



Universitat de Barcelona

UNIT 10

DIALOGIC MODEL FOR THE PREVENTION AND RESOLUTION OF CONFLICT

Training in Learning Communities



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union





Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



This project has been funded with support from the European Commission.
This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the
Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the
information contained therein.



Attribution-Non Commercial- No Derivatives 4.0 International

CONTENTS

UNIT 10. DIALOGIC MODEL FOR THE PREVENTION AND RESOLUTION OF CONFLICT

10.1. From discipline-based model to a dialogic model	3
10.2. Preventive socialisation of gender violence.....	9
10.3. Bibliography.....	16

UNIT 10 - DIALOGIC MODEL FOR THE PREVENTION AND RESOLUTION OF CONFLICT

Education centres must be safe spaces for all children. They must be areas in which children learn, grow and relate freely with one other so that learning is within everyone's reach. The dialogic model for the prevention and resolution of conflict, allows for a better coexistence both in the centre and in the education community as a whole. It is based upon dialogue and consensus amongst all parties involved, particularly the student body, regarding coexistence rules.

In this unit, three models which deal with the prevention and resolution of conflict are initially presented and summarised: discipline-based, mediation-based and dialogic. Next, further detail is provided regarding how the dialogic model is organised using the example of the implementation of rule consensus.

Although often difficult to identify, most problems in centres arise as a result of affective-sexual relationships. For this reason, the second part of the unit focuses on preventing the socialisation of gender-based violence, outlining certain key errors which can occur when handling such subjects.

10.1 From the discipline-based model to the dialogic model for the prevention and resolution of conflict

Since the period of the industrial society, the most widespread model used when tackling or avoiding unrest at education centres has been the **discipline-based model**. This is based upon established hierarchies and the role of a particular authority (the staff), who has been considered responsible for maintaining coexistence.

Rules and roles are defined and established in the discipline-based model by the figures of authority. The faculty impose regulations without input from the student body. The regulations then are enforced from top to bottom, that is the figures of authority make decisions and everyone else must behave accordingly.

In an industrial society, the discipline-based model suited how groups and institutions were managed. For instance, the head of a family (the man) had authority and he would devise his children's timetable and decide which programmes were to be watched on TV. The doctor's authority was not to be questioned either. In the current information society, these hierarchies do not vanish, but they are questioned and are constantly challenged. If someone is not in agreement with a doctor, they are able to ask for a second opinion. Adolescents can discuss their plans and schedule and families, in all their forms, need not sit in front of a TV set waiting to discover what the head of the family decides to do with the remote control. Thus, people interact, participate in and engage in dialogue about activities, plans and family behaviour and question or look for a second opinion in medicine.

For this reason, the discipline-based model cannot work satisfactorily in current society. Although it is fairly common for school authorities to request and listen to suggestions, it is clear that this is insufficient for reducing conflict and guaranteeing coexistence in centres.

In order to ensure that rules are abided by, the discipline-based model applies sanctions against those who breach them or behave disruptively. Punishments may include, amongst many others, banning the offender from class for a few days, sending them to alternative programmes or excluding them from the centre.

Sanctions and disqualifying measures frequently lead to the labelling of specific pupils who already suffer stigmatisation. Those who often suffer stigmatisation include pupils from Roma and other ethnic minority groups and pupils from economically depressed areas and they can be labeled as as defiant, aggressive or poorly mannered. Such prejudices are internalised by the pupils and only serve to strengthen any poor expectations they may have of themselves. Also, school punishments, whether temporary or permanent, increase the time pupils spend outside of their learning groups thereby incrementally increasing the gap in learning between them and their classmates. Removal from classrooms or even from centres does not solve but increases problems and does not provide space for opportunities for collaborative reflection on difficulties provoking that these pupils act the same in the future.

The mediator model represents an improvement on the discipline-based system as it includes all the parties involved in a given problematic situation and in the subsequent resolution process, therefore placing emphasis back on coexistence. This model is characterised by the involvement of an 'expert' who mediates between parties and offers responses according to a established rules. This model uses reactive solutions, that is solutions which arise from responses to a conflict which has already emerged, rather than prevention measures. Even though a framework of rules is generally defined by an 'expert' (the authority), enforcement is not a top to bottom process, but a dialogue between equals who have a common purpose. Instead of focusing on apportioning blame and responding with punishment, there is a fostering of support between participants.

The drawbacks in the mediator model lie in restricting responsibility for coexistence to very specific people, Also the 'expert' must be impartial and maintain personal distance and for this reason they use a specific form of language and particular communication techniques. This professionalisation or specialisation of mediation tasks may generate certain types of responses. On the one hand, despite involved parties being in acceptance of the service offered, sometimes some uncertainty or scepticism remain or arise during the process, but participants may feel unable to express this, thereby having an impact on outcomes. At times, participants can reach the end of a mediation process with the sense not only that the mediator has been unable to see their points of view but, also, that little progress has been made in resolving the problem.

The **dialogic model, however**, involves the whole community by means of a dialogue which allows for the *'discovery of the causes and origins of conflict situations in order to resolve them ... as such well before they emerge'* (Flecha & García, 2007). Therefore, this approach focusses on the prevention of conflict, by creating an atmosphere of collaboration where members participate in the co-creation of rules, the running of the centre, how conflict is resolved and where there is a greater understanding by all involved.

In this model, necessary space and conditions are established in order that everybody has an equal opportunity to voice their feelings opinions for resolution. To make this dialogue

possible it is considered that everybody, regardless of their culture or education level and so on has the opportunity to intervene, give opinions and participate in the search for an agreed solution which helps in preventing conflict. The responsibility and capacity for managing coexistence does not lie only with someone with authority or with an expert, but with all students, staff and people in the community. The objective here is to overcome pretensions of power which are so present in the discipline-based model and allow for real, valid and egalitarian relationships.

Dialogue is present across throughout the prevention and resolution of conflict, both in the compiling of rules and in their subsequent implementation and in responding to procedural ethics and deliberative democracy in approaches (Elster, 1998). **Procedural ethics** establish that value of decisions or agreements does not only depend on their contents but on the procedures which were followed when agreeing the rule, the decision, the agreement.. The higher the number of people and the higher the diversity of said people, the more valuable the rule is due to the increase in perspectives and arguments. **Deliberative democracy**, for its part, is based on the view that dialogue and consensus is preferable to voting for opposing choices when making democratic decisions. In a vote, two or more options are presented and voted upon so that a majority vote may be used to make a decision. However, in a deliberative democratic process, the initial viewpoints of those involved in decision-making can alter with discussion and arguments and alternative options are allowed to emerge, thus making reaching a consensus more inclusive.

The generation of dialogue spaces prevents conflict. The involvement of the whole community is necessary, so that all opinions about causes and origins of conflict and its solutions are heard and taken into consideration while the conflict still is latent.

The dialogic model means taking a step further to prevent problems in coexistence. It does not necessarily entirely replace the other models outline above, but these in themselves cannot eradicate the occurrence of problems. When the student body, their relatives and the staff have the opportunity to participate in the management of their centre as well as rule creation and conflict resolution, the quality of coexistence is improved both in the centre and in the education community as a whole. Furthermore, community participation does not contrast with student learning but fully compliments it and fosters instrumental learning.

The following chart summarises the aforementioned models and their concepts:

DISCIPLINE-BASED MODEL	MEDIATOR MODEL	COMMUNITY MODEL
Removing a conflict situation by means of punitive actions	Resolving a conflict situation once it has emerged	Preventing a conflict situation
Authority	Mediator	Community
Top to bottom rules	Dialogue for implementing rules	Dialogue throughout the rulemaking process (procedural ethics and deliberative democracy)
Emphasis on sanctions, exclusions, etc.	Emphasis on support between peers rather than apportioning blame	Emphasis on participation; A clear link to learning

In Learning Communities, the participation of the community in the prevention of conflicts is encouraged in many day-to-day areas. In, for example Mixed Commissions, assemblies, family education, the classroom and the library, everyone in the community connects with one another and establishes relationships based on trust which allows them to work together in such ways as to prevent conflict or an escalation of conflict before it occurs.

An education centre which is open to families encourages relationships based on openness so that communication is no longer practised only when problems occur. Also, when signs of conflict do arise, the situation can be addressed more quickly. When families and other education agents are in classrooms, they help reduce conflict and achieve outcomes which the faculty themselves cannot.

Some Learning Communities have a Mixed Commission whose role is to focus on coexistence. In this Commission, the student body, their relatives, the faculty and other professionals oversee potential conflict situations. For example, in one particular Learning Community, one such Mixed Commission mentioned that in the third year of primary school there was a particular child who was dominating some of his classmates and behaving as if they were disliked and not accepted. Some of the other children supported his actions, partly to avoid becoming victims themselves and others were upset about the problem. The coexistence commission decided to speak to the parents of the third year and, in particular, the leader child's mother. The child's mother who was used to the dialogue approach of the school community, conceded that her son behaved in such a way. The school year parents together decided that, rather than punishing the dominating child or even implementing mediation,

they would go into the classroom to talk to the children and participate in several Interactive Group sessions which fostered changes the various relationships of the group.

In the dialogic model, a particular procedure may be used to reach a consensus on rules within a community as detailed below.

The consensus procedure for establishing rules:

The consensus procedure for establishing rules consists of a deliberation by the whole education community and starts with one which everyone can commit to meeting.

Characteristics of the rule to be agreed upon:

There are various examples of the implementation of rules which Learning Communities have agreed upon. Choosing a suitable rule according to the inclusion of all viewpoints is done by meeting certain conditions. Here, these conditions are illustrated by the following example of a rule adopted by one particular Learning Community: *No child can be insulted or attacked for the way he/she dresses.*

The rule is clearly agreed upon by everybody regardless of their point of view or age: Even if someone does not agree with the wearing of a particular garment, for instance a mini skirt, a veil, or a hat, they agree that this is not a reason to insult or attack anybody.

The rule is directly related to an area of the children's lives: A rule must be directly related to the children's lives and be part of solving real coexistence problems. Most proposed rules focus on needs which are perceived as important by the faculty and other adults, for example punctuality and treating school materials with respect. Despite the importance of such issues, they may not initially have a clear impact on the children themselves whereas being insulted or attacked because of clothes, or indeed witnessing how other children are attacked, causes clear emotional distress and has consequences on behaviour, safety and freedom in various contexts aside from just at school.

The rule has clear verbal support from the whole community not just in the classroom and centre: The wider education community is prepared to support and uphold the rule outwardly in the way they interact and communicate with others even when opinions about the way students dress vary.

Repeated breach of agreement: In spite of verbal support, there are rules which are repeatedly breached. Unfortunately there are many cases at school centres of boys lifting up the skirts of girls. Also some are insulted on account of wearing veil or because of the quality of their clothes.

The rule must respond to a behaviour which can be eliminated: The rule has to be sufficiently limited as to provide clarity in its adherence. Therefore it must specify one particular clearly recognisable behaviour which can be modified. It is more difficult to eliminate feelings, attitudes or very general behaviours as in the case of 'any form of verbal abuse', for instance.

The community must be an example of improvement to society in their approaches to overcoming conflict: By agreeing on a rule, not only is a specific problem solved, but also the community learns that it is capable of resolving future conflict situations. This serves as an excellent basis and motivation for creating further rules and becoming aware that mutual understanding is possible.

Steps for ensuring the participation of and dialogue between the whole community:

In order to decide on a rule and respect it, a dialogic process is proposed which may occur over a few weeks. This process is based on seven steps and involves the participation of the whole community as follows:

A Mixed Commission of teachers, families and students proposes a rule for the consideration of the whole community.

The rule is considered and debated by the faculty and a community assembly with the maximum possible participation.

Members of the Mixed Commission disseminate the proposed rule to all classrooms from which class representatives collect reflections, comments and suggestions for change or ideas for the fulfilment of the rule.

Delegates from the student body debate how the proposed rule should be implemented with the support of members of the Mixed Commission.

Representatives from the student body call an assembly to explain the results of their deliberations to the faculty, their relatives and the community. They also gather the responses of these agents and return to their respective classes accompanied by teacher or tutor plus a representative from the Mixed Commission.

The community observes the implementation of the rule and ensures its continuous review. Follow-ups are conducted in groups and the overall process is overseen by the classroom delegates and the Mixed Commission.

The process works alongside training in the form of Dialogic Gatherings, discussion of texts, video-forums and other activities as deemed necessary.

An example of prevention and resolution of conflict:

An example of prevention and resolution of conflict at CEP San Antonio is described here by the centre project coordinators, M^a Carmen Vega Lorente and Marta Sánchez-Beaskoechea Gómez:

http://utopiadream.info/ca/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CEP_San_Antonio_prevencion_de_conflictos.pdf

(Checked on April 2016)

10.2. Preventive socialization of gender violence

Most problems of coexistence which occur at an education centre have their origins in affective-sexual relationships between students, although centre staff and the so-called 'official body' (staff, teachers, assistants and parents) are usually under the impression that these problems are a result of other issues.

Commonly occurring situations are like the events which unfolded surrounding Marta, a 13-year-old girl who had a brief relationship with Toni, one of the most popular boys in her class, who in the past used to go out with another girl in the group. Initially she feels proud of her conquest, that of going out with the most popular boy in her class. Even when Toni loses interest in Marta she feels that she has entered the realm of the successful girls because suddenly there are also other boys who are now interested in her. She now listens to what some of her girlfriends tell her and decides to do things she would have never dreamt of doing before. She goes out with various boys of her own age or even older and agrees to take daring photographs for them. Sometime later, however, Marta's feelings of success turn into bitterness and distress as other boys and girls start saying nasty things about her. They write insulting messages on the walls about her and send her obscene messages. They share the photos she took and tell rude jokes about her on *Facebook* and apps such as *Gossip*. When Toni starts going out with another girl, the situation worsens further for Marta who now feels that going to school is a nightmare. One day at break-time, she is insulted in public and Marta tries to defend herself by shouting back at the girls who, in the past, were her friends.

The staff believes that this argument is simply a conflict between a group of girls made worse by Marta's poor interest in school. Because they are unaware that the fight is just the tip of the iceberg of other problems, perhaps the staff decides to punish all the girls or just let them make peace between themselves. Since they are not aware of the underlying problems, the staff may do little to address any of the real feelings involved or help to resolve the conflict.



The frequent lack of awareness among staff regarding the socialisation processes involved in affective-sexual relationships in the student body impedes the detection and identification of day-to-day problems in classrooms. It also prevents the discovery of an effective solution to said problems which is for students to establish free of violence relationships. Resolving the underlying problems has the capacity to make a significant impact on students' learning and also on the rest of their lives. Jesús Gómez states:

'All children have the right to an education which will allow them to develop satisfactory affective-sexual relationships which do not condemn them to a problematic relationship which then acts as a precursor to an unsatisfactory life. '(2015:114)

To enable young people to receive such an education, it is necessary to consider contributions from current research and international feminism regarding affective-sexual relationships in youths to prevent the frequent and dreadful mistakes and incidents which otherwise occur.

Overall, there is serious confusion in schools when they foster coexistence programmes and gender-based violence prevention programmes for adolescents and youths because the affective-sexual relations which underlie most conflict are not recognised and their impact on lives is not acknowledged. Such misunderstandings even start at the level of official administrative definition. Despite being an example of great progress, even the Law against Gender Violence of 2004 in Spain considers gender violence in only past or current long-term relationships as follows:

Article 1. Purpose of the Law

This Law aims to work against violence when inequality between men over women in relationships occurs as a sign of discrimination, when there is violence against women, regardless of who their husbands or partners are or who may be emotionally connected to them, whether or not they live together.

The international scientific community does not consider gender-based violence as necessarily being a result of stable emotional (loving) relationships, but as consequence of every kind of relationship whether stable or casual. Also, gender-based violence is often learnt and developed during periods when casual or brief relationships are most commonly formed.

If available scientific evidence had been consulted when the law was compiled (by various political parties), would have included without a doubt casual/brief relationships in its definition of gender-based violence. In fact, subsequent autonomous laws have since included this form of gender-based violence (Valls, Puigvert, Melgar, García-Yeste, 2016).

Centre staff must be aware of the fact that scientific evidence shows gender-based violence being common among older children/adolescents, frequently occurring in brief and casual relationships (Aubert, Melgar, Valls, 2011; Oliver & Valls, 2004). Aside from the serious impact of the abuse and the attacks themselves, such gender-based violence also has a massive influence on the young people's subsequent relationships. Therefore several researchers have concluded that violence generates further violence and that those who suffered violence

during adolescence are more likely to suffer violence again in their youth and when adults. Some researchers also consider the possibility that becoming a victim of gender-based violence as a youth is more strongly correlated with initial emotional experiences than with possible child abuse (Oliver & Valls, 2004; Smith, White, & Holland, 2003).

Affective-sexual socialisation

Consequently, consideration needs to be given to how other youths like Marta above can be prevented from becoming involved with and subsequently insulted, humiliated and distressed by young males and how sexist behaviour in general can be prevented. Attacks on girls' freedom can end badly, at worst tragically, or in the very least impede on students' happiness.

An argument in the yard at break time is just the tip of the iceberg, of something unseen by adults until there is a display of distress in public. Behind well-known and terribly sad cases such as the murder of a 17-year-old girl (Marta del Castillo) by her ex-boyfriend in 2009 or the other case of another young woman killed on a date on a summer's night are situations which are frequently invisible. Also, the fact that sometimes the murderers of these young women, such as the person who killed Marta del Castillo, even have fan clubs, shows that there is a tremendous amount of work still to be done.

Fortunately, the social sciences and feminism provide us with options for intervention. For many decades, the social sciences have produced studies on the social aspects of the emotion 'love'. This is, we fall in love with some people, not with some others, not through a biologic determinism but based on cultural and social interactions, from which we learn our socialization.

The pioneering research of Jesús Gómez (2015) about socialisation in love and attraction, especially amongst adolescents, for the first time presents the concept of attraction being a result of social interactions. It demonstrates the existence of a primary socialisation process (although not unique or exclusive) which often fosters a connection between attraction and violence. Many agents of socialisation, including films, music and advertising in the *mass-media* produce relationship models where it is transmitted that violent relationships or potentially violent are harmful but thrilling, convey excitement. Egalitarian relationship models are convenient and safe, but boring. As a point of reference, many a TV series will effectively try to sell viewers a model of masculinity as the lead character. However, how often is he the most caring character who is open to discussion or how often is he closed and conflictive or aggressive? Films and novels which feature intense or passionate relationships often show conflict and even violence as part of their interactions. It is less common to see dialogue and relationships based on respect. The mass media provide clear examples of gender-based violence socialisation. Mass-media are a clear example, but above all reflect this majority socialisation in which all interactions have their influence, family too, educational centre and mainly the group of peers and those sexual-emotional relations that are being established by the people (Flecha, Pulido, Christou, 2011).

However, since love and attraction are a result of social interactions, this means that the common socialisation processes which link attraction and violence can be altered. As an

alternative to socialisation in gender-based violence, Gómez (2015) proposed the model of merging friendship and affection with excitement and desire in relationships, regardless of duration. Gómez clarifies as follows: *'Dissatisfaction in relationships based either on 'flirting' (passion without love) or stability (love without passion) can only be overcome by uniting affection and excitement, friendship and passion and stability and madness in the same person.'* (Gómez, 2015, p. 77)

Preventive socialisation of gender-based violence consists of creating social interactions which foster attraction towards egalitarian models and the rejection of aggressive models (Gómez, 2015; Puigvert, 2014). Of course it must be said that not everybody is socialised in attraction to violence although there is a general trend towards it. Hence it is about fostering said socialisation that transmits equality as exciting and thrilling. Furthermore, the preventive socialisation of gender violence then also can influence and modify the preferences of people who are already socialised to find violence appealing. Also, if love and attraction are in fact social, dialogue will allow for the transformation of an attraction for violence into a preference for a more egalitarian models.

Ethics and desire language

However, preventative socialisation of gender violence cannot be achieved through using the language of ethics only. Another error of educational programmes in co-education and prevention of violence is that of trying to foster egalitarian relationships and egalitarian young men using the language of ethics only which is that of values and concepts of 'good' and 'bad'. Whereas in the language of ethics the focus is on, for example, not being sexist, having respect or perhaps distributing housework equally between boys and girls and so on which is not appealing language, is not the desire language that adolescents use. Also, at the same time as these programmes are being developed, the majority of socialisation (mass media, films, nets, friendly conversations) reinforces attraction towards violence and aggressive men. The connection between attraction and violence is fostered, in part, as stated previously, by the distinct separation between what is safe, and boring and what is unsafe but exciting. If the language of ethics is used which tends to convey the above traditional ideas, the root cause of the problem is never challenged, that of relationships based on gender-based aggression being exciting and therefore attractive. (Castro & Mara, 2014; Duque, 2015)

The following statement from research previously referred to by Gómez (2015), reflects the dichotomy between ethics and desire language and is provided by an adolescent girl in *Ragazza*, a women's magazine: *'My parents tell me to marry a good man and I take good notice of them; Until I have to get married, I have fun with bad boys.'*

This example clearly shows a double standard: Here the language of ethics represents what the father and the mother say as being 'good' and what the girl wants as being 'bad'. Desire language refers to what is liked, what is desirable and attractive. This is conveyed in films, advertising, songs and so on and through many personal interactions too. This is why it is necessary to work with desire language in order to make both violence unattractive and alternative egalitarian models more attractive. The idea is not for people to suppress their

desires by accepting what is 'safe' for but for the preventive socialisation to generate attraction towards 'safer' models and to convey the idea that what is 'good' is also exciting. Of course, however, such desire language could no be changed from the experts on training programmes, but language and desires can be changed from the young people themselves through their interactions with peers, friends, brothers and sisters and volunteers of a similar age.

For this reason, for the development of a preventive socialisation of violence in relationships, the dialogic model is highlighted in which spaces for subjects related to the children's lives can be considered alongside the participation and dialogue of all education agents of a similar age within their community. Transformative dialogue occurs when a variety of women take part (Aubert, Melgar, Valls, 2011; Oliver, Soler, & Flecha, 2009; Padrós, 2014), so that not only the language of values is introduced (necessary) but also the language of desire. This dialogue with multiple participants is the most effective option for learning about developing emotions and feelings even though it contradicts other approaches currently being used in emotional education.

Frequent errors in emotional-social education

It is surprising that current education literature, despite its many references to the importance of emotional-social education leaves feelings aside. Although an exact translation for *sentimiento* does not exist in English, it is clear that feelings are different from emotions. In drawing a distinction between feelings and emotions, languages often highlight a difference in duration. Emotions are a transient and can change in an instant whereas feelings are often more stable and enduring.

At times, a dichotomy between intensity (of emotion) and continuity is reinforced. It seems then that where there are feelings, for example in friendship or long-term loving relationships, emotions are not counted, almost as if they do not exist or that there is less intensity of emotion. This incorrectly pushes individuals to choose between one or the other as if they are opposing faces. If emotions are considered to be in opposition to love and friendship, they quickly generate increasing negative emotions such as jealousy, frustration and distrust which then cause deterioration in relationships, as well as in the quality of life of the person experiencing them. Also, subsequent hope in the possibility of a new world where sexism and gender violence is reduced. Positive emotions can be exciting and instant but they also need not contrast with love and friendship. Henceforth, emotional-social education which contributes to overcoming gender violence and sexism is inseparable from education in feelings such as friendship and love.

Consequently, feelings are considered as even more important than emotions because they can include and reinforce positive emotions. Friendship and love (feelings) felt by students will have a strong influence on their personal, academic and professional lives. This is why feelings of friendship are the most important ones to be fostered at school. And friendship is not 'taught' in particular sessions but is created and nurtured in day-to-day activities such as Interactive Groups in which pupils understand and help each other on a daily basis. Outside the classroom, the peer who they have been helping or who has given them help is not just a

person who they can ignore, but a real friend to accept and protect. All children who have participated in Interactive Groups say how much these activities have helped them become better friends than ever before, thereby improving relationships in every area of their lives inside and outside school.

Emotions and feelings generated in Interactive Groups and during other Successful Educational Actions are based on egalitarian dialogue and equality of differences. This is completely unrelated to the actions of some programmes which attempt to 'emotionally educate' students by forcing them to make physical contact with one another as a form of communicating emotional expression even when they do not wish to work with the partners they are given. Such activities entirely go against the student's freedom and favour harassment and aggression. It is essential in education centres that the freedom to choose if and how contact occurs is fostered (Oliver, 2014).

The ideal of romantic love

Regarding feelings and love, there is also significant confusion between assumptions and scientific evidence in many coexistence programmes and sometimes even in programmes for the prevention of gender-based violence. The most common mistake is in believing that romantic fairytale love promotes violence in relationships between boys and girls. There is no proof of this. In reviewing scientific literature about romantic love, there is no evidence that romantic love fosters gender violence (Duque, 2015; Yuste, Serrano, Girbés, Arandia, 2014). When reviewing fairy tales from the point of view of the socialisation of attraction to violence, it can be noted that there is never a fairytale prince who hits or abuses the woman he is in love with. Equally, there is never a fairytale princess who falls in love with somebody who abuses her.

A different issue is that of whether fairytales promote stereotyped model roles of men and women and foster traditional relationships. However, traditional gender roles are a separate issue not directly linked with gender violence nor related to the appeal of violence (Yuste, Serrano, Girbés, Arandia, 2014). Gender violence victims are women from every kind of background. They do not always match a traditional model of femininity. Many women who have lived according to a traditional family model and role of a woman have suffered gender-based violence and many have not. Equally, many women who have broken with the traditional model have suffered gender violence and many have not. In fact, many years' worth of gender violence prevention programmes which have focussed exclusively on overcoming gender stereotypes have been unable to eradicate gender-based aggression. Gender-based violence is still reality for young women educated in coeducational schools which challenge traditional feminine roles.

It is the same people and programmes who portray romantic love in a negative light who often also uphold aggressive models of the male which appear in many films, books and songs. Examples here include *The Perfume* which appears to celebrate a woman killer or *Three Metres Above the Sky* among others. Proponents of such gender roles consider the princess in the fairytale who has a prince devoted to her and who cares for her as 'submissive' whereas

they regard the female protagonist in *50 Shades of Grey* as 'open-minded' when it is in fact the latter model who signs a contract of submission.

Based on respect, romantic love prevents and does not foster gender violence. The adolescent females who are seeking males to fall in love with them, regardless of the duration of the relationship, believing in such an idealistic model, are more likely to value themselves and not subject themselves to sexist relationships which cause people, in turn, to believe that true love is impossible or to link passion with violence.

Alternative masculinities

Gender violence prevention must also consider perceptions of masculinity in terms of rejecting violent masculine models and encouraging violence-free models. Again, this topic has frequently been developed with the language of ethics which is less attractive for many young people and inefficient in overcoming gender violence.

Starting from notion of the existence of a form of socialisation which fosters appeal towards violent masculine models, if coeducational programmes fostering egalitarian masculinities are implemented, but the existence of the above appealing model is ignored, the result is disastrous. These programmes foster masculine roles with egalitarian behaviours such as task distribution and non-violent interactions which result in models which are neither appealing nor interesting. Henceforth it is once more conveyed with the language of ethics that a 'suitable' man is one which is egalitarian but not exciting. As a consequence, many young males do not wish to become the egalitarian who is ignored by the opposite sex, but to be the 'non-egalitarian' who is socially regarded as more attractive. An adolescent said the following after a workshop on masculinity where he was educated in not being violent, to perform housework and to take care of women: *'I like all that very much, in fact I do it, but my question is, why don't I pull anyone?'*

To consider masculinity from the perspective of gender violence preventive socialisation it is firstly necessary to start with some basic principles. In heterosexual relationships there are three clear models: the traditional dominant masculinity, the traditional oppressed masculinity and new alternative masculinities (Castro Sandúa & Mara, 2014; Duque, 2015; Flecha, Puigvert, & Ríos, 2013).

Traditional dominant masculinity is based on power and contempt towards women. It is the form of masculinity which creates gender violence and double standards. The link between this model and attraction generates relationships which are founded on gender-based violence. The traditional oppressed masculinity describes men who have egalitarian relationships with women which contain no excitement. Theories and actions which are only based on the language of ethics and ignore the language of desire foster this type of masculinity. These two traditional masculinities (dominant and oppressed) have always existed. Both of them may contain the traditional elements of, for example, not distributing the housework and so on, but one is aggressive and the other is not. Sometimes, the non-violent oppressed masculinity, has been mistakenly identified as a new masculinity, when in fact it is not new and has always existed. Neither is it an alternative masculinity because it is in

fact the other side of the same coin which represents traditional dominant masculinity. Oppressed masculinity is not the cause of gender violence and cannot be blamed, just as the victims of the gender violence cannot be blamed. However, its oppressed position means it does not serve to overcome gender-based violence but in fact to feed the existence of a dominant masculinity. Just as violent masculinities are attractive, there must also exist an unattractive egalitarian masculinity. To be 'unsuitable' men regarded as exciting, there must be 'suitable' men void of excitement.

However, new alternative masculinities break with this dichotomy of the oppressor and the oppressed to propose a 'suitable' and exciting, egalitarian and attractive model. These masculinities represent a diversified model of men having egalitarian relationships based on both love and desire. They are attractive men who neither exercise domination nor contempt. They are egalitarian men who do not accept being oppressed by either the dominant masculinity or by women. They are men who do not reject values like strength or courage which appear as elements of dominant models. In fact they are strong and courageous in confronting instances of gender-based violence for they protect victims and stand up to aggressors. Also, in terms of affective-sexual relationships they do not accept relationships with women who look at them as a 'good man' for after having had 'fun with the bad boys' as acted out in the role of the oppressed masculinity. It is a masculine model which only has relationships with women who are attracted to them and who get excited through egalitarian treat. This alternative model of masculinity is one which in fact overcomes gender-based violence as it breaks the bond between attraction and violence.

In conclusion, the fostering of masculinities which are viewed as exclusively 'good' or 'bad' or the 'right' man or the 'wrong' man, does not generate appeal for young women in non-violent masculinity, neither does it generate a wish in young men to take on such an image. This again, highlights the need for work from the desire language with young people.

To find out more:

- Gómez, J. (2015). *Radical love. A revolution for the 21st century*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Flecha, R., Puigvert, L., & Ríos, O. (2013). The New Masculinities and the Overcoming of Gender Violence. *International and Multidisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(1), 881-13.
- Oliver, E. (2014) Zero Violence since Early Childhood. The Dialogic Recreation of Knowledge, *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(7), p. 902-908
- Puigvert, L. (2014) Preventive Socialization of Gender Violence Moving Forward Using the Communicative Methodology of Research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 20(7), p. 839-843.

10.3. Bibliography

- Aubert, A., Melgar, P., & Valls, R. (2011). Communicative Daily Life Stories and Focus Groups: Proposals for Overcoming Gender Violence among Teenagers. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17(3), 295-303.
- Castro Sandúa, M., & Mara, L. C. (2014). The Social Nature of Attractiveness: How to Shift Attraction from the Dominant Traditional to Alternative Masculinities. *International and Multidisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(2), 182–206.
- Duque, E. (Coord.) (2015) *IDEALOVE&NAM. Socialización preventiva de la violencia de género [IDEALOVE&NAM: Preventive socialization of gender]*. Madrid: CNIIE. Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte.
- Elster, J. (1998). *Deliberative Democracy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Flecha A., Pulido C., & Christou M. (2011). Transforming violent selves through reflection in critical communicative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17 (3), 246-255.
- Flecha, R., Puigvert, L., & Ríos, O. (2013). The new alternative masculinities and the overcoming of gender violence. *International and Multidisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(1), 88-113.
- Flecha, R., & Garcia, C. (2007). Prevención de conflictos en las comunidades de aprendizaje [Prevention of conflicts in Learning Communities]. *Idea La Mancha: Revista de Educación de Castilla-La Mancha*, 4, 72-76.
- Gómez, J. (2015). *Radical love. A revolution for the 21st century*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Oliver, E. (2014). Zero Violence since Early Childhood. The Dialogic Recreation of Knowledge. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(7), 902-908
- Oliver, E., Soler, M., & Flecha, R. (2009). Opening schools to all (women): Efforts to overcome gender violence in Spain. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 30(2), 207-218.
- Oliver, E., & Valls, R. (2004). *Violencia de género. investigaciones sobre quiénes, por qué y cómo superarla [Gender violence. Researchers about who, why and how to overcome it]*. Barcelona: Hipatia.
- Padrós, M. (2014). *A transformative approach to prevent peer violence in schools: contributions from communicative research methods*. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(7), 916-922.
- Puigvert, L. (2014) Preventive Socialization of Gender Violence Moving Forward Using the Communicative Methodology of Research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 20(7), 839-843.
- Smith, P. H., White, J. W., & Holland, L. (2003). A longitudinal perspective on dating violence among adolescent and college-age women. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97(7), 104-110.

- Valls, R., Puigvert, L. Melgar, P., & García-Yeste, C. (2016) Breaking the silence at the Spanish universities: the first research about violence against women. *Violence Against Women*, 29, 1-21.
- Yuste, M., Serrano, M.A., Gírbés, S., & Arandia, M. (2014) Romantic Love and Gender Violence Clarifying Misunderstandings through Communicative Organization of the Research, *Qualitative Inquiry* 20(7), 850-855.