Violence Against Women: Attitudes & Prevention

Authored by

mohammed looti

November 30, 2025

Introduction: Defining Attitudes Towards Violence Against Women and Girls

Attitudes towards violence against women and girls (VAWG) represent a complex constellation of beliefs, justifications, and normative judgments that either condone, minimize, or excuse acts of gender-based harm. These attitudes are not merely passive opinions; they are deeply ingrained cognitive structures that operate as powerful precursors to behavior, shaping the likelihood of perpetration, influencing bystander intervention, and determining institutional responses to abuse. Understanding these attitudes is paramount because they form the invisible cultural infrastructure that sustains the persistence of VAWG across diverse societies, creating a climate of impunity for perpetrators. A critical distinction must be drawn between explicit attitudes, which are consciously held and reportable, and implicit attitudes, which operate outside conscious awareness but nonetheless influence snap judgments and behavioral reactions. The study of these attitudes reveals the intricate ways in which societal norms regarding gender hierarchy and power imbalances translate into individual psychological acceptance of violence as an inevitable, or even justifiable, element of interpersonal relationships.

These attitudes are often characterized by two primary mechanisms: the minimization of the severity of the violence and the attribution of blame onto the victim. Minimization involves framing serious acts of abuse, such as physical assault or sexual coercion, as private matters, misunderstandings, or exaggerated complaints, thereby reducing the perceived need for external intervention or punishment. Concurrently, **victim-blaming** shifts responsibility away from the perpetrator by focusing on the victim's actions, dress, or presence in certain locations, effectively justifying the violence as a predictable consequence of the victim's perceived transgression of social norms. This dual process of minimization and external attribution of blame serves a crucial psychological function: it allows individuals to maintain a positive self-image while simultaneously accommodating socially permissive views on violence. Furthermore, the attitudes under scrutiny encompass a spectrum, ranging from outright endorsement of violence to more subtle forms of passive acceptance, such as believing that domestic disputes should not involve law enforcement or that sexual harassment is simply a harmless expression of male sexuality.

The global prevalence of VAWG necessitates a rigorous examination of these underlying attitudinal drivers. While legal frameworks in many nations prohibit violence, the effectiveness of these laws is often undermined by pervasive community attitudes that normalize or excuse abuse. These attitudes are not monolithic; they vary significantly based on cultural context, socioeconomic status, religious background, and exposure to educational resources, yet they consistently reflect deeply entrenched patriarchal structures that privilege male authority and control. This encyclopedia entry seeks to dissect the theoretical underpinnings, sociocultural drivers, psychological mechanisms, and measurement challenges associated with attitudes towards VAWG, ultimately guiding the reader toward evidence-based strategies for challenging and transforming these harmful normative landscapes.

Theoretical Frameworks of Attitudinal Acceptance

The acceptance of VAWG is not random but systematically rooted in established psychological and sociological theories, providing a framework for understanding how such harmful beliefs are acquired, maintained, and propagated. **Social Learning Theory** posits that attitudes towards violence are primarily learned through observation and modeling, particularly within primary socialization contexts such as the family, peer groups, and media consumption. When children witness violence being enacted or excused, or observe that perpetrators face no negative consequences--or, conversely, that violence achieves desired outcomes, such as control or dominance--they internalize the belief that such behavior is acceptable or effective. This process is reinforced by societal narratives and cultural scripts that normalize aggressive masculinity and subordinate femininity, leading to the development of schemas that define violence as a legitimate tool for resolving conflict or enforcing gender roles.

Complementing social learning, **Cognitive Dissonance Theory** helps explain the maintenance of permissive attitudes, particularly among individuals who may recognize the harm of violence but are simultaneously embedded within social systems that condone it. When an individual's behavior (e.g., witnessing abuse without intervening) conflicts with their purported belief (e.g., violence is wrong), they experience dissonance. To reduce this uncomfortable psychological state, individuals often adjust their attitudes to align with their behavior, leading them to minimize the violence or justify the inaction, thereby reinforcing the attitude of acceptance. Furthermore, the **Theory of Planned Behavior** highlights the role of subjective norms--the perceived social pressure to engage or not engage in a behavior--in shaping attitudes. If an individual perceives that their social circle or community expects them to tolerate or ignore VAWG, this subjective norm significantly strengthens their personal attitude of acceptance, creating a powerful barrier against challenging the status quo.

From a macro-sociological perspective, **Feminist and Patriarchal Theories** provide the overarching structure, emphasizing that attitudes accepting VAWG are fundamentally instruments of male power maintenance. These theories argue that violence, and the attitudes that justify it, serve to enforce gender inequality and maintain the hierarchical dominance of men over women. Attitudes such as the belief that men have a right to discipline their partners or that women owe men sexual access function as ideological tools to sustain systemic patriarchy. This framework underscores that attitudinal change cannot be achieved merely through individual psychological interventions; it requires challenging the structural inequalities and systemic power dynamics that grant legitimacy to these harmful beliefs. Thus, the acceptance of VAWG is understood as a culturally sanctioned mechanism for preserving the existing gender order.

Sociocultural Drivers and Norms

The formation and persistence of attitudes accepting VAWG are profoundly influenced by prevalent sociocultural drivers and norms, which act as the societal environment in which individual beliefs take root. Central among these drivers is **gender inequality**, which manifests in economic disparity, unequal political representation, and limited access to education for women. Societies characterized by high levels of gender inequality consistently report higher prevalence rates of VAWG and, crucially, higher levels of attitudinal acceptance of that violence. This correlation suggests that attitudes are not isolated phenomena but rather reflections of broader structural arrangements where women are systematically devalued, making violence against them conceptually less serious in the eyes of the community.

Furthermore, rigid adherence to **traditional gender roles** serves as a powerful normative driver. Norms that dictate that men must be dominant, aggressive, and controlling, while women must be submissive, passive, and focused solely on domestic duties, create a fertile ground for violence. When a woman deviates from these prescribed roles--by seeking independence, challenging male authority, or refusing sexual advances--the violence enacted against her is often perceived, by those holding permissive attitudes, as a necessary corrective action to restore the "natural" gender order. In contexts governed by strict honor/shame cultures, violence may be explicitly justified as a means of protecting family reputation, particularly when the victim is perceived to have brought shame upon the household, reinforcing attitudes that prioritize collective reputation over individual safety and autonomy.

The role of social institutions in either challenging or perpetuating these attitudes cannot be overstated. Legal systems that are slow to prosecute VAWG cases, religious institutions that interpret texts to enforce female subservience, and educational systems that fail to teach comprehensive gender equality all contribute to a normative environment of tacit approval. Media representations, which frequently sensationalize violence, trivialize sexual assault, or depict women primarily as sexual objects or victims, further reinforce permissive attitudes by shaping public discourse and normalizing harmful stereotypes. Transforming these entrenched attitudes requires a multi-pronged approach that targets not only individual beliefs but also the institutional practices and **sociocultural norms** that grant them legitimacy and widespread currency within the community structure.

Psychological Mechanisms of Justification

Individual attitudes that accept or excuse violence often rely on sophisticated psychological mechanisms designed to minimize cognitive conflict and maintain a sense of justice or order. The most pervasive of these is **victim-blaming**, which operates on the psychological need for control and the belief in a just world (BJW). The BJW hypothesis suggests that people need to believe that

the world is fundamentally fair and predictable, meaning that good things happen to good people and bad things happen to bad people. When confronted with evidence of horrific violence, attributing the cause to the victim's behavior (e.g., "she shouldn't have been drinking," "she provoked him") allows the observer to maintain their belief in a just world, assuring themselves that such a tragedy would not happen to them because they would not make the same mistakes. This mechanism provides a reassuring, albeit false, sense of safety and predictability.

Another key mechanism involves the use of **euphemisms and minimization** to reframe violent acts as less severe or understandable responses to stress. For instance, physical abuse may be described merely as a "heated argument" or "loss of temper," rather than a criminal assault. Sexual violence is often minimized through the concept of "contributory behavior," suggesting that the victim's attire or flirtatious behavior negated the severity of the non-consensual act. This language manipulation is crucial for individuals who hold internally conflicting attitudes--they can condemn "violence" in the abstract while simultaneously excusing specific acts by redefining them in non-violent terms. This cognitive restructuring allows individuals and communities to avoid the moral and legal responsibility inherent in acknowledging the true nature of the abuse.

Finally, the interplay between hostile and **benevolent sexism** provides a nuanced understanding of justification. Hostile sexism involves overtly negative attitudes toward women who challenge the status quo, and is directly linked to the acceptance of punitive violence. Benevolent sexism, however, is seemingly positive, characterizing women as pure, fragile, and needing male protection. While appearing benign, benevolent sexism is deeply paternalistic and justifies restrictive behaviors, such as controlling a woman's movements or isolating her from others, under the guise of care. When violence occurs, those endorsing benevolent sexism may justify it as a necessary, albeit regrettable, consequence of a man protecting his dependent partner, thereby reinforcing attitudes that accept violence as a mechanism of control rather than rejection of it as a violation of rights.

Measurement and Assessment of Attitudes

Accurate measurement of attitudes towards VAWG is fundamental for evaluating intervention efficacy and understanding population risk factors, yet it presents significant methodological challenges. The primary tool for explicit attitude assessment involves psychometric scales, such as the **Acceptance of Violence Against Women (AVAW) scale** or the Rape Myth Acceptance (RMA) scale. These instruments typically use Likert-type scales to gauge agreement with statements that minimize violence, blame victims, or endorse traditional gender roles associated with control. A major challenge in using these explicit measures is the pervasive issue of social desirability bias, where respondents, aware that accepting violence is socially frowned upon, tend to provide answers they perceive as socially acceptable rather than reflecting their true beliefs, potentially leading to an underestimation of permissive attitudes.

To mitigate the limitations of explicit self-report measures, researchers increasingly employ techniques designed to capture **implicit attitudes**--unconscious associations and biases that are automatically activated. The Implicit Association Test (IAT) is a common implicit measure that assesses the strength of automatic associations between concepts (e.g., "violence" and "justified") and target groups (e.g., "women" and "responsible"). These implicit measures often reveal higher levels of acceptance or justification than explicit scales, suggesting that while individuals may consciously reject violence, unconscious biases still influence their perceptions and reactions, particularly under conditions of stress or rapid decision-making. The combination of explicit and implicit measures offers a more comprehensive and robust profile of attitudinal acceptance within a given population.

Furthermore, cultural adaptation and validation are crucial considerations in assessment. An attitude that is unacceptable in one cultural context may be normative in another, requiring careful calibration of scale items to ensure cross-cultural equivalence and relevance. For instance, items related to male entitlement to sex may need contextualization in societies where marriage is viewed as an institution granting automatic sexual access, regardless of individual consent. Researchers must also utilize qualitative methods, such as focus groups and in-depth interviews, to unpack the complex rationale and narratives surrounding attitudinal responses, providing rich context that quantitative scores often miss. Effective measurement must therefore be sensitive to both the psychological universality of bias and the sociocultural specificity of normative justification.

The Continuum of Acceptance and Impact on Behavior

Attitudes toward VAWG exist along a wide continuum, ranging from outright rejection and active opposition to explicit endorsement and facilitation. This spectrum of acceptance is critical because even passive tolerance has profound consequences for behavioral outcomes, contributing to a culture of impunity that enables violence. At the far end of the negative continuum, individuals who explicitly endorse beliefs such as male ownership or the necessity of physical discipline are significantly more likely to become **perpetrators of violence** themselves. Their attitudes serve as internal permission structures, lowering the psychological barriers necessary to inflict harm, particularly when coupled with low empathy and high levels of hostile masculinity.

However, the middle ground of passive acceptance--the silent majority--is equally detrimental. These individuals may not personally commit violence but hold attitudes that minimize the severity of abuse, distrust victims, or believe that violence is a private matter. This passive tolerance translates into a failure of **bystander intervention**. When community members hold attitudes that prioritize non-interference or view the victim as partially responsible, they are far less likely to challenge perpetrators, report incidents, or offer support to survivors. This collective silence signals to perpetrators that their actions will go unchecked, effectively reinforcing the structural acceptance of violence within the community and institutional settings, such as schools or workplaces.

The link between attitudinal acceptance and behavioral outcomes extends beyond direct perpetration and intervention; it also impacts institutional responses. Attitudes held by police officers, judges, healthcare providers, and social workers directly influence the quality of justice and support provided to survivors. If institutional actors hold beliefs that victim-blame or minimize sexual assault, investigations may be flawed, court sentences lenient, and medical care inadequate. Therefore, challenging permissive attitudes is a necessary prerequisite for effective legal enforcement and the establishment of trauma-informed systems of support. The transformation of individual attitudes is thus an essential component of broader public health and safety interventions aimed at reducing the overall incidence of VAWG.

Interventions and Strategies for Change

Effective strategies for transforming attitudes towards VAWG require comprehensive, multi-level interventions that target individuals, communities, and institutional structures simultaneously. The most successful approaches focus on **primary prevention**, aiming to challenge and change harmful norms before violence occurs. Education is a cornerstone of this effort, particularly programs implemented during adolescence that promote critical thinking about gender stereotypes, media representations, and coercive relationship behaviors. These programs often use interactive methods, such as role-playing and peer education, to foster empathy and build skills for non-violent conflict resolution, directly counteracting the attitudes learned through social modeling.

Community-level interventions are crucial for shifting subjective norms--the perceived social acceptability of violence. These strategies include large-scale public awareness campaigns that use mass media to challenge rape myths and victim-blaming narratives, often featuring male champions who actively denounce violence and model equitable behavior. Engaging community leaders, including religious figures, local politicians, and traditional elders, is essential to institutionalize new, positive norms regarding gender equality and respect. These initiatives aim to create an environment where the non-acceptance of violence becomes the new social expectation, increasing the social cost associated with holding or expressing permissive attitudes.

Finally, structural and policy interventions are necessary to ensure that institutional practices reinforce positive attitudinal change. This includes mandatory training for professionals in the justice, health, and education sectors to identify and address their own implicit biases and attitudes that might lead to victim-blaming or minimization. Furthermore, policy changes that promote women's economic empowerment and political participation directly challenge the structural gender inequality that fuels VAWG attitudes. Successful, sustained attitudinal change is therefore a long-term process that demands continuous investment in challenging patriarchal norms at every level of society, ensuring that both laws and cultural beliefs align in their unequivocal rejection of violence against women and girls.

Conclusion and Future Directions

Attitudes towards violence against women and girls are critical determinants of the prevalence and persistence of VAWG globally. These attitudes, shaped by sociocultural norms and maintained by psychological justification mechanisms, function as the societal license that allows violence to thrive. While significant progress has been made in identifying the drivers of permissive attitudes and developing effective measurement tools, the pervasive influence of implicit bias and social desirability continues to complicate assessment and intervention. The evidence overwhelmingly demonstrates that reducing VAWG requires a fundamental shift in the normative landscape, moving from passive tolerance or explicit acceptance to active opposition and zero tolerance.

Future research must continue to explore the complex intersectionality of attitudes, examining how factors like race, sexuality, disability, and socioeconomic status modify the acceptance or rejection of violence. For example, research is needed to understand attitudes specifically related to emerging forms of harm, such as **technology-facilitated violence** and online harassment, which introduce new contexts for justification and minimization. Furthermore, longitudinal studies are essential to track the sustainability of attitudinal changes resulting from prevention programs, ensuring that short-term shifts translate into enduring, transformative cultural norms across generations.

Ultimately, the goal of transforming attitudes towards VAWG transcends individual psychology; it is a project of structural and cultural reform. By rigorously measuring acceptance, dissecting the mechanisms of justification, and implementing evidence-based interventions that challenge patriarchal structures, societies can dismantle the ideological foundations that currently sustain gender-based violence, moving closer to achieving true gender equality and safety for all women and girls. The sustained commitment to challenging every form of attitudinal acceptance is not merely an academic exercise but a moral imperative.