion to Qualitative Research*, eds. Uwe Flick, Ernst von Kardorff & Ines Steinke. London, Thousand Oaks & New Delhi: Sage, pp. 214–221. German original Reinbek 2000.
- Buchen, Sylvia, Cornelia Helfferich & Maja S. Maier, eds. (2004): *Gender methodologisch. Empirische Forschung in der Informationsgesellschaft vor neuen Herausforderungen*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Ferree, Myra Marx (2012): *Varieties of Feminism. German Gender Politics in Global Perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Ferree, Myra Marx, & David A. Merrill (2000): Hot movements, cold cognition: Thinking about social movements in gendered frames. In: *Contemporary Sociology*, vol 29, no 3, pp. 454–462.
- Finch, Helen & Jane Lewis (2003): Focus groups. In: *Qualitative Research Practice*, ed. Jane Ritchie & Jane Lewis. London, Thousand Oaks & New Delhi: Sage, pp. 170–198.
- Freire, Paulo (1970): *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Hagemann-White, Carol & Bianca Grafe, eds. (2016): *Experiences of Intervention Against Violence. An Anthology of Stories*. Cultural Encounters in Intervention Against Violence Vol. II. Op-laden: Barbara Budrich Publishers. <https://shop.budrich-academic.de/produkt/experiences-of-intervention-against-violence>, 7 June 2019.
- Hagemann-White, Carol (2006): *Combating Violence Against Women. Stocktaking Study on the Measures and Actions Taken in Council of Europe Member States* (with Judith Katenbrink and Heike Rabe). Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Hagemann-White, Carol (2014a): Background paper: Methodology and Impulses of multiprofessional workshops, at CEINAV website <http://tinyurl.com/ceinavproject>
- Hagemann-White, Carol (2014b): *Analytical Study of the Results of the Fourth Round of Monitoring the Implementation of Recommendation Rec(2002)5 on the Protection of Women against Violence in Council of Europe Member States*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. <https://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/convention-violence/Docs/Analytical%20Study%20ENG.pdf>

- Helfferrich, Cornelia (2004): Gender-Positionierungen in Gruppendiskussionen. In: *Gender methodologisch. Empirische Forschung in der Informationsgesellschaft vor neuen Herausforderungen*, eds. Sylvia Buchen, Cornelia Helfferrich & Maja S. Maier. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, pp. 89–106.
- Hesse-Biber, Sharlene, ed. (2012): *Handbook of Feminist Research: Theory and Praxis*. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Hughes, Rhidian & Meg Huby (2004): The construction and interpretation of vignettes in social research. In: *Social Work & Social Sciences Review*, vol 11, no 1, pp. 36–51.
- Kamberelis, George & Greg Dimitriadis (2011): Focus groups: Contingent articulations of pedagogy, politics, and inquiry. In: *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, ed. Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln. London, Thousand Oaks & New Delhi: Sage, pp. 545–562.
- Krizsan, Andrea & Emanuela Lombardo (2013): The quality of gender equality policies: A discursive approach. In: *European Journal of Women's Studies*, vol 20, no 1, pp. 77–92.
- Krizsan, Andrea, Maria Bustelo, Andromachi Hadjiyanni & Fray Kamoutis (2007): Domestic violence: A public matter. In: *Multiple Meanings of Gender Equality: A Critical Frame Analysis of Gender Policies in Europe*, ed. Mieke Verloo. Budapest: CPS Books, pp. 141–169.
- Lombardo, Emanuela, Petra Meier & Mieke Verloo (2009): *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality. Stretching, Bending and Policymaking*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Magalhães, Maria José, Carol Hagemann-White, Rita Lopez & Vera Inês Costa Silva (2015): *Comparative Paper on the Intervention Against Domestic Violence in Portugal, Slovenia and England and Wales*, from the research project “Cultural Encounters in Intervention Against Violence” (CEINAV). <http://tinyurl.com/ceinavproject>
- Mayring, Philipp (2014): *Qualitative Content Analysis: Theoretical Foundation, Basic Procedures and Software Solution*. Klagenfurt: gesis, Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Meysen, Thomas & Liz Kelly (2018): Child protection systems between professional cooperation and trustful relationships: A comparison of professional practical and ethical dilemmas in England/Wales, Germany, Portugal, and Slovenia. In: *Child & Family Social Work*, vol 23, no 2, pp. 222–229.
- Morgan, David L. (2012): Focus groups and social interaction. In: *The SAGE Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft*, eds. Jaber F. Gubrium, James E. Holstein, Amir B. Marvasti & Karyn D. McKinney. London etc.: Sage, pp. 161–176.
- Rehman, Yasmin, Liz Kelly & Hannana Siddiqui, eds. (2013): *Moving in the Shadows. Violence in the Lives of Minority Women and Children*. Farnham, Burlington VT: Ashgate.
- Stetson, Dorothy & Amy Mazur, eds. (1995): *Comparative State Feminism*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Verloo, Mieke & Emanuela Lombardo (2007): Contested gender equality and policy variety in europe: Introducing a critical frame analysis approach. In: *Multiple Meanings of Gender Equality: A Critical Frame Analysis of Gender Policies in Europe*, ed. Mieke Verloo. Budapest: CPS Books, pp. 21–49.
- Wilkinson, Sue (1998): Focus groups in feminist research: Power, interaction, and the co-construction of meaning. In: *Women's Studies International Forum*, vol 21, no 2, pp. 11–125.

Chapter 3

Theorising complex inequalities to meet the challenges of intervention against violence

Vlasta Jalušič¹

¹ *Peace Institute, Institute for Contemporary Social and Political Studies, Slovenia*

1 Introduction

The experiences of both researchers and activists in various fields of the struggle against inequalities have uncovered the multidimensionality of unequal positions, not only that different sources of inequality might be interconnected and complementary, but also that inequalities stem from various realms of power relations simultaneously. Thus, gender inequality can have its sources in the economic, political, family and ethno-cultural realms at the same time, while not all of them necessarily influence it to the same extent. Speaking of complex inequalities therefore means not only to speak of multiple and multi-layered inequalities, as this can still imply several dimensions added on to one that is presumed to be basic (for example class, race or nationality added on to gender), or are of the same importance (gender and age, for example). If we speak of complex inequalities this means that we do not automatically, in advance, assume which dimension is decisive for the (un)equal position of an individual or a group and which combination of different dimensions in concrete situations creates new circumstances or situations that have to be taken into consideration (cf. Hancock 2007).

Scholars describe these phenomena either in terms of different power relations (as a matrix of domination or oppression, see Collins 1990) or use more neutral terms like inequality strands (Walby 2007 and 2009; Squires 2008); strands connect themselves with various dimensions and their sources. Complexity of inequality also means that the institutional elements (of structure and power) and individual elements (called „personal“ circumstances) supplement each other and mix among themselves in the processes of inequality construction whereby in some cases it is possible and in others it is impossible to separate their influence and results.

In spite of the quite well researched diversity of encounters with inequalities, there is still an insufficiently comprehensive elaboration of these in social and political theory (Walby 2009, p. 19). Nor are they an integral part of policy formation and intervention models. In consequence, laws and policies often do not take diverse inequalities into account, and there is no adequate guidance for intervention practice in this regard. Yet the corpus of studies and practices dealing with complex inequalities is growing fast and does not only encompass gender and ethnic studies circles but also children's and elderly studies and reaches into the sphere of social work and practice of intervention against violence (Murphy et al. 2009; Ravnbøl 2009; Sherwin & Uçar 2012; Sosa 2017).