

Sexual Violence against Journalists in Conflict Zones

Gendered Practices and Cultures in the Newsroom

Marte Høiby

Abstract

While sexual violence is a threat to both men and women in war and conflict, cases concerning male victims are largely absent from public discussion and women's vulnerability regularly assumed. This paper suggests that procedures for journalist safety are influenced by a male-aggressor/female-victim paradigm, underestimating the vulnerability of male colleagues and discriminating against women.

Keywords: conflict reporting, journalist safety, gender, women, sexual violence, male-aggressor female-victim paradigm

Introduction

While sexual violence is a threat to both men and women in war and conflict, cases concerning male victims are largely absent in the public discussion, and women's vulnerability is regularly assumed. This chapter suggests that gendered policies and practices for journalists' safety in the field of conflict reporting are influenced by a male aggressor/female victim paradigm, underestimating the vulnerability of male colleagues and discriminating against women. The result is limited professional leeway for female staff and underreporting of assaults for both men and women. Dominant masculinities in editorial leadership exist and influence decision making and routines, regardless of gender participation.

Sexualised violence or threats against women journalists have in several cases led to sexist deployment to work in areas where female reporters have endured sexual assaults. The women journalists interviewed or otherwise considered for this study express a need to reclaim their professional freedom with respect to safety and sexual violence. Their concern is for the discrimination (misjudgement and distrust) they suffer when it comes to decision making for their own safety, and the gendered preju-

dice which occurs among editors and fellow journalists of both genders. At the same time, male journalists have said they are pressured (by the same dominant culture) by unrealistic expectations of their manhood.

I shall discuss in theory and challenge empirically some assumptions influencing practices in the newsroom (and in the field): that violence against men is essentially different (by motive) from that against women; that women staff require extra protection; and that these assumed situations will be alleviated by hiring women in leading positions. While violence against men sometimes *appears* different from that against women, my questions are about *how* it differs, and which differences – and similarities – are significant. That women need extra protection will not be opposed – but why is extra protection reserved for women? I approach these issues in the context of rape theory and literature on masculine hegemony and conflict-related sexual violence, scholarly fields offering critical analysis of gendered issues including victimisation and agency and further contextualise the disjuncture between men and the masculine. It has long been known that there are multiple masculinities within any one culture and across cultures, and that it is impossible to draw a dichotomic demarcation line between men and women. It is this binary perspective that I aim to challenge – without, though, opposing the notion that gendered differences do exist for women and men as war reporters. Choosing to shed some light on the violence suffered by men, I may, hopefully, contribute to a more nuanced and complex discussion of the reality for both women and men reporters who are risking their lives in the job of covering war and conflict.

The empirical data presented is retrieved from twenty in-depth interviews with journalists and editors in the Philippines and Norway that were carried out for a larger study on journalists' safety and adaptation strategies in seven countries (see Høiby & Ottosen 2014). It is augmented with secondary data from public interviews and reports by international bodies, and takes an explorative approach in discussing gendered attitudes and adaptation strategies among journalists and editors working in the field of conflict coverage. It considers the potential problems of gendering risk and sexual violence against journalists, and intends to serve as a contribution to dialogue on a topic to which there are few definitive answers or solutions.

Method and structural considerations

The following is based on findings from a research project which set out to map journalists' and editors' experiences with threats, and their responses to a potentially more dangerous security situation for journalists at work in conflict zones. The project interviewed a hundred journalists and editors in seven countries. Gender was not the original aim of the research project, and because of methodological inconsistency among project participants in the different countries it was discussed in only some of the interviews. This chapter is based on eighteen of the interviews; all the informants are from Norway and the Philippines.

Six of the informants are editors and twelve are journalists. Ten are women and eight are men. Most of the journalists are staff reporters, and only a few are freelancers or contracted on short-term agreements. The Norwegian journalists work as foreign affairs or international reporters, and the Filipino work locally and/or are connected to international bureaux. Many of them have lifelong experience of conflict coverage, and all have covered conflict frequently in the past five years. Most of the interviews are recorded, but some are not, for safety concerns, and the identities of interviewees are protected. Additionally, this chapter will use information and statistics from international institutions working to promote journalists' safety, and from public interviews of journalists who shared the stories of their attacks.

The definition of conflict reporting decided upon was outlined in the study:

reporting on armed or violent social conflict ... both armed conflict and organised crime; any type of reporting in which the journalist is putting her or his life at risk for the job, based on potential threat from actors involved in the conflict.

Violence and gender in theory

The assumption that violence against women is different from violence against men has been challenged on several premises by scholars. Richard Felson (2002), who has studied broadly the social psychology of violence, concludes that the same motives – to gain control or retribution and to promote or defend self-image – play a role in almost all violence, regardless of gender. Carine Mardorossian holds that all violence is sexualised, and describes it as “an inherently sexualised phenomenon of which rape is the extreme form” (Mardorossian 2014: 8). She advocates for greater focus on the representativeness of rape in society and culture, and warns against the treatment of sexual violence as a ‘woman’s issue’.

In war and conflict, violence may be used strategically to subjugate the enemy and demonstrate sovereignty, at an individual level or more systematically. In the book *The Landscape of Silence* Amalendu Misra (2015) gives a record of the very prevalent issue of sexual violence against men in war, which he describes as a most effective means to “humiliate, de-masculinise and strategically weaken the male enemy for good”. He argues that through this form of violence the rapist or violator appropriates the victim’s body and mind for a longer period of time owing to the fear, shame and ruined self-image that often follow the attack. The victim is likely to reduce social and political activity (forcibly or by will) and let the perpetrator succeed in minimising his influence in society, but “discipline and punishment are often its core objectives” (op. cit.: 73). The lack of spaces for the male victim to turn to after the attack makes it even more difficult for him to restore his position in society. Misra stresses the absence of methods to redress male victims’ conditions in “social, political, legal, medical and post-conflict contexts” and that society perpetuates ‘false’ norms that ignores men and boys as victims

of sexual violence (op. cit.: 225). It imposes unhealthy expectations about masculinity onto men whereby they are expected to keep quiet about their victimhood – and the silence may reinforce the assumption of their invulnerability. Although Misra's research focuses on men (combatants and non-combatants), many women (combatants or not) are victims of the same masculine hegemony of war and conflict. In their case, however, their struggles are commonly reduced to a 'woman's issue'.

While men do not receive recognition for their vulnerability and need of protection, women are perhaps restrained by excessive focus on these very issues. As Todd W. Reeser puts it: "the most basic assumption about masculinity ... [is] that it belongs to men (Reeser 2010, in Mardorossian 2014: 12), and I suppose the same presupposition exists for women and the feminine. One example is the combat culture and strategy towards military efficiency in the US army. Barkawi (1999) argues that the 'soldierising' of recruits demands transformation by a set of values that he labels 'warrior masculinity' which ensures their readiness and effectiveness in combat. Such masculinity is the furthest point of the masculine and both men and women (with a heterosexual orientation) can undergo the transformation of adopting these values. (Thus, they argue, the recruitment of soldiers with other than heterosexual orientation will be at risk of de-masculinising, for example through stimulating social cohesion, combat groups and reduced military effectiveness) (Barkawi op. cit.: 184).

For example, in the male-only basic training of US army combat arms recruits, group norms, derived from civilian society but also fostered (tactically or otherwise) by staff (for example, in marching songs), regularly figure women as either "saints" or "whores". Such constructions of the feminine foster warrior masculinity and group solidarity. Women are to be protected from the realities of war because, while virtuous, they are weak, or they are to be used for sexual gratification. The widespread prostitution around military bases and other forms of subordination of women are consequences of this construction of femininity. In these and other ways, a specifically masculine and heterosexist soldierly identity is produced, an identity crucial to the competitiveness, the aggressiveness, and the willingness to kill and die required of effective combat formations (ibid.).

The protection scenario of the masculine, or the warrior masculine, protecting the feminine, is further manifest in society through the absence of bodies and resolutions protecting boys and men in war (see Misra 2015). Similarly, civilian males and combatants are also excluded from 'protection' in human security discourse in international institutions (Carpenter 2006). This social construction – the overpowering position of the masculine and the subordinate position of the feminine in the combat setting (or conflict zone) – is likely to also influence conflict reporting from the field. Recent feminist scholarship contends that any individual – regardless of gender, ethnicity or sexual orientation – can act either as superior masculine or subordinate feminine. This chapter discusses the extent to which such pre-judgements and pre-suppositions are still entrenched in society and in newsroom cultures.

(Sexual) violence against journalists – women’s issue?

In war and conflict, journalists are in a particular situation; protected as civilians (by UN Resolution 1738), but increasingly targeted as combatants, and they may hold substantial political influence through the dissemination of information. Violence against journalists is on the rise (see Reporters Without Borders 2014; UNESCO 2011; CPJ 2012) and both journalists and editors are increasingly reluctant to enter and engage staff in work at the conflict hotspots (Høiby & Ottosen 2015). Although journalist safety is receiving growing attention and strengthening international standards (UNESCO 2014), the critical and extensively underreported issue of sexual violence against journalists has not until recently been on the radar of international bodies and support organisations.

The Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ) report *The silencing crime: Sexual violence and journalists* (Wolfe 2011) lays out the findings from interviews with more than fifty local and international journalists, both men and women. It states that sexual assaults can typically be placed in the following categories: “targeted sexual violation of specific journalists, often in reprisal for their work; mob-related sexual violence against journalists covering public events; and sexual abuse of journalists in detention or captivity”. Women are more likely to be targeted, while there are also registered attacks on male journalists, “most often while in captivity or detention” (op. cit.) More than a dozen of those interviewed said they had endured rape or other severely violent sexual assault, and the majority of international correspondents reported having been repeatedly groped while working.

A study by the International News Safety Institute (INSI) of 1,000 women journalists supports the claim that sexual violence is frequently used to silence and intimidate women journalists, and adds that women are additionally exposed to attacks because their work challenges gender stereotypes (Barton a& Storm 2014). However, the majority of threats and assaults disclosed in the study occurred in the workplace and were perpetrated by bosses, supervisors and co-workers. In general, targeted attacks on women journalists are lower than their proportion in newsrooms (UNESCO 2014), and according to CPJs figures women account for only between 5 and 10 per cent of journalists killed in a year.¹

There is little focus on such atrocities against men, and there has been no major systematic research among male journalists. There are cases of organised rape in prisons where journalists are being held and where such violence is known to be used against male reporters (Wolfe 2012). Another example is the assault against Umar Cheema, reporter for the English-language Pakistani newspaper, *The News*, who was tortured and raped in 2010. His openness about the attack contributed to breaking the stigma and focusing the spotlight on sexual violence against male journalists as well. But, still, it is assumed that there are many such unrecorded cases.

Most of the threats to women (according to male and female informants) consist of sexual harassment and verbal threats, abduction, rape and capture into forced ‘mar-

riage', which happens especially when covering local conflict in provincial areas. In the interviews, several women mentioned the risk of not being let out again if entering a camp or an area under the control of insurgency groups.

... you have a feeling that there's already a threat against you because you're a woman. When I went up to the camp, I saw women and I learned that they were really not from the mountains; one is a teller, the other a nurse, a teacher – I met all of them. One of them even asked me to send a letter to her parents that she was already made to be a wife [to one of the group members]. The threat against you is not by bullet. You feel that there's a threat against you for being a woman.

But the threat of rape or capture into marriage can be mitigated by pretending to be married already. Another woman journalist recalls an experience from covering insurgency in a provincial area:

At the ... camp in ... in 2007, there were people asking about you, asking whether you already have a husband. They were told that I already have one so I had to borrow a ring because we needed to go back ... this is an added risk for women in those areas. You could be easily taken in as wife or married to someone there under duress ... you may get raped or forced to marry someone. The fear is real and the threat is real.

This was also used as a strategy by a Norwegian journalist when taken hostage by the Abu Sayyaf Group in the Philippines fifteen years ago. In a recent account of her kidnapping, she recalls that she asked a French co-captive if he would pretend to be her husband, thinking that the kidnappers would have more respect for a woman who is married (NRK 2015). Stories told by women journalists in the book *No Woman's Land* (Storm & Williams 2012) echo this strategy among their many tips to women reporters on how to stay safe. Inventing stories about the classical nuclear family of husband and two or three children is often on the list of safeguarding remedies.

So, why do they believe that by claiming their dignity in advance they can prevent an attack? And why is it that sometimes an attack *can* be prevented (as in the case of the informant who borrowed a ring and was let out of the camp)? It may be explained by cultural or religious norm: if one is married, one cannot be married again. At the same time, this underscores the essence of shame in sexual violence. "I would rather you shoot me than get raped," was a statement from one of the female journalist informants. Why would she give her life to her assailant? The stigma of rape is substantial. While the violence may appear as sexual, it is political in essence – rape and sexual violence against journalists in war and conflict zones is used strategically to control information (as pinpointed by Amalendu Misra (2015), for discipline and for punishment.

Gendered restrictions in risk assessment

Although violence regularly takes a sexual form regardless of gender, women journalists face particular restraints that do not apply to their male colleagues. An example that set a precedent in the Philippines was the kidnapping in 2008 of ABS-CBN anchor and broadcast reporter Cecilia Victoria Oreña-Drilon (famously known as Ces Drilon) and cameramen Jimmy Encarnacion and Angelo Valderrama. They were held for nine days by the Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG), and the ordeal triggered a significant shift in the security focus of national media houses towards extra protection of women journalists – even though two of the kidnapped were men. Whereas Drilon and the cameramen were released claiming to be physically unharmed, whether or not she had been raped in capture took significant space in the media coverage and the online discussions following the ordeal.

One of the editors interviewed for this study says that after the kidnapping of Ces Drilon they strengthened safety routines in general with briefings and routines that were rapidly institutionalised.

It also affected sending female journalists [to the area]. Not just the women but also those who are not senior or experienced in those kinds of situations. We don't just send the 'younger' ones. We no longer deploy the 'newbie' into those types of coverages.

While this statement signals a leader's commitment to protect employees' safety and wellbeing, it also discloses an assumed relationship between vulnerability and age, experience – and gender. It is also worth noting that the statement was given by a female leader. The following came from one of the female journalist interviewees:

You need to be able to convince the bosses that it's not dangerous for women ... the kidnapping of women made an impact on the desk. There's some word going around that female kidnap victims were raped in the past including the foreign hostages. It sends a signal that if you're a woman, you will be raped ... [after] Ces was kidnapped, we noticed that they're more careful in deploying women.

There seems to be a trend to take decisions about risk assessment away from the women journalists more often than for the male, and regardless of their age and experience. The term 'hegemonic masculinity', coined by Raewyn W. Connell (2006), refers to a set of practices promoting the dominant position of men in society. Women in leadership positions may adopt such dominant masculine cultures (which succumb to the power of men and vulnerability of women) along with their male colleagues.

It is not only editorial management that sets restrictions for female journalists; during the political unrest in Cairo in 2011, where several women reporters and activists endured attacks by organised mobs, RSF (2011) declared:

It is more dangerous for a woman than a man to cover the demonstrations in Tahrir Square. That is the reality and the media must face it. It is the first time that there have

been repeated sexual assaults against women reporters in the same place. The media must keep this in mind when sending staff there and must take special safety measures.

While RSF did not directly call for media houses to deny access to their women staff, during this time many media administrations experienced internal disputes on whether to send women and many (including editors interviewed for this chapter) decided to take their women staff reporters off the story. When asked about their response to the international warning, one of the editors replied that “gender consideration is naturally part of our risk assessment [and] if women in particular are attacked at a site, we will be reluctant to send them”. None of the editors expressed concern about gendered risks to their male employees and there are no known cases in which men have been denied tenure because of their gender. One editor said that women reporters could have advantages in conflict zones, seemingly posing a lesser threat to their surroundings and appearing more sensitive in matters that demand a sensitive approach. Although the answer is in accordance with traditional stereotyping, the informant could possibly be right to assume that a woman who has just survived a rape by a male assailant is more likely to be speaking to a female than a male journalist about it, but the categorisation of assignments into those suited to women and those suited to men continues to reinforce the stereotypes of women as ‘kind’ and men as ‘insensitive’ which is a concern for both the freedom and participation of the female reporters and for the safety of the male. At the core of this issue may lie the fact that the adaptation strategies rely on stereotyped gender roles. It also poses a line of questioning about gender identities and gender categorising of individuals.

Gendered restrictions by editorial leadership often result in the women’s limited power over their own professional practice, downplaying their ability to make good decisions and strategise for own safety. Altogether, it limits their opportunities for work in the field of conflict coverage. According to the aforementioned INSI study, most incidents of harassment and violence were never reported, even though a majority of women who experienced them said they were psychologically affected. Those who did report sexual harassment were asked “what was the outcome?” and their responses mostly indicated negative effects, from being disregarded to losing assignments or, in a few cases, being fired (INSI 2015).

The alternative, to take on freelance assignments, would potentially and counter-effectively reduce their safety standards even further owing to less training, equipment and resources for safe transport and accommodation. Most of the women consulted for this study felt capable of assessing the risk themselves. “Primarily because of the [insurgency] group, we shouldn’t be sending female journalists because there’s a possibility we may be raped. But sometimes I am opposed to that because it limits us when in fact I can handle the situation.”

Regulations to protect women from sexual violence further invite an assumption that the woman did not strategise prior to her attack and that she could have done something to prevent it from happening (such as not entering the area of risk). Such

regulations also signal to male staff that they are not at risk of sexual violence and that there is no willingness to protect them – or space to deal with this form for violence should it occur. The focus for response ought to lie in the social system, as it does with most other crimes. It is questionable why this has to be emphasised so particularly in the case of sexual violence against women – and why we resort so easily to solutions where freedom is taken away from them.

Macho culture and sexist deployment

At the journalist and academic research conference *Women, democracy and the media: Political participation and freedom of expression* held in Tunisia in 2014, female reporters discussed how they had established themselves in the occupation – which, for many, had been an experience of swimming against the current. Women war and conflict reporters say that they have to ‘prove themselves’ before being contracted. What has to be *proven* does not refer to building journalistic experience or networks but, rather, to demonstrate that she, as a woman, can navigate foreign landscapes and cultures ‘on her own’ and has the physical and mental capacity to endure work in especially demanding conditions. Several women say that (more than their male counterparts) they have to prove they are willing to take risks and know what such risks may entail.

Both men and women reporters interviewed for the study said that deployment to conflict zones often depends on physical strength and masculine traits. As an editor put it: “Men are usually deployed in conflict/violence coverage. We only have one woman reporter. She covers politics. It is also a dangerous beat, but not as risky as war coverage where there’s action and violence.” The statement suggests that the physical conditions (action and violence) of war are less suitable for women than for men. A male reporter says, “Here in [conflicted province area] you don’t regularly see women covering actual war. I think the fear comes more from the desk. Will the desk approve of deploying women? I don’t think so.” A woman journalist said she believed she was allowed to cover the defence beat because she looked ‘macho and not fragile’ – only one example of how women in the business of covering war and conflict also respond to the same masculine hegemony as men.

Women’s ‘particular needs’ and the lack of facilities to meet them, has been an issue for military and editorial leaders throughout history when it comes to sending women into the battle zones (Steiner 2015). Arguments against deployment are based on their physical requirements and assumed necessities, and that they are more vulnerable to sexual assaults. One example is this statement by one of the (male) journalists interviewed:

If I were to assign, I wouldn’t assign a woman in jungle warfare. What about her needs? I can take a bath in the river ... It’s like what they say; twelve soldiers and journalists can pee all at the same time in one toilet. For women, they have to take cover.

A female reporter also gives an account of experience (in this case related to the coverage of natural disasters) which is potentially dangerous and often traumatising:

Sexist deployment exists. The guys are always considered first. I confronted an editor before the ... earthquake because I noticed that they sent people who you know are lazy. Just because the 'Top five' were tired you would send a crappy reporter to do the job just because he's a man. There was one editor who refused to accept my observation that they're sexist when deploying reporters. I asked the editor to list down the last ten typhoons and count how many women were deployed to cover them. She still denied this by saying I was just hallucinating. I think this was the reason I was deployed to cover the [next] earthquake. I felt everyone was waiting for me to fail because I challenged their decision-making process on who to send ... Some female reporters thanked me because I was able to break the mode. Now they also get deployed. Why do we even have to fight this hard? Eventually the editor admitted that it's because we, women, take so long to pack our clothes, we easily get scared, we get our monthly periods and "then, before you know it, I need to pull you out" ... I overheard a male reporter once, that men always get deployed to dangerous places not because of sexism but as a matter of convenience. He echoed the statements that it's just faster and more efficient operationally to send a guy. [But] the younger male reporters also stand up for women in the newsroom. We regard each other through skill, merits, strengths ... beyond gender.

Some journalists and editors said that they believe gender is not an issue. One of the male editors-in-chief expressed clear confidence in his female reporters: "I believe there is no issue. We can have initial reservations but this doesn't prevent us from deploying female reporters to conflict areas."

The propensity to take risks has been documented in a large number of questionnaires and experimental studies. For example, a meta-analysis by Byrnes, Miller and Schafer (1999) reviewed over 150 papers on gender differences in risk perception. They concluded that the literature "clearly" indicated that "male participants are more likely to take risks than female participants" (op. cit.: 377). Given the amount of documentation of gendered differences in risk taking, one might consider this a significant element for reporters' safety in the field. Men and women calculate risk differently and women in general take more precautions in potentially dangerous situations (Harris et al. 2006).

Underreporting of incidents

That some journalists are denied tenured work in conflict zones with concerns about safety discourages journalists of both genders from reporting incidents of threats and violence. The CPJ report (2012) states:

[M]ost of the journalists told CPJ that they had chosen not to tell their editors or go public about the sexual assaults, and of the few who did speak up, all but one said they had been met with censure, such as being pulled from an assignment or being told to remain quiet.

In the report, *ProPublica* reporter Kim Barker told the CPJ: “I think it’s difficult for us to talk about this stuff because we don’t want to look like we’re weak, or whiners ... The tendency of bosses is to want someone who knows what to do and doesn’t need hand-holding.” One of the interviewed editors expressed it explicitly: “The culture plays a role. If you admit that you need psychological help, your reputation will suffer ... you’re considered lucky if the editor even asks about what you’re going through internally after a coverage.”

Reluctance to report incidents is not limited to women but becomes a restraint on all reporters, and male journalists are also exposed to the pressure of being able to ‘handle it’. Several male reporters indicated that they did not want to show weakness by reporting after-effects and injuries, as this could lead to exclusion from new assignments. This way of thinking is expressed in a statement by one of the editors: “We also don’t force [the assignment] even on our senior reporters. If you don’t feel comfortable [with it], it will not be taken against you or you will not be seen as unreliable.” Even though in this instance the journalists’ own limits are indeed being respected, fear of being considered ‘unreliable’ if refraining from accepting an assignment is evidently an issue that exists and of which the editor is aware.

Conclusions

Statements from informants to this chapter indicate that female and male reporters experience threats and violence motivated by social and political control. Although reported threats towards women are often sexualised, there is reason to believe that dark figures for this form of violence against men are significant. Sexual violence against women journalists is among the main concerns for journalists and editors of both sexes. The interviews in this study, as well as research from interested organisations, indicate that women journalists face risks for challenging gender stereotypes *and* for doing the work of a journalist, and that assailants aiming to silence them more often resort to a sexualised form when they attack. On the other hand, little if any research has been done to find whether male journalists run additional risks for being men, despite men having been victims of more than 90 per cent of journalist killings annually, as recorded by the CPJ since 1992 (CPJ 2016).

Sexual assaults happen directly or through harassment; in personal attacks and in phone calls, e-mails and SMSs. Many also suffer the after-effects of such attacks, and some are reluctant to report these reactions for fear of appearing fragile or vulnerable to colleagues and management. The competition for assignments related to war

and conflict is tough, and journalists may wish to appear strong and well suited to the physical and psychological challenges. This emphasis on traditional masculine (stereotypical) traits has the potential to further obscure the true objective of quality journalism.

Editors' responses to protecting their employees often depend on whether the employee is a man or a woman; many editors have said that they are reluctant to send women staff to a site where there is a specific risk of rape. However, neither editors nor journalists in this study mention that a situation could be more dangerous for men than women – which indicates that adaptation strategies may rely upon constructed ideas of stereotypical gender roles. The purpose of this chapter is thus not to encourage journalists and editors to stop taking preventive measures to stay safe from rape or any other form of violence, but merely to warn against seeing it as a women's issue instead of a societal problem constituting a threat to democracy and free speech.

It seems like sexual violence is considered an issue that pertains only (or mostly) to women journalists although we know that it also affects men. The idea that men are slightly better suited to work in conflict zones and require less protection than women appears mainstream at times. Men may strive to comply with a heroic ideal of the masculine, for which they are often admired. It would be interesting to examine whether those men who cannot or will not comply with the script of heroic manliness become marginalised, or to what extent their alternative form of masculinity is recognised. Whereas women are more likely to face sexual violence than murder, this is not a risk they are admired for taking because of the considerable stigma around this form of violence. In some cases, women reporters may strive to comply with the same masculine heroic ideal as the men and, if successful, contribute to the same dominant masculine culture. In that case, reporting incidents would be an ultimate setback for compliance with the macho ideal for both men and women. Men are reluctant to report sexual violence, but under the same masculine regime it seems be difficult for the women too, as they may lose the competition for future work.

Note

1. See annual statistics at www.cpj.org

References

- Amnesty International (2013). *EGYPT Gender-based violence against women around Tahrir Square*. London: Amnesty International Publications.
- Barkawi, Tarak; Dandeker, Christopher; Wells-Petry, Melissa & Kier, Elizabeth (1999). Rights and fights: Sexual orientation and military effectiveness. *International Security*, 24(1): 181-201
- Barton, Alana & Storm, Hanna (2014). *Violence and harassment against women in the news media: A global picture*. International News safety Institute (INSI).
- Bourke, Joanna (2014). Rape as a weapon of war, *The Lancet*, 383(9934):e19-e20.
- Carpenter, R. Charli (2006). Recognizing gender-based violence against civilian men and boys in conflict

- situations. *Security Dialogue*, 37(1): 83-103.
- Cole, Alyson Manda (2006). *The cult of true victimhood: From the war on welfare to the war on terror*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ) (2012). *Attacks on the press in 2011 – A worldwide survey by the Committee to Protect Journalists*. New York: CPJ.
- Connell, W. Raewyn (2005). *Masculinities*. 2nd edition. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Felson, Richard B. (2002). Violence and gender re-examined. Law and public policy. Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Harris, Christine R.; Jenkins, Michael & Glaser, Dale (2006). Gender differences in risk assessment: Why do women take fewer risks than men? *Judgment and Decision Making*, 1(1) : 48.
- Høiby, Marte & Ottosen, Rune (2015). Journalism under pressure: A mapping of editorial policies and practices for journalists covering conflict. In Høiby, Marte & Ottosen, Rune (eds.) (2015). HIO Report no. 6. Oslo: Oslo and Akershus University College.
- Harris, Janet, Mosdell, Nick & Griffiths, James (2016). Gender, risk and journalism, journalism practice. Taylor & Francis Online. [Accessed on 1.3.2016].
- Mardorossian, Carine M. (2014). *Framing the rape victim: Gender and agency*. New Brunswick, NJ and London: Rutgers University Press.
- Mardorossian, Carine M. (2002). Toward a new feminist theory of rape. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 27(3): 743-775.
- Mason, Corinne L. (2013). Global violence against women as a national security 'emergency' *Feminist Formations*, 25(2): 55-80.
- Misra, Amalendu (2015). *The landscape of silence: Sexual violence against men in war*. London: Hurst.
- Storm, Hannah & Williams, Helena (2012). *No woman's land: On the frontline with female reporters*. London: International News Safety Institute (INSI).
- NRK (2015). Et gissels erfaring (A hostage's experience). [online] Norsk Rikskringkasting (Norwegian National Broadcasting). <http://www.nrk.no/norge/et-gissels-erfaring-1.12566130> [Accessed 1 March 2016].
- Reporters Without Borders (2011). Media urged to prioritise safety after another sexual assault on woman reporter [online]. <https://rsf.org/en/news/media-urged-prioritize-safety-after-another-sexual-assault-woman-reporter> [Accessed 15 November 2015]
- Steiner, Linda (2016). Bodies at war: The dangers facing women war reporters (Chapter 2 in this volume.
- UNESCO (2014). *World trends in freedom of expression and media development* [report]. Paris: UNESCO.
- Wolfe, Lauren (2011). The silencing crime. Committee to Protect Journalists report. <https://www.cpj.org/reports/2011/06/silencing-crime-sexual-violence-journalists.php> [Accessed 1 October 2015].

